|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assurance of Student Learning Report**  **2020-2021** | |
| *PCAL* | *Communication* |
| *Corporate and Organizational Communication 522* | |
| *Holly Payne, Ph.D.* | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1: Apply organizational communication theories to identify communication problems** | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: “Consultant’s Report” from COMM 489: Internship in Communication** | | |
| **Instrument 2** |  | | |
| **Instrument 3** |  | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2: Propose theoretically grounded solutions for organizational problems** | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: “Consultant’s Report” from COMM 489: Internship in Communication** | | |
| **Instrument 2** |  | | |
| **Instrument 3** |  | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3: Articulate how to develop and maintain productive organizational relationships** | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: “Consultant’s Report” from COMM 489: Internship in Communication** | | |
| **Instrument 2** | **Indirect: Supervisor Evaluations in Internship** | | |
| **Instrument 3** |  | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 4: Create strategic communication plans that are appropriate to the purposes of content** | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Assessment of Personal Brand Portfolio COMM 462 including Resume, Elevator Pitch, LinkedIn Profile** | | |
| **Instrument 2** |  | | |
| **Instrument 3** |  | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 4.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)** |
| For the 2020-2021 academic year the department fully incorporated revised learning outcomes including:  Students should be able ethically to:  SLO 1: Apply organizational communication theories to identify communication problems.  SLO 2: Propose theoretically grounded solutions for organizational problems.  SLO 3: Articulate how to develop and maintain productive organizational relationships  SLO 4: Create strategic communication plans that are appropriate to the purposes of content  Based on the 2019-2020 assessment, the following measures were implemented to enhance student achievement and increase reliability and validity of the assessment measures. First, new evaluation rubrics were created to capture the revised objectives specifically for the “Consultant’s Report” from the Internship Course and for the Personal Brand Portfolio. Second, faculty members leading COMM 489 met with interns halfway through the upcoming semester to review expectations of learning in the internship and focus attention on the requirements and value of the ‘“Consultant’s Report”’ assignment. Additionally, the instructions for the consulting report were revised requiring students to focus on internal communication processes. Given the elapsed time between when a student completes the internship and the COMM 362 Organizational Communication pre-requisite and their subsequent cognitive distance from learned theories, students were provided with a resource guide on organizational communication theory to guide their internship work and reinforce the theoretical lenses available through which to analyze organizational strengths, weaknesses, and strategies. Finally, a direct assessment of students’ personal branding portfolio assessing their resume, elevator pitch, and LinkedIn profile was used to determine skill level at developing strategic messages.  The Communication faculty conducted rubric-based analyses and evaluations of the “Consultant’s Report” paper in COMM 489: Internship and the Personal Brand Portfolio from COMM 462: Advanced Organizational Communication. The average scores for the four assessed SLO outcomes were as follows: SLO1: 2.82; SLO2: 2.61; SLO3: 2.82; SLO4: 3.22.  After discussing possible reasons students failed to demonstrate proficiency in SLO1-3 the faculty identified students’ difficulties in applying and explaining communication theory and concepts. We concluded that the lack of face-to-face meetings in the course reduced student attention to the assignment and the resource guide provided. In the future, we will enhance the current assignment by developing more specific guidance in the assignment description. Further, the faculty member leading the internship class will meet each student at a mid-point of internship to discuss the writing assignment, answer questions, and enhance their understanding. Finally, a list of potential theories, models, and concepts will be provided to students to help in identifying possible ideas for connecting scholarship to practice. Aside from the “Consultant’s Report” students demonstrated successful achievements in their internship. One hundred percent of students scored at the proficient and excellent level on the following criteria: appearance, maturity, punctuality, attitude, interpersonal relationship skills, organization, ability to learn, initiative, responsibility, quantity of work, and quality of work. For SLO4, the overall mean score across all three rated artifacts was proficient; however, closer analysis of the data indicated students were most proficient on developing resumes and less proficient on the elevator pitch and LinkedIn profiles. To address these issues, the faculty member teaching COMM 462 developed more specific assignment guidelines for each activity including a listing of the information that must be included in each assignment. Additionally, students were provided with both student and professional exemplars of pitches and profiles.  We increased the sample size from 10 to 14 students papers and 16 portfolios and will continue to assess using the newly developed rubrics and objectives in the 2021/2022 academic year. The rubrics will be expanded from 4-point to 5-point scales allowing for greater precision in measuring student performance. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1** | | | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | **Apply organizational communication theories to identify communication problems** | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **Direct: “Consultant’s Report” from COMM 489: Internship in Communication (One of the required core courses).**  In this paper assignment, each student explains and applies relevant organizational communication theory and concepts to the actual communication needs of their internship organization. This assignment develops students’ competencies in theory-based project learning in organizational communication.  We used two criteria to assess the first learning outcome: (a) how well a student can explain a theory/concept in organizational communication. (b) how well a student can apply the theory/concept to communication observed in the internship situation. We assessed each student’s outcome using a 4-point scale (1 as Insufficient to 4 as Excellent). | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students should meet or exceed 3 (Proficient) in the above criteria. | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 70% and above | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 64% | |
