COMMUNICATION - BA

Cycles included in this report:
Jul 1, 2019 to Jun 30, 2020

Program Name: COMMUNICATION - BA

Reporting Cycle: Jul 1, 2019 to Jun 30, 2020

1 University Mission Statement

We educate and empower students to understand and transform our world.

2 College/School Mission Statement

East Central University's College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences takes a student-centered approach inside and outside of the classroom, providing quality instruction and producing research and creative work that enriches our academic disciplines, our communities, and the lives of our students.

3 Program Mission Statement Program Mission Statement

The East Central University School of Fine Arts is committed to a cultural environment that provides unique expressions of emotion, intellect and spirit by encouraging students' artistic, intellectual, personal, and civic development. Artistic skills, technique, analytic processes and historical investigations are all part of the Fine Arts educational environment that will help students deal with the current and evolving realities of the arts and arts related professions. The School of Fine Arts serves the students at East Central University in both their educational and professional development and encourages the larger university community to appreciate all the Arts through various concerts, exhibits, productions and lectures. By providing an enriching exposure to the challenges and possibilities of the Arts, the School of Fine Arts encourages other disciplines to explore the Arts as an integral part of the liberal arts education. In the School of Fine Arts, programs will work in an interdisciplinary effort to strengthen and enrich the opportunity for a diversified, quality arts education.

4 Program Goal(s) Program Goals

Communication Studies traces its ancestry to the classic liberal arts and the study of rhetoric. Study in Communication Studies prepares students to apprehend and analyze ideas of others; organize and articulate their own ideas; adapt to diverse settings and audiences; teach communication at the secondary level; and prepare for employment and/or graduate study in these fields. The key stakeholders in this undertaking are the program's currently enrolled students, alumni, faculty, and employers of program graduates.

The Communication Department is committed to a continuous improvement approach to achieve its goal; one aspect of departmental improvement is the Assessment Plan. The Assessment Plan facilitates continuous improvement by collecting and evaluating information to identify program strengths and concerns. This information is obtained as feedback from key stakeholders identified above, from standardized tests given to and evaluation of projects by currently enrolled program students, and from other sources. Program strengths are noted and, if possible, developed. When program concerns are encountered, an attempt is made to determine the cause and significance of the substandard performance. If the problem may be linked to a particular course or lack of a course, an attempt is made to adjust course material or the curriculum to correct the deficiency. Ineffective pedagogy is addressed by exploring ways to make teaching more effective, as measured by student performance in subject areas. Program changes made as a result of the assessment responses from key stakeholders are communicated to significant groups through appropriate channels. Program Facebook pages and departmental web pages through the university keep students up-to-date. The department also emails current students and alumni concerning departmental and university events.

5 Assessment Across Program Statement Assessment Across Program Statement

We have an external (and indirect) instrument that is given each year to each student. The "Interpersonal Rating Scale" (IRS) was developed with Brian Spitzberg as the lead researcher. Administering the IRS helps us in terms of adding an indirect measurement AND it allows us to measure each student every year (with the same measurement. Measuring each student each year with the same measurement will help us spot trends; furthermore, it will allow us to follow

individual students longitudinally. Aside from the IRS, in the Freshmen year each student takes "Introduction to Communication and Performance Studies." Every student in our program is required to take "Interpersonal Communication" (a sophomore-level course). Each student is also required to take "Group Dynamics" (a junior-level course). Finally, each student is required to successfully complete a Senior Project (with the exception of "Teacher Certification Students" who must take the OSAT exam).

6 External Instrument Availablity

As mentioned above, CPS students will complete the Interpersonal Rating Scale each year. See the instrument below.

7 Student Learning Outcome

Student Learning Outcome 1: Senior students in Communication Studies will employ theoretical and practical tools appropriately when communicating and when evaluating the communication of others. (Please note that we use one Learning Outcome for oral communication and a different Learning Outcome for written communication.)

7.1 Criterion

Criterion 1.1: Students will complete oral presentations and be assessed on topic choice, audience analysis and adaptation, use of supporting material, organization, language appropriate to audience (i.e., uses vocal vareity), proper grammar and articulation, and physical behaviors that support the verbal message.

7.1.1 Instrument/Measurement

Instrument/Measurement: The "Competent Speaker" Rating Form completed by faculty observing the senior project presentation comprising eight competencies. The rubric has 8 categories that are rated from 1-9. Therefore, the possible scores range from 8-72.

📄 Competent Speaker PDF 241 Kb Oct 31, 2018 View Rename Remove

7.1.1.1 Population

Communication Studies Concentration Majors

7.1.1.2 Standard

75% of students will achieve a summative score of 54 or above on a scale of 8-72.

7.1.1.3 Data Table (Results)

Table: 7.1.
Evaluation of Oral Senior Projects for Communication Studies Emphasis

Academic Year	N	Range of Student Scores	Mean of Student Scores	Percentage Pass Rate
2019-20*	0	NA	NA	NA
2018-19	1	NA	NA	100%
2017-18*	0	NA	NA	NA
Total	1	NA	NA	100%

*We had no students complete the Senior project on these years.

