Assurance of Student Learning			
	2019-2020		
Potter College	Communication		
0012 Organizational Communication			
Dr. Jieyoung Kong			

Use this page to	list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the	e subsequent p	oages.
Student Learnin	ng Outcome 1: Demonstrate mastery in research		
Instrument 1	Direct: Capstone Project (Thesis/Non-thesis options)		
Instrument 2			
Based on your i	results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.	Met	Not Met
Student Learnin	ng Outcome 2: Demonstrate mastery in written communication		
Instrument 1	Direct: Capstone Project (Thesis/Non-thesis options)		
Instrument 2			
Based on your i	results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.	Met	Not Met
Student Learnin	ng Outcome 3: Identify distinct communication practices of culturally diverse groups		
Instrument 1	Direct: Capstone Project (Thesis/Non-thesis options)		
Instrument 2			
Based on your i	results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.	Met	Not Met
D C	/D · 6	l	

Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)

Overall, the result from this assessment indicate that students who complete our program successfully achieve the program learning outcomes. This is owed to our program instituting a significant revision in Fall 2012 after conducting a benchmark analysis, student surveys, and a SWOT analysis aimed at understanding disciplinary changes and student need. Our current program learning outcomes are as follow:

- 1. Demonstrate mastery in research
- 2. Demonstrate mastery in written communication
- 3. Explain theories and concepts
- 4. Identify distinct communication practices of culturally diverse groups
- 5. Demonstrate ability to apply communication concepts in organizational contexts

For individual courses, these learning outcomes are assessed using multiple tools such as exams, application papers, presentations, research proposals, and qualitative, quantitative, and rhetorically grounded primary research studies. For the program as a whole, the above learning outcomes are assessed through the capstone experience, whether that is the thesis-track or the non-thesis track. In other words, learning outcome assessment for the program as a whole has been embedded in the capstone experience. In the 2018-2019 ASL assessment, we had assessed learning outcomes 2, 3, and 5. So for this year's ASL assessment, we assessed learning outcomes 1, 2, and 4.

Student Learning Outcome 1					
<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	Demonstrate ma	astery in research			
Measurement Instrument 1	DIRECT measure of student learning: For the thesis track, students complete original research and successfully defend their thesis. A thesis typically focuses on answering a specialized question(s) in communication research. In their first semester of thesis work, students prepare a prospectus, which includes a rationale, literature review, methodology sections, and a timeline for thesis completion. When they successfully defend their prospectus, they then proceed with the rest of the research project to collect, analyze data, and then write up the findings and implications in their second semester of the thesis work. Completion of a thesis depends on student demonstrating mastery in written communication. For the non-thesis track, students must take the comprehensive exam for their degree completion.  The exam is composed of three questions to assess each of the following: theoretical knowledge, methodological mastery, and application of theories and concepts to specific context. The design of the exam and the questions written by faculty take into account the learning outcomes. Students must demonstrate mastery in written communication to convey their knowledge, critical thinking, and application skills.				
Criteria for Student Success	In the case of the thesis track, students should successfully defend their thesis. In the case of the non-thesis track, the student must "Pass" their comprehensive exam for each of the areas tested. Student exam paper is evaluated by a set of rubrics adapted from the Widener University Doctor of Education Program (see attachment). The first rubric for the theory answer assesses for concept mastery, foundational content, literature use, organization, and language. The second rubric for the method answer assesses for the link of problem to design, research design, method, measurement, procedures, data analysis, and quality of writing. The third rubric for the application answer assesses on concepts, application to problem/case, literature use, organization, and language. Scores for each dimension per area range from "Insufficient" (1 point), "Emergent" (2 points), "Proficient" (3 points), and "Distinguished" (4 points). The scores from each dimension in each question area are summed up, which are then translated by a scale to determine success level into Fail, Pass, or Pass with Honors. To get a "Pass" on their exam answer, students must receive 13 out of a maximum of 20 points and no more than two individual dimension below "emergent" for each question area from each of their faculty committee member. A score that is 18 or above is considered "Pass with Honors." For the final step, scores from the committee members are combined by each question area, and then translated by a scale to determine success level. If the total combined score for each question area is less than 38, it is "Fail." If the combined score is 39-53 points, it gets "Pass." Scores that are 54 or above, with 60 points being maximum possible points, get "Pass with Honors." Success is defined as				
Program Success Target for this	pass or higher.  Measurement		cent of Program Achieving Target	100%	
Methods	faculty who are indefend it orally.	from capstone experience ( $N = 9$ ) were used for this assessment members of the student's thesis committee reviewed their work for students who chose the comprehensive exam ( $n = 5$ ), the s independently using the set of rubrics mentioned above. For	ork and approved o ree faculty member	f its quality before the student w s of their exam committee read a	as allowed to and assessed
	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.)					

