

## Academic Assessment Report - AY 2012-2013

College, School/Department, Name of Program: Humanities and Social Sciences/ Communication

### Program SLOs:

SLO1: Understand how the power of communication helps change and shape society;

(KU 2), (GE K2, S4, GEV 2, GEV 3, GEV 4, GEV 5)

SLO2: Demonstrate diverse communication styles: oral, written, nonverbal and visual;

(KU 1,2,4), (GE S1, S2, S5, GEV 3)

SLO3: Engage in critical dialogue to become reflective practitioners;

(KU 1,2,4), (GE S1, S2, S4, GEV 2, GEV3 )

SLO4: Apply the ability to balance theory and experience;

(KU 3,4), (GE K2 )

SLO5: Demonstrate leadership skills and skills in coordinating team dynamics;

(KU 1-4), (GE S2, S4, GEV3 )

SLO6: Ground communication messages in a framework that promote ethical analysis;

(KU 1-4) (GE S2, GE S3, GE S4, GEV1, GEV2, GEV3)

Program Level Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Measure(s)	Assessment Criteria	Results of Assessment	Action Taken
<p><b>SLO #1</b> Understand how the power of communication helps change and shape society</p>	<p>Direct: Question added to twelve concept pr/test post test</p>	<p>Administered in ID 2415 and Comm 4962</p>	<p>In Spring 2013 166 studnets participated. Students improved on all 12 questions from the Intro class ID 2415 to Comm 4962. Low scores in Comm 4962 were: 39% on the question of Aristotle's modes, 29% on symbolic convergence theory and 4.5% on systems theory. This final score was significantly lower than the response in ID 2415.</p>	<p>These three concepts need to be reinforced across the curriculum by faculty</p>
	<p>Direct: Graduate Comprehensive written and oral Exam</p>	<p>Faculty rated students on a Likert scale after oral exams in areas of written communication, oral presentation, identity, integration of theory and praxis, communication scholarship and analytical skills.</p>	<p>7 students completed oral and written exams on a scale. The question on Identity related to this area. Students earned a mean score of 3.2( 1 is low, 5 is high</p>	<p>We need to teach more in our classes that communication is not just a skill but a persuasive tool. Faculty discussions occur after each student oral and we will focus more in our teaching on building Identity.</p>
	<p>Indirect: Graduating Student Survey</p>	<p>79 students were surveyed by the assessment office. 11 responded</p>	<p>Of 11 students 1.27 on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being low felt they learned in this area</p>	<p>We need to administer this survey in class for more student input</p>

<p><b>SLO #2</b>          Demonstrate diverse communication styles: oral, written, nonverbal and visual</p>	<p>Direct: Assessment tool created for comm. 3590 for all classes on Monroe Motivated Speech</p>	<p>To be administered by instructors. Assessment categories included organization, delivery, persuasion, research and preparation.</p>	<p>403 students were part of this analysis in Fall and Spring. 28% of students were ranked unacceptable or needs work in the categories of Research and Preparation. Analysis shows that some students do well in the class while others do not. There are extremes. 71% scored excellent or acceptable on research while 255 were rated excellent in preparation, 47% were acceptable.</p>	<p>This reflects the same issue as we found in ID 2415. 28% of students are not prepared for class. The problem is this creates a gap with students who are more motivated. This issue needs to be discussed with Comm 3590 instructors in June at our annual meeting. We need to find ways to motivate students who do not do the work. One way is to ensure that outlines weigh more heavily in grading and are submitted earlier in the process to look for preparation and research.</p>
	<p>Direct: Media faculty to create an assessment of core camera skills to be completed by students</p>	<p>To be administered Fall 2012</p>	<p>Not implemented</p>	
	<p>Direct: Speech Assessment to Measure Oral Presentations in the Capstone class</p>	<p>Administered Fall and spring to 133 students</p>	<p>On a scale of 1-5 with 5 being high, students ranked highest for outlines 4.4 was the mean score. They ranked 4.3 (mean) for analysis of topic. Students ranked 3.7 for organization</p>	<p>Students know the rules of organization from their classes. Our suspicion is that students are not taking the time to properly organize a speaker's outline before a presentation. This is almost a contradiction with what they scored highest on, but a speaker's outline is different from a preparation outline.</p>
	<p>Direct: Written Assessment of capstone students using Capstone rubric</p>	<p>Administered Fall and spring to 133 students</p>	<p>Students scored highest in relation to genre/ audience and genre with a mean of 4.2. All other areas scored a mean of 4.1</p>	<p>We will collect all final papers and keep in a file within the department.</p>

