|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assurance of Student Learning**  **2020-2021** | |
| *Potter College* | *Communication* |
| *0471 Communicating in Organizations Certificate* | |
| *Dr. Jieyoung Kong* | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages.*** | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1:**  Identify and analyze communication challenges in organizational life. | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Analysis of a course assignment paper.** | | |
| **Instrument 2** |  | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2:**  Apply communication theories, principles, and/or research to construct practical recommendations that address organizational challenges. | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Analysis of a course assignment paper.** | | |
| **Instrument 2** |  | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3:** Evaluate and/or develop messages and strategies that affect organizational outcomes. | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Analysis of a course assignment paper.** | | |
| **Instrument 2** |  | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)** | | | |
| The Communicating in Organizations certificate provides students the opportunity to develop an in-depth understanding of how communication functions in organizations. Using foundational and current research in the field, students are exposed to organizational communication theory and processes. Students will take graduate courses that focus on general organizational communication theory, applied organizational communication, communication within specific organizational contexts, and one other course chosen by participants as especially relevant to their own work and interests.  Over the past year, the program coordinator and the members of the Graduate Program Committee drafted a tentative set of student learning objectives for the certificate program based on input and feedback from those faculty who teach the graduate courses in the program:  (1) Identifies and analyzes communication challenges in organizational life,  (2) Applies communication theories, principles, and/or research to construct practical recommendations, and  (3) Evaluates and/or develops messages/strategies that affect organizational outcomes.  These were presented to the Gradaute Faculty Committee for deliberation and approval at the department level in fall 2020. Once approved, they were communicated to the faculty and posted on the department Blackboard for record-keeping purposes.  Faculty members who teach the graduate courses in the certificate program did not yet have a chance to update their course objectives and assignments to reflect the latest program learning objectives, but several were approached for artifacts of those targeted students enrolled in the program for this year’s assessment. The reason for going ahead with the assessment nevertheless was the belief that courses with a clear focus and learning outcomes would still align with the new program learning objectives even if their specific course assignments differed. Another reason for going ahead with the assessment was to use the process to prompt the faculty to become familiar with the latets program learning objectives and to reflect them into their courses. The result of this year’s assessment indicate that the mean scores of the sampled student papers had reached and/or exceeded the self-reported assessment goals for all of the three SLOs. The assessment results suggest generally there is good alignment between the selected core course learning outcomes and program learning outcomes. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1** | | | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | **Identify and analyze communication challenges in organizational life.** | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Student artifacts chosen for this SLO assessment varied from 5-page short analysis papers to a full-lenth term paper, because they came from four different courses. But all of the select papers shared a common assignment purpose, which was for the student to analyze communication challenges in organizational life, apply communication theories, principles, and/or research to construct practical recommendations, and then to develop messages/strategies that affect organizational outcomes. | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Due to the fact there is no capstone course or core courses for this certificate, those courses in the certificate program with more than one student enrolled in the certificate program were contacted for the targetted student's artifact. A total of four courses were approached and four different assignments were collected for assessment. Three quarters of students in these courses should score “proficient” or higher on the rubric developed from program learning outcomes. Scores on the rubric item for this SLO ranged from “insufficient (1 point),” “weak (2 point),” “proficient (3 points),” and “excellent (4 points).” Success is defined as a 3 or better. | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 75% | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 75% | |
| **Methods** | Direct: Artifacts from 8 students (*n* = 8) enrolled in four different courses in the certificate program were collected out of a total of 11 students enrolled in the certificate program (*N* = 11). Three student artifacts could not be included because they either were not taking the courses in the given academic year or had decided to withdraw from the course. All identifiers were removed (student name, course name, and faculty name) from the artifacts and each was assigned to two full-time graduate faculty who teach in the graduate communication program so that each paper was read twice by two different reviewers. The mean of the reviewer scores were used as the final score. The rubric used for scoring was developed from the program learning outcomes; for this SLO, there was a single corresponding rubric item which could be scored along four different levels. | | | | |
| **Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | |
| Overall, the result from this assessment indicate that the mean scores for all of the sampled student papers for this SLOs has not only met, but exceeded the self-declared goal. The assessment result suggest there is good alignment between the core course learning outcomes and the program learning outcome. In terms of actions for program improvement, faculty who teach courses in the certificate program need to update their course learning objectives and course assignments to reflect the latest program learning objectives starting next academic year. | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | |
| None planned for now. | | | | | |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) | | | | | |