All students have successfully either defended their thesis or passed their comprehensive exam in their first attempt. Thus, these results have not indicated a need for program improvement or chang

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, program will be assessed using the same process but SLO criteria 2, 3, and 5.

		Student Learning Outcom	me 2			
<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	Demonstrate ma	stery in written communication				
Measurement Instrument 1	typically focuses prospectus, which defend their prosp implications in th communication. I The exam is comp theories and conce	e of student learning: For the thesis track, student on answering a specialized question(s) in communication in control in includes a rationale, literature review, methodol pectus, they then proceed with the rest of the reseleir second semester of the thesis work. Completion For the non-thesis track, students must take the composed of three questions to assess each of the followers to specific context. The design of the exam and the must demonstrate mastery in written communications.	unication research. In their first semester of the logy sections, and a timeline for thesis complearch project to collect, analyze data, and then on of a thesis depends on student demonstrate comprehensive exam for their degree completiowing: theoretical knowledge, methodologic and the questions written by faculty take into	nesis work, stude etion. When they write up the fining mastery in won.  al mastery, and a account the learn	nts prepare a v successfully dings and ritten application of ning	
Criteria for Student Success	In the case of the thesis track, students should successfully defend their thesis. In the case of the non-thesis track, the student must "Pass" their comprehensive exam for each of the areas tested. Student exam paper is evaluated by a set of rubrics adapted from the Widener University Doctor of Education Program (see attachment). The first rubric for the theory answer assesses for concept mastery, foundational content, literature use, organization, and language. The second rubric for the method answer assesses for the link of problem to design, research design, method, measurement, procedures, data analysis, and quality of writing. The third rubric for the application answer assesses on concepts, application to problem/case, literature use, organization, and language. Scores for each dimension per area range from "Insufficient" (1 point), "Emergent" (2 points), "Proficient" (3 points), and "Distinguished" (4 points). The scores from each dimension in each question area are summed up, which are then translated by a scale to determine success level into Fail, Pass, or Pass with Honors. To get a "Pass" on their exam answer, students must receive 13 out of a maximum of 20 points and no more than two individual dimension below "emergent" for each question area from each of their faculty committee member. A score that is 18 or above is considered "Pass with Honors." For the final step, scores from the committee members are combined by each question area, and then translated by a scale to determine success level. If the total combined score for each question area is less than 38, it is "Fail." If the combined score is 39-53 points, it gets "Pass." Scores that are 54 or above, with 60 points being maximum possible points, get "Pass with Honors." Success is defined as					
Program Success Target for this	pass or higher.  S Measurement	100%	Percent of Program Achieving Target	100%		
Methods	Direct: Artifacts from capstone experience $(N = 9)$ were used for this assessment. For student who have chosen the thesis track $(n = 4)$ , three faculty who are members of the student's thesis committee reviewed their work and approved of its quality before the student was allowed to defend it orally. For students who chose the comprehensive exam $(n = 5)$ , three faculty members of their exam committee read and assessed the exam answers independently using the set of rubrics mentioned above. For this SLO, scores from all areas of the exam were relevant.					
		the program met the goal Student Learning O		Met	Not Met	
		actions planned for program improvement. The actions planned for program improvement.			1.6	
All students have successfully eith improvement or chang.	her detended their	thesis or passed their comprehensive exam in the	eir first attempt. Thus, these results have not	indicated a need	1 for program	
	for follow-up. If f	follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions	above have resulted in program improvemen	t.)		
None planned for now.						

Next Assessment Cycle Plan (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome)

After consulting the Gradaute Program Committee, program will be assessed using the same process but SLO criteria 2, 3, and 5.