<p>Direct: Assessment tool revised on speeches for entire campus</p>	<p>Administered in 2012-13</p>		<p>After consultation with General Education this change was not implemented.</p>
<p>Direct: Pre/Test-Post/test continue to administer in Comm 1402</p>	<p>trainings</p>	<p>Students showed higher improvement in 9 of 10 categories in Spring 2013. The area of style did not show a significant increase from speech 1 to speech 2.</p> <p>458 evaluations were completed by faculty for students who have completed both speeches. This is the most participation we have ever had. There are approximately 1000 students across all sections of Comm 1402.</p>	<p>Summer training will focus on the area of style that includes proper grammar, clearly defining terms and avoiding clichés.</p>
<p>Direct: Create checklist for Speech Lab</p>	<p>To be completed and collated by speech coaches. The students do are asked for their needs and then at end of session coach evaluates for improvement.</p>	<p>269 appointments were scheduled by 151 students. 72% of students came to the lab from Comm 1402. Others were sent by the College of Education. Majors using the Lab were diverse. The most common needs students expressed were: help with organization (66%), delivery (60%) audience engagement ( 54% and Communication Apprehension (48%). Lab coaches ranked student improvement an average of 4.49 on a 5 point scale.</p>	<p>We need to promote the speech lab more among faculty across campus. Brochures are handed out at campus assessment days.</p> <p>Coaches will create printed sheets with ideas for improving organization, delivery, audience engagement and Communication Apprehension.</p> <p>We continue to search for ways to improve objectivity of assessment tools.</p>
<p>Direct: Graduate Comprehensive Oral and Written exam</p>	<p>Faculty will rate students on a Likert scale after oral exams</p>	<p>We found that students scored 3.7 on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being high and a 3.4 on oral presentation on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being high. This is ironic for a communication program since our graduating students do better in written work rather than oral work.</p>	<p>We need to have graduate students giving more oral presentations in the classroom. Faculty discussion noted that there are many students who never speak in class discussions.</p>

				We need to provide more points for class discussions in our grading systems.
	Indirect: Writing/ Research assessment tool created	To be administered on a voluntary basis by instructors	Instructors were pleased with this tool . Students showed more awareness of the problems their papers faced in areas such as repetition of ideas. This tool was shared with campus community at January assessment day.	We need to find ways to measure this tool.  We need to continue to promote its use among our faculty.
	Indirect: Graduating Student Survey	79 students were surveyed by the assessment office. 11 responded	On a scale of 1-5 with 5 being low, students rank this a 1.64	Faculty need to give this survey in class for more involvement
<b>SLO #3</b> Engage in critical dialogue to become reflective practitioners	Direct: Instructor oral feedback and class discussion after each oral presentation	Faculty meeting to discuss ways to measure this and reinforce		We still need to follow up on this issue At faculty meetings and trainings.
	Direct: Graduate Comprehensive Oral and Written Exam	Faculty will rate students on a Likert scale after oral exams	Graduate students scored a 3.5 on a scale of 1-4 with 4 being high. While this is fine students struggle to incorporate theory and praxis as seen through a rating of 3.2 on a scale of 1-4 with 4 being high	Faculty need to discuss this further.
	Direct: Three measures for capstone students on written papers that analyze integration of theory and praxis, understanding of the communication discipline, ability to interpret data	Faculty will rate on a scale	Only one faculty member rated this scale due to confusion over rubrics. We were able to measure two classes or a total of 30 students and found that students scored a mean of 3.9 in this area.	We need to focus on a rubric sheet that all faculty can remember to incorporate. The problem is we have about 5 different rubrics in one class