| **Methods** | The Communication faculty assessed all “Consultant’s Report” papers from majors enrolled in COMM 489 from the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 semester (*N* = 14). After deleting the student’s name from each paper, the papers were distributed to faculty members, excluding the faculty member who teaches COMM 489. Reviewers submitted the evaluations through Qualtrics. Each paper had two reviewers. Mean scores were computed for each rubric category aimed at capturing the full SLO (see attached rubric). The overall average score for this SLO was 2.82, with 64% of students meeting or exceeding 3 (Proficient). Faculty raters indicated that overall students did a good job of identifying organizational problems and deficiencies in communication; however, many students did not have an appropriate theory-based discussion or application to understand or solve the problems. | | | | |
| **Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Actions** | | | | | |
| Thiswas the first year students were provided with the Theory Resource Guide created based on the 2019/2020 assessment. According to the teacher of record, students who actually used the guide did a significantly better job of applying and explaining organizational communication theories to their internship organization. In an effort to encourage students to apply theories from their coursework, students will be given additional reminders to use the resource guide and the guide will be referenced in the assignment instructions. Additionally, a list of theories/models/concepts will be provided to students to assist them in brainstorming for the most applicable explanation and solution to their organization’s identified problems. | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** | | | | | |
| Faculty members leading COMM 489: Internship added the Theory Resource Guide information to the assignment instructions and provided a list of theories/concepts/models starting Summer 2021. | | | | | |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** | | | | | |
| SLO1 will be assessed again in 2021-2022 using the “Consultant’s Report” assignment. A sample of majors completing the internship course in the summer, spring, and fall will be included in assessment. The rubrics will be expanded from 4-point to 5-point scales allowing for greater precision in measuring student performance. | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2** | | | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | **Propose theoretically grounded solutions for organizational problems** | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **Direct: “Consultant’s Report” from COMM 489: Internship in Communication (One of the required core courses).**  In this paper assignment, each student identifies communication needs and solutions for their internship organization using organizational communication theories and concepts. They write a report as if they are a consultant. This assignment develops students’ analytical and writing skills.  We used four criteria to assess this learning outcome: (a) how well a student can identify communication needs, (b) how well a student can incorporate credible sources to support their analysis, (c) how well a student can write, and (d) how well a student can conform to the standard writing style (APA style). We assessed each student’s outcome using a 4-point scale (1 as Insufficient to 4 as Excellent). | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students should meet or exceed 3 (Proficient) in the above criteria. | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 70% and above | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 43% | |
| **Methods** | The Communication faculty assessed all “Consultant’s Report” papers from majors from the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 semester (*N* = 14). After deleting the student’s name from each paper, the papers were distributed to faculty members, excluding the faculty member who teaches COMM 489. Reviewers submitted the evaluations through Qualtrics. Each paper had two reviewers. Mean scores were computed for each rubric category aimed at capturing the full SLO. The overall average score for this SLO was 2.61, with 43% of students meeting or exceeding the Proficient level (3). Similar to SLO1, raters noted that while students were able to identify communication problems in their intern organization, they struggled to use theory in proposing solutions. Since their understanding of the theories was weak (SLO1), for many students the application was also below the proficient level. | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Actions** | | | | | |
| Thiswas the first year students were provided with the Theory Resource Guide created based on the 2019/2020 assessment. According to the teacher of record, students who actually used the guide did a significantly better job of applying and explaining organizational communication theories to their internship organization. In an effort to encourage students to apply theories from their coursework, students were given additional reminders to use the resource guide and the guide was referenced in the assignment instructions. Additionally, a list of theories/models/concepts was provided to students to assist them in brainstorming for the most applicable explanation and solution to their organization’s identified problems. | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** | | | | | |
| Faculty members leading COMM 489: Internship added the Theory Resource Guide information to the assignment instructions and provided a list of theories/concepts/models starting Summer 2021. | | | | | |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** | | | | | |
| SLO2 will be assessed again in 2021-2022 using the “Consultant’s Report” assignment. A sample of majors completing the internship course in the summer, spring, and fall will be included in assessment. The rubrics will be expanded from 4-point to 5-point scales allowing for greater precision in measuring student performance. | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3** | | | | | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | **Articulate how to develop and maintain productive organizational relationships** | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **Direct: “Consultant’s Report” from COMM 489: Internship in Communication (One of the required core courses).**  In this paper assignment, each student identifies communication needs of their internship organization using organizational communication theories and concepts and writes a report as if they are a consultant. This assignment develops students’ analytical and writing skills.  We used four criteria to assess this learning outcome: (a) how well a student can identify communication needs, (b) how well a student can incorporate credible sources to support his/her analysis, (c) how well a student can write, and (d) how well a student can conform to the standard writing style (APA style). We assessed each student’s outcome using 4-point scale (1 as Unsatisfactory to 4 as Excellent). | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students should meet or exceed 3.0 (Proficient) or above on the criteria. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | | 70% and above | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 62% | |
