Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Degree Program Name: _____Communication_____ **Contact Name and Email** ____Debra Israel (debra.israel@indstate.edu)____

Part One

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year? If this is a graduate program, indicate the **Graduate Student Learning Outcome*** each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
Learning Objective One: Demonstrate the ability to conduct advanced primary research in Communication: a)Locate academic texts published in scholarly forums. b)Analyze academic texts published in scholarly forums. c) Cite academic texts published in scholarly forums.	Rubric will be used to evaluate final course projects in Comm 602 where these objectives are reinforced.	80% will achieve a 4 (on a scale of 1-5) or higher on related rubric criteria.	Since artifacts were collected at the end of the Spring 2016 semester, assessment will occur in early Fall 2016.	1) The faculty member for Comm 602 will provide the final course projects. 2) A sub-committee of the graduate program faculty will work on the assessment in Fall 2016 and share the results with the graduate program faculty.
Learning Objective Four: Demonstrate an understanding of the social and ethical implications of persuasion in socio-political contexts: a)Identify and articulate the component parts of an argument. b) Support argumentative claims with appropriate evidence and cogent reasoning.	Rubric will be used to evaluate final course projects in Comm 602 where these objectives are reinforced.	80% will achieve a 4 (on a scale of 1-5) or higher on related rubric criteria.	Since artifacts were collected at the end of the Spring 2016 semester, assessment will occur in early Fall 2016.	1) The faculty member for Comm 602 will provide the final course projects. 2) A sub-committee of the graduate program faculty will work on the assessment in Fall 2016 and share the results with the graduate program faculty.

Part Two

AY 2015-16 was a somewhat turbulent time for the graduate program in Communication, when the Graduate Council recommended suspension of the program. However, Provost Licari supported continuation of the graduate program while the graduate faculty examines direction(s) for growing and developing the program. The assessment of the current program will be a vital part of this conversation. However, due to recent changes in the department (appointment of external chairperson in January 2016, and resignation of the Graduate Program director in May 2016) the progress on reporting assessment of the graduate program for AY 2015-16 is limited. The assessment plan called for evaluation of Learning Objective Five: Apply research skills and critical thinking skills in a sustained argument or discussion suitable for professional presentation in Fall 2015, using final course projects from Comm 601. This was apparently not done (and the instructor has left the university), so this will be postponed until Fall 2016, when Comm 601 will be taught again. The matrix above outlines the learning objectives that will be assessed in Fall 2016, using final course projects from Comm 602 (taught in Spring 2016). Also, during the coming year, the graduate faculty will elaborate on the connections between the Communication program learning outcomes and the learning outcomes for all ISU graduate programs (listed below):

1. Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.
2. Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.
3. Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.
4. Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.
5. Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.

Degree Program: MA in Communication   Date: 8.14.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	☐ No outcomes are identified. ☐ No Curriculum Map was provided.	☐ Outcomes were identified. ☐ Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. ☐ A Curriculum Map was provided.	☒ Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. ☒ Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☐ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. ☐ At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	☐ Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. ☐ Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☐ Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). ☐ Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) ☐ Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. ☐ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes. ☐ Two or more outcomes were

				assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	☐ No measures are provided. ☐ No goals for student performance are identified.	☒ Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. ☐ Measures are primarily indirect. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.	☒ At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. ☐ Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☒ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. ☐ Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.	☐ Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. ☐ Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. ☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. ☐ Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) ☐ Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. ☐ Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do.

			☐ If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	☐ No data are being collected. ☐ No information is provided about the data collection process. ☐ No results are provided. ☐ Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	☐ Some data are being collected and analyzed. ☐ Some results are provided. ☐ Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. ☐ Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	☐ Data are being collected and analyzed. Will be ☐ Results are provided. Will be ☐ Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. ☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	☐ Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process. ☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. ☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	☐ No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. ☐ Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. ☐ No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. ☐ No reflection is offered about previous results or	☐ The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. ☐ It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. ☐ Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results.	☐ Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ Results regularly are shared with the faculty. Will be ☐ The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. Will be ☐ These discussions lead to the development of specific,	☐ All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. ☐ Faculty and other important

	plans.	☐ Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	relevant plans for improvement. ☐ Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. ☐ Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. ☐ Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. ☐ Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	☒ **Level 0 – Undeveloped**	☐ **Level 1 - Developing**	☐ **Level 2 – Mature**	☐ **Level 3 – Exemplary**

COMMENTS
Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

The two outcomes identified are clear and measurable, and the performance standards are appropriate for a graduate program. The associated assessment methods, however, are not clear: What are the specific assignments you will use to determine whether students met the outcomes?

Please include an update on this year's plan in your 2017 report. Provide sufficient details to make it clear that you know exactly what students do well (and less well) and will take appropriate steps to identify and improve their performance.

I understand the challenges the program has been facing and appreciate your efforts to keep moving forward. Thanks!