		Student Learning	Outcome	e 3		
<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	Identify distinct	communication practices of culturall	y diverse gi	roups		
Measurement Instrument 1	typically focuses prospectus, which defend their prosp implications in the communication. In The exam is com- theories and concerns.	on answering a specialized question(s) h includes a rationale, literature review, pectus, they then proceed with the rest cheir second semester of the thesis work. For the non-thesis track, students must the posed of three questions to assess each chepts to specific context. The design of the special context is the second seminary of the second seminary of the seminary of the second seminary of the seminary of	in communi methodolog of the researc Completion ake the com of the follow he exam and	complete original research and successfully ication research. In their first semester of the gy sections, and a timeline for thesis completed project to collect, analyze data, and then not a thesis depends on student demonstration prehensive exam for their degree completed wing: theoretical knowledge, methodological difference to convey their knowledge, critical this ation to convey their knowledge, critical this	nesis work, studention. When they a write up the finding mastery in wron. al mastery, and a account the learn	nts prepare a successfully lings and ritten pplication of hing
Criteria for Student Success	their comprehens University Docto content, literature research design, i on concepts, appl "Insufficient" (1 each question are get a "Pass" on th below "emergent Honors." For the determine succes	sive exam for each of the areas tested. So or of Education Program (see attachment e use, organization, and language. The so method, measurement, procedures, data lication to problem/case, literature use, of point), "Emergent" (2 points), "Proficie has are summed up, which are then translated heir exam answer, students must receive "for each question area from each of the final step, scores from the committee me is level. If the total combined score for e	udent exam ). The first is econd rubric analysis, an organization int" (3 points ated by a scall 3 out of a eir faculty cembers are each question	neir thesis. In the case of the non-thesis trace in paper is evaluated by a set of rubrics adapt rubric for the theory answer assesses for cocc for the method answer assesses for the line in a quality of writing. The third rubric for the in, and language. Scores for each dimension its), and "Distinguished" (4 points). The score ale to determine success level into Fail, Passes in maximum of 20 points and no more than to committee member. A score that is 18 or about a score is less than 38, it is "Fail." If the continuum possible points, get "Pass with Honoric in the committee in the continuum possible points, get "Pass with Honoric in the continuum possible points, get "Pass with Honoric in the continuum possible points, get "Pass with Honoric in the continuum possible points, get "Pass with Honoric in the continuum possible points, get "Pass with Honoric in the continuum possible points, get "Pass with Honoric in the case of the	ted from the Wid procept mastery, for the of problem to one e application and per area range from each directly ass, or Pass with Howe individual directly woo individual directly translated by a sombined score is 39	dener bundational design, wer assesses om nension in donors. To mension d "Pass with cale to 9-53 points,
Program Success Target for this		100%		Percent of Program Achieving Target	100%	
Methods	faculty who are n defend it orally. I the exam answers	nembers of the student's thesis committee. For students who chose the comprehensing independently using the set of rubrics.	ee reviewed ve exam (n mentioned a	s assessment. For student who have chosen their work and approved of its quality before 5, three faculty members of their example above. For this SLO, scores from all areas of	ore the student w committee read a	as allowed to and assessed
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.)  All students have successfully either defended their thesis or passed their comprehensive exam in their first attempt. Thus, these results have not indicated a need for program						
All students have successfully eith improvement or chang.	ner defended their	thesis or passed their comprehensive ex	am in their	r first attempt. Thus, these results have not	indicated a need	I for program
	for follow-up. If i	follow-up has occurred, describe how th	e actions ab	pove have resulted in program improvement	t.)	
None planned for now.						

Next Assessment Cycle Plan (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome)

After consulting the Gradaute Program Committee, program will be assessed using the same process but SLO criteria 2, 3, and 5.

## **Comprehensive Exam Assessment Rubric**

## Scoring Rubric for Communication Foundations/Theory Question

Candidate Proficiencies	Insufficient 1	Emergent 2	Proficient 3	Distinguished 4
CONCEPT	Misunderstands prompt and/or confuses some significant concepts with regard to theory	Responds adequately to the prompt, may have some factual, interpretative or conceptual errors or irrelevancies with regard to theory.	Responds well to the prompt; analysis goes beyond the obvious and explores the uses and value of theory	Comprehensively responds to the prompt; analysis relevant, sophisticated and original; creates clear linkages between the centrality of theory to research
FOUNDATIONAL CONTENT	Explanation of theory/theories is inaccurate, vague, irrelevant or absent	Explanation of theory/theories is overly general and lacking depth	Explanation of theory/theories is clear, detailed, and accurate	Explanation of theory/theories is grounded, specific, arguable, and complex
LITERATURE	Evidence only narrative or anecdotal, awkwardly or incorrectly incorporated	Provides some evidence but not always relevant, sufficient, or integrated into the response; citations are minimal	Provides sufficient and appropriate evidence (literature in text of response) and makes effort to contextualize it; citations are appropriate	Provides substantial, well- chosen evidence (research and textual citations) establishing a clear foundation and framework; definitions are used to strengthen response; citations are excellent
ORGANIZATION	Arbitrary or no paragraph structure, illogical or no transition, repetitive, wanders	Uneven: paragraphs sometimes effective, but some brief, weakly unified, or undeveloped; some awkward or missing transitions	Distinct units of thought in paragraphs, coherently arranged; some transitions between sentences and paragraphs	Apt, seemingly inevitable sequence of paragraphs; appropriate, clear and adequate transitions between sentences and paragraphs
LANGUAGE	Frequent major and minor grammar problems; frequent imprecise diction; wordiness; awkward syntax; repetitive sentence patterns; problems impede meaning	Occasional major grammar errors (e.g., agreement, tense); frequent minor grammar errors (e.g., prepositions, articles); awkward syntax; wordiness	Some mechanical difficulties; occasional problematic word choices or awkward syntax errors; occasional grammar errors; some wordiness	Scholarly and precise writing, syntactic variety, clear command of the language