| **Methods** | The Communication faculty assessed all “Consultant’s Report” papers from majors from the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 semester (*N* = 14). After deleting the student’s name from each paper, the papers were distributed to faculty members, excluding the faculty member who teaches COMM 489. Reviewers submitted the evaluations through Qualtrics. Each paper had two reviewers. Mean scores were computed for each rubric category aimed at capturing the full SLO. The overall average score for this SLO was 2.82, with 43% of students meeting or exceeding 3 (proficient). Raters noted that while students were able to identify and understand relational issues in their workplaces they struggled to explain why they were important or how to resolve them using communication theories and concepts. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | **Indirect: Supervisor Evaluations in Internship.** | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students should meet or exceed a 3.5 on each of the 11 measures and overall positive outcomes on qualitative comments made by the supervisors. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 100% of the students exceeded 3.5 on each measure (on a five point scale) | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | | 100% | |
| **Methods** | After completing the intern period, each supervisor was asked to assess the student in 11 criteria including: appearance (*m* = 5), maturity (*m* = 5), punctuality (*m* = 4.8), attitude (*m* = 5), interpersonal relation skills (*m* = 5), organization (*m* = 4.90), ability to learn (*m* = 5), initiative (*m* = 4.9), responsibility (*m* = 5), quantity of work (*m* = 5), and quality of work (*m* = 5). The supervisors rated the students using a 5-point scale (1 as lowest to 5 as highest). The supervisor was also encouraged to provide comments in each area. Two Communication faculty members, each holding a Ph.D. degree, reviewed 10 supervisors’ evaluations in the above 11 criteria and for repeated themes to identify the strengths and weaknesses. Supervisors reported students were eager to learn and flexible. Areas for improvement included needing guidance at the start of projects and lacking confidence in work. | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | | | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Actions** | | | | | |
| Overall, students were able to identify relational issues in their oganizations but less able to offer a translation on why relationships are important and how organizational communication processes can build relationships. That said, the internship supervisors rated students as excellent on a number of factors including in their interpersonal relationships at work. This points to an issue in students connecting organizational communication concepts to their identified problems. Thiswas the first year students were provided with the Theory Resource Guide created based on the 2019/2020 assessment. According to the teacher of record, students who actually used the guide did a significantly better job of applying and explaining organizational communication theories to their internship organization. In an effort to encourage students to apply theories from their coursework, students will be given additional reminders to use the resource guide and the guide will be referenced in the assignment instructions. Additionally, a list of theories/models/concepts will be provided to students to assist them in brainstorming for the most applicable explanation and solution to their organization’s identified problems. | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** | | | | | |
| Faculty members leading COMM 489: Internship added the Theory Resource Guide information to the assignment instructions and provided a list of theories/concepts/models . starting in Summer 2021. | | | | | |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** | | | | | |
| SLO3 will be assessed again in 2021-2022 using the “Consultant’s Report” assignment. A sample of majors completing the internship course in the summer, spring, and fall will be included in assessment. The rubrics will be expanded from 4-point to 5-point scales allowing for greater precision in measuring student performance | | | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome 4** | | | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | **Create strategic communication plans that are appropriate to the purposes of content** | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **Direct:**  **Assessment of Personal Brand Portfolio from COMM 462 (Required course) including Resume, Elevator Pitch, LinkedIn Profile**  In this paper assignment, students create a portfolio of strategically crafted messages relevant to employment communication. The portfolio includes links to student resumes, a video recorded elevator pitch, and a link to their LinkedIn profiles. Students have studied organizational socialization and have covered a unit on employment communication in preparation for the final project. A primary objective of this assignment is for students to demonstrate the ability to develop strategic messages.  Students’ elevator pitches were assessed for professionalism, inclusion of components such as experiences, skills, and goals, and persuasiveness. Students’ resumes were evaluated for formatting, content, and persuasiveness. LinkedIn accounts were evaluated on professionalism, inclusion of major profile components, and a persuasive by-line. Each artifact was assessed holistically using a 4-point scale (1 as Insufficient to 4 as Excellent). | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students should meet or exceed a mean score of 2.80 in the above criteria. | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 70% or Above | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **81.25%** | |
| **Methods** | The faculty of COMM 462 collected the portoflios of all 16 Corporate and Organizational Communication students enrolled in the course. The portfolios were distributed to and rated by four graduate faculty members who hold a Ph.D. in Communication, excluding the faculty member who teaches COMM 462. Reviewers submitted the evaluations through Qualtrics. Each project had two reviewers. We computed the mean for each piece of the portfolio including the elevator pitch, resume, and LinkedIn profile. The overall average for this SLO across all three artifacts was 3.01 (Proficient) with 81.25% of students scoring a 2.8 or above on all artifacts. Faculty raters found the students were proficient at connecting their work experience, skills, and education especially in the resume. They identified weaknesses in developing creative, persuasive cases for employers and having some elements of incomplete information in the LinkedIn Profile and in the elevator pitch. | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 4.** | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Actions** |
| Given that 81% of students reached proficiency in crafting a strategic resume, improvement actions for the Spring 2022 section of COMM 462 targeted the Elevator Pitch and the LinkedIn Profile assignments. Specifically, faculty members teaching COMM 462 added more detail on each assignment guideline document listing the specific pieces of information to include on both the profile and the pitch. In addition, students were provided with examples of student work deemed “Excellent” on both artifacts as well as professional examples from employees. |
| **Follow-Up** |
| Faculty teaching COMM 462 in the Spring 2022 semester added more detail to the assignment guidelines for the Elevator Pitch and the LinkedIn Profile outlining specific pieces of information students should include. Students were also provided with both student and professional exemplars. |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** |
| SLO4 will be assessed again in 2021-2022 using the “Consultant’s Report” assignment. A sample of majors completing the internship course in the summer, spring, and fall will be included in assessment. The rubrics will be expanded from 4-point to 5-point scales allowing for greater precision in measuring student performance |