	Direct: Journalism students are asked 10 questions related to theory	Test administered in Comm 2920 Intro to Journalism and Comm 3910 Advanced journalism. It was also administered to Tower (campus newspaper staff)	<p>The survey showed that Tower staff ranked much higher than Advanced Journalism suggesting that praxis does help learning.</p> <p>Students scored lowest in the area of Conflict of Interest with 385 of Advanced Journalism getting the answer correct and only 54% of Tower getting the correct answer.</p> <p>Advanced journalism group scored lower than the Tower</p>	<p>We need to discuss Conflict of Interest ( Question 8) across all groups in our program.</p> <p>We need to have discussion with Comm 2920 instructors to ensure that all concepts are covered in the core class.</p> <p>We need to review what knowledge students transfer into Kean who have taken Intro elsewhere.</p>
	Indirect: Writing /Research rubric created to make students more reflective		This was distributed across faculty at January assessment days.	We need to continue to promote faculty usage of this tool
	Indirect: Graduating Student Survey	79 students were surveyed by the assessment office. 11 responded	Students ranked this assessment 1.73 on a scale with 1 being high and 5 being low.	Faculty need to incorporate this measure in class for more involvement
<b>SLO #4</b> Apply the ability to balance theory and experience	Direct: Measure created and training held for group problem solving for ID 2415 faculty	Training held June 4, 2012. Instructors submitted data over two semesters.		
	Direct: Graduate Comprehensive Oral and Written Exam	Faculty will rate students on a Likert scale after oral exams	We tested 7 graduates for the integration of theory and praxis. They scored 3.1 on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being high.	<p>Faculty discussed this issue on May 17, 2013 and decided we need to add an extra hour to our orientation of new students in September. Students do not understand the value of theory. Each instructor needs to point out the importance of theory.</p> <p>Half of our classes have been taught by professionals who are not resident faculty. We need</p>

				to meet with them and remind them that praxis is fine but students need to reinforce it with theoretical foundations. We need to ensure that every class is using books and readings.
	Indirect: Graduating Student Survey	79 students were surveyed by the assessment office. 11 responded	Students ranked this a 1.90 on a scale of 1-5. 1 being high.	We need to measure this in the classroom for more student involvement.
<b>SLO #5</b> Demonstrate leadership skills and skills in coordinating team dynamics	Direct: ID 2415 tool to measure team building and problem solving	Training held June 4, 2012. Instructors submitted data over two semesters.	Students were ranked on an 11 item scale for group work. Students still need work in area of Mode of Implementation and research. Of 266 students over two semesters 19.5% were rated as needing more work in the area of modes of implementation. This includes the practicalities of group work). 17% need work in the area of research (citation of sources). Students scored high, 98% in ensuring that all are equally involved in group work. They also scored high 100% in identifying problems to discuss.	<p>There is a connection in these two areas that we also notice in ID 2415. While some students work well, others are not prepared.</p> <p>July '13 training will emphasize the need for all instructors to lay out clear and consistent standards for outside class work. Both the areas of low score involve activities not done in class.</p> <p>Students in these sections might benefit by sessions in the library regarding research</p> <p>There needs to be more monitoring to keep students on task.</p>
	Direct: Networking Simulation workshop created with Career Services for Comm 3590	Created in Summer 12	This was not implemented	We need to get this back on track for Fall 13. Dialogue needs to be renewed with Career Services

	Indirect: Graduating Student Survey	<p>Faculty meeting to discuss this SLO</p> <p>79 students were surveyed by the assessment office. 11 responded</p>	Students ranked this 1.45 on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being low and 1 being high.	We need to measure this in the classroom for more student input
<p><b>SLO #6</b></p> <p>Ground communication messages in a framework that promote ethical analysis</p>	Indirect: Graduating Student Survey	<p>79 students were surveyed by the assessment office. 11 responded</p>	Students ranked this 1.45 on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being low and 1 being high	We need to distribute this within the classroom to get more student involvement.