<sup>\*</sup>Assessment form and rubrics adapted from Widener University's Doctor of Education Program

## Scoring Rubric for Communication Research Methods Question

Candidate Proficiencies	Insufficient 1	Emergent 2	Proficient 3	Distinguished 4
Links Between	Provided no evidence to	Provided limited evidence of	Made logical	Described how specific
Research Problem	for a rationale of one's	a rationale for one's choice	connections between	elements of research designs
and Design	choice of research designs	of research designs	one's chosen research	provide a unique justification
			designs and the	for solving a research question
			research problem	
Research Design	Included no information to	Included limited information	Included information to	Described how the chosen
Links between	justify the sampling	to justify the sampling	justify the sampling	sampling strategy strengthens
Sampling Strategy	strategy	strategy	strategy	decisions about one's choices
and Research				of research designs
Design				
Methods,	Provided no rationale for	Provided limited rationale	Provided clear rationale	Provided very strong rationale
Measurement, &	the selection/creation of	for selection/creation of	for selection/creation of	for selection/creation of
Procedures	quantitative or qualitative	quantitative or qualitative	quantitative or	quantitative or qualitative
	protocols that emphasize	protocols that emphasize	qualitative protocols	protocols that emphasize
	validity, reliability,	validity, reliability, credibility	that emphasize validity,	validity, reliability, credibility
	credibility and/or	and/or trustworthiness	reliability, credibility	and/or trustworthiness
	trustworthiness		and/or trustworthiness	
Data Analysis	Showed no understanding	Showed limited	Showed understanding	Showed advanced
	of appropriate use of the	understanding of	of appropriate use of	understanding of appropriate
	selected method	appropriate use of the	the selected method	use of the selected method
		selected method		
Quality of Writing	Response is mechanically	Response made some	Response is relatively	Response is well-written and
	and rhetorically flawed	mechanical and rhetorical	free of mechanical and	has a strong rhetorical
		errors	rhetorical errors	structure

## Scoring Rubric for Communication Application Question

Candidate Proficiencies	Insufficient 1	Emergent 2	Proficient 3	Distinguished 4
CONCEPT	Misunderstands prompt and/or confuses some significant concepts of the case example	Responds adequately to the prompt, may have some factual, interpretive, or conceptual errors or irrelevancies	Responds well to the prompt analysis goes beyond the obvious	Responds comprehensively to the prompt; analysis relevant, sophisticated, and original
APPLICATION TO PROBLEM /CASE	Fails to demonstrate minimal proficiencies to describe, explain, or resolve the case or situation as presented; provides limited evidence of critical thinking and problemsolving	Demonstrates minimal proficiencies to describe, explain, or resolve the case or situation as presented; demonstrates cursory critical thinking and problem-solving	Demonstrates acceptable proficiencies to describe, predict, or resolve the case or situation as presented; demonstrates critical thinking and problem-solving	Demonstrates excellence and proficiency in describing, predicting, or resolving the case or situation as presented; integrates scholarship in a way that demonstrates excellent critical thinking and problemsolving
LITERATURE	Evidence only narrative or anecdotal, awkwardly or incorrectly incorporated	Provides some evidence but not always relevant, sufficient, or integrated into the response; citations are minimal	Provides sufficient and appropriate evidence (literature in text of response) and makes effort to contextualize it; citations are appropriate	Provides substantial, well- chosen evidence (research or textual citations) establishing a clear foundation and framework; definitions are used to strengthen response; citations are excellent
ORGANIZATION	Arbitrary or no paragraph structure, illogical or no transitions, repetitive, wanders	Uneven: paragraphs sometimes effective, but some brief, weakly unified, or undeveloped; some awkward or missing transitions	Distinct units of thought in paragraphs, coherently arranged; some transitions between sentences and paragraphs	Apt, seemingly inevitable sequence of paragraphs; appropriate, clear, and adequate transitions between sentences and paragraphs
LANGUAGE	Frequent major and minor grammar problems; frequent imprecise diction; wordiness; awkward syntax; repetitive sentence patterns; problems impede meaning	Occasional major grammar errors (e.g., agreement, tense); frequent minor grammar errors (e.g., prepositions, articles); occasional imprecise diction; awkward syntax; wordiness	Some mechanical difficulties; occasional problematic word choices or awkward syntax errors; occasional grammar errors; some wordiness	Scholarly and precise use of language, clear command of the language

<sup>\*</sup>Assessment form and rubrics adapted from Widener University's Doctor of Education Program