**Corporate & Organizational Communication Assessment**

**Rubric for Evaluating the “Consultant’s Report”**

**SLO1 - Apply organizational communication theories to Identify communication problems.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Please assess how the author* ***analyzes and diagnoses*** *communication challenges in the internship organization. Consider the degree to which the student incorporates relevant organizational communication theories and concepts in evaluating the organization’s functioning as well as areas for improvement.* | |
|  | **EXCELLENT** - Demonstrates excellence and proficiency in analyzing and diagnosing communication challenges in the internship organization. |
|  | **PROFICIENT** - Demonstrates acceptable proficiency in analyzing and diagnosing communication challenges in the internship organization. |
|  | **WEAK** - Demonstrates minimal proficiency in analyzing and diagnosing communication challenges in the internship organization. |
|  | **INSUFFICIENT** - Fails to demonstrate minimal proficiency in analyzing and diagnosing communication challenges in the internship organization. |

**SLO2 -- Propose theoretically grounded solutions for organizational problems.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Please assess how well the author applies organizational communication theories, principles, and processes to develop* ***solutions*** *that address challenges for the internship organization.* | |
|  | **EXCELLENT** - Very effective in applying organizational communication theories and principles in proposing solutions to diagnosed problems. |
|  | **PROFICIENT** – Adequately applies organizational communication theories and principles to develop solutions that address challenges to the internship organization. |
|  | **WEAK** – Minimally or poorly applies organizational communication theories and principles to develop solutions that address challenges for the internship organization. |
|  | **INSUFFICIENT** - Fails to apply organizational communication theories and principles, failed to develop solutions that address challenges for the internship organization. |