| After consulting the Gradaute Program Committee and course instructors, program will be assessed using the same process. | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2** | | | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | **Apply communication theories, principles, and/or research to construct practical recommendations that address organizational challenges.** | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Student artifacts chosen for this SLO assessment varied from 5-page short analysis papers to a full-lenth term paper, because they came from four different courses. But all of the select papers shared a common assignment purpose, which was for the student to analyze communication challenges in organizational life, apply communication theories, principles, and/or research to construct practical recommendations, and then to develop messages/strategies that affect organizational outcomes. | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Due to the fact there is no capstone course or core courses for this certificate, those courses in the certificate program with more than one student enrolled in the certificate program were contacted for the targetted student's artifact. A total of four courses were approached and four different assignments were collected for assessment. Three quarters of students in these courses should score “proficient” or higher on the rubric developed from program learning outcomes. Scores on the rubric item for this SLO ranged from “insufficient (1 point),” “weak (2 point),” “proficient (3 points),” and “excellent (4 points).” Success is defined as a 3 or better. | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 75% | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 75% | |
| **Methods** | Direct: Artifacts from 8 students (*n* = 8) enrolled in four different courses in the certificate program were collected out of a total of 11 students enrolled in the certificate program (*N* = 11). Three student artifacts could not be included because they either were not taking the courses in the given academic year or had decided to withdraw from the course. All identifiers were removed (student name, course name, and faculty name) from the artifacts and each was assigned to two full-time graduate faculty who teach in the graduate communication program so that each paper was read twice by two different reviewers. The mean of the reviewer scores were used as the final score. The rubric used for scoring was developed from the program learning outcomes; for this SLO, there was a single corresponding rubric item which could be scored along four different levels. | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | |
| Overall, the result from this assessment indicate that the mean scores for all of the sampled student papers for this SLOs has not only met, but exceeded the self-declared goal. The assessment result suggest there is good alignment between the core course learning outcomes and the program learning outcome. In terms of actions for program improvement, faculty who teach courses in the certificate program need to update their course learning objectives and course assignments to reflect the latest program learning objectives starting next academic year. | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | |
| None planned for now. | | | | | |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) | | | | | |
| After consulting the Gradaute Program Committee and course instructors, program will be assessed using the same process. | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3** | | | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | **Evaluate and/or develop messages and strategies that affect organizational outcomes.** | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Student artifacts chosen for this SLO assessment varied from 5-page short analysis papers to a full-lenth term paper, because they came from four different courses. But all of the select papers shared a common assignment purpose, which was for the student to analyze communication challenges in organizational life, apply communication theories, principles, and/or research to construct practical recommendations, and then to develop messages/strategies that affect organizational outcomes. | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Due to the fact there is no capstone course or core courses for this certificate, those courses in the certificate program with more than one student enrolled in the certificate program were contacted for the targetted student's artifact. A total of three courses were approached and three different assignments were collected for assessment. Three quarters of students in these courses should score “proficient” or higher on the rubric developed from program learning outcomes. Scores on the rubric item for this SLO ranged from “insufficient (1 point),” “weak (2 point),” “proficient (3 points),” and “excellent (4 points).” | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 75% | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 80% | |
| **Methods** | Direct: Artifacts from 5 students (*n* = 5) enrolled in three different courses in the certificate program were collected out of a total of 11 students enrolled in the certificate program (*N* = 11). In addition to the three student artifacts which could not be included because they either were not taking the courses in the given academic year or had decided to withdraw from the course, assessment for this particular is three less students than the previous two SLOs, because one of the course assignment did not include this learning outcome in its assignment. All identifiers were removed (student name, course name, and faculty name) from the artifacts and each was assigned to two full-time graduate faculty who teach in the graduate communication program so that each paper was read twice by two different reviewers. The mean of the reviewer scores were used as the final score. The rubric used for scoring was developed from the program learning outcomes; for this SLO, there was a single corresponding rubric item which could be scored along four different levels. | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | |
| Overall, the result from this assessment indicate that the mean scores for all of the sampled student papers for this SLOs has not only met, but exceeded the self-declared goal. The assessment result suggest there is good alignment between the core course learning outcomes and the program learning outcome. In terms of actions for program improvement, faculty who teach courses in the certificate program need to update their course learning objectives and course assignments to reflect the latest program learning objectives starting next academic year. | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | |
| None planned for now. | | | | | |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) | | | | | |
| After consulting the Gradaute Program Committee and course instructors, program will be assessed using the same process. | | | | | |