**SLO3- Articulate how to develop and maintain productive organizational relationships**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Please assess how effectively the student* ***describes the relational aspects*** *of the organization and considers the* ***importance of developing and maintaining productive relationships****. Specifically, students may discuss organizational concepts and processes such as assimilation, identification, decision-making, conflict, leadership, technology use, etc. to show awareness of the importance of relationships.* | |
|  | **EXCELLENT** – Effectively discusses the importance of relational aspects of the organization and accurately assesses the status of relationships and ways relationships can be improved through communication processes. |
|  | **PROFICIENT** – Provides a good discussion of organizational relationships and demonstrates proficiency in describing how to improve relationships through communication. |
|  | **WEAK** - Minimally integrates academic knowledge in a way that demonstrates critical thinking with regard to the importance of relationships and how to develop and maintain them. |
|  | **INSUFFICIENT** - Fails to integrate academic knowledge in a way that demonstrates awareness of relational dynamics or practical, realistic ways to develop and maintain relationships. |

**Optional – Please provide additional comments or remarks about the work:**

**Corporate & Organizational Communication Assessment**

**Rubric for Evaluating the Personal Brand Portfolio**

**SLO4 - Create strategic communication plans that are appropriate to the purposes of content.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. *Please assess the student’s elevator pitch.* | |
|  | **EXCELLENT** -- Outstanding relevance, creativity, and professionalism. This participant is memorable. Basic information is included, but the student chooses compelling experiences/ knowledge to illustrate and describe relevant skills. Describes aspirations in a clear and concise manner in a way that is realistic and targeted to a specific position/industry. Has a clear strategy for ending the conversation (the close/hook). |
|  | **PROFICIENT** - An overall good pitch. The student includes relevant, somewhat creative information. Describes 1-2 experiences/ knowledge to illustrate relevant skills. Describes aspirations in a clear manner; they seem realistic but are downplayed or unnecessarily wordy. Demonstrates knowledge of the field/industry. Has a strategy for ending the conversation but may be passive. |
|  | **WEAK** - The pitch seems to be minimally relevant or gimmicky. Includes some basic information, but specific examples of experiences are missing or little description is provided. The description of aspirations is moderately clear; goals could be unrealistic. Does not demonstrate much knowledge of the field/position, and fails to put forward a decisive close/hook. |
|  | **INSUFFICIENT** - The pitch lacks basic information and does not describe experiences. Minimal relevance; or gimmicky. Aspirations are not described at all, or if they are they are unclear and/or obviously unrealistic. Doesn’t demonstrate knowledge of the field/company and fails to close the conversation or make “the ask.” |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. *Please assess the student’s resume.* | |
|  | **EXCELLENT** – The resume is well formatted, without errors, and pleasing to the eye. It demonstrates creativity, but still conforms to business expectations. The resume highlights job experience, skills, and activities in a way that is highly persuasive to an employer. |
|  | **PROFICIENT** – Adequately persuasive. The resume is well formatted but maybe not creative. It is without major errors and adequately describes work experience, skills, and activities. |
|  | **WEAK** – The resume feels somewhat incomplete in that too little information is provided. May not include major sections such as activities/achievements. May have a few errors. |
|  | **INSUFFICIENT** – Resume fails to conform to format and content guidelines and may have errors. Fails to adequately describe work experience, skills, or activities. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. *Please assess the student’s LinkedIn Profile* | |
|  | **EXCELLENT** – Profile is professional and includes all the major components including a professional photo, a headline that reflects a brand statement/attention-getter, a summary of who they are professionally and how they are unique with regard to skills; summarizes current position as well as at least two past jobs or internships and/or volunteer opportunities (includes samples of projects or pictures of work), includes all education as well as honors and awards, and relevant links. |
|  | **PROFICIENT** – Profile is strong, but maybe doesn’t maximize all the features of LinkedIn such as attaching samples of work or including relevant links. The important elements are present such as a professional photo, a headline that reflects a brand statement, a summary of who they are professionally, a summary of work experience and/or volunteer opportunities; and includes education as well as honors and awards, and relevant links. |
|  | **WEAK** - Profile seems a bit incomplete and doesn’t utilize many of the features of LinkedIn. Some elements are present such as work experience, but others are missing such as activities or skills. |
|  | **INSUFFICIENT** - Profile is incomplete and may contain fatal errors such as an unprofessional photo or no work experience. The profile may seem too short and include grammatical/spelling errors. |

**Optional – Please provide additional comments or remarks about the work:**