The data reporting format changed in 2017-18. No students with a Communication Studies Emphasis completed a Senior Project in 2017-18.

Year	Projects	Projects	Percentage	Average Scores

		Scoring > 54*	Scoring > 54	
2016-17	2	1	50%	52.21
2015-16	0	NA	NA	NA
Total	2	1	50%	52.21

NA = There is no data available for two of the cells above. No students completed projects those years.

 ** = We raised the pass rate to 75% in 2017-18.

7.1.1.4 Analysis

1. **Was your standard met/not met for the year?** We has no students complete the Senior Project during this reporting period.
2. **Whether met or not met, tell how the students performed in relation to the standard (use the mean, range, and pass rate).** NA
3. **Discuss possible reasons for why students met or did not meet the standard this year.** NA
4. **Look at the 5-year data for trends and discuss those. Note if student scores seem to be increasing/decreasing with time and if so, reasons why.** NA
5. **Using this information, make data-driven decisions about your program—and add this information (only from #5) to Current Actions and/or Changes.** For the last few years we have had low enrollment. Therefore, we have had very few Senior Projects.

7.2 Criterion

Criterion 1.2: Students will complete oral presentations and be assessed on topic choice, audience analysis and adaptation, use of supporting material, organization, language appropriate to audience (i.e., uses vocal vareity), proper grammar and articulation, and physical behaviors that support the verbal message. Students assessed will be program majors in selected Communication Studies courses using faculty evalution tool as an embedded assessment tool. The selected courses are: COMM 2237 (Argumentation & Debate), COMM 3243 (Presentational Communication), COMM 3613 (Group Dynamics), and COMM 3593 (Dramatic and Rhetorical Analysis). These courses were chosen in a faculty forum.

7.2.1 Instrument/Measurement

Instrument/Measurement: The "Competent Speaker" Rating Form completed by faculty observing the senior project presentation comprising eight competencies. The rubric has 8 categories that are rated from 1-9. Therefore, the possible scores range from 8-72.

📄 Competent Speaker PDF 241 Kb Oct 31, 2018 View Rename Remove

7.2.1.1 Population

Communication Studies Concentration Majors

7.2.1.2 Standard

75% of students will achieve a summative score of 54 (i.e., 75%) or above on a (8-72) scale evaluation.

7.2.1.3 Data Table (Results)

Table 7.2.
Evaluations of Presentations Embedded in Courses

Academic Year	N	Range of Student Scores	Mean of Student Scores	Percentage Pass Rate
2019-20	ND-COVID19	NA	NA	NA

2018-19	1	NA	NA	100%
2017-18	2	64-71	67.5	100%

The data reporting format changed in 2017-18.

Year	Presentations	Presentations Scoring >54*	Percentage Scoring > 54	Avgerage Scores
2016-17	1	0	0%	33
2015-16	0	NA	NA	NA
Total	4	2	50%	33, 61.67

NA = There is no data available for 2015-16. Either there were no students who completed the assignments, none of the listed courses were offered, or the faculty failed to collect the data.
* = We raised the pass rate to 75% in 2017-18.

7.2.1.4 Analysis

- Due to the COVID-19 event and the move to fully online teaching after spring break, Spring 2020 data collection was suspended.

8 Student Learning Outcome

Student Learning Outcome 2: Communication Studies students will possess the ability to communicate in writing at a level appropriate for use in industry or graduate programs.

8.1 Criterion

Criterion 2.1: Students will exhibit the ability to defend (in writing) the use of selected model/standards in appraising communication during Senior Projects. The standards which will be assessed are: writes with a clear purpose; inteterests the reader; treats the topic freshly, perceptively, and with intellectual rigor; focus is coherent; development is uniform; if researched, the resources are relevant, credible, current, and skillfully used; tone/voice are audience appropriate; sentences are clear and varied and demonstrate a maturity of structure; writing meets demands of the rhetorical situation (i.e., the structure of the argument is adapted well to the audience's understanding); writing follows accepted conventions in word and sentence mechanics; is the work as a whole beneficial, engaging, memorable, and written in such a way that readers would recommend it to others.

8.1.1 Instrument/Measurement

We used the Competent Writer form. Outcome 2.1 uses the written portion of the Senior Project to evaluate the students' abilities to defend the use of models/standards in appraising communication. (See Appendix B.). *The papers were assessed using six competencies. Each competency was rated on a 1-9 scale. The possible scores range from 6 (far below average) to 54 (far above average).*

Competent Writer PDF 277 Kb Oct 31, 2018 View Rename Remove

8.1.1.1 Population

Senior Communication Studies Concentration Majors

8.1.1.2 Standard

75% of students will achieve a score of 75% or above on a 54-point scale.

8.1.1.3 Data Table (Results)

Table 8.1.
Evaluations of Written Senior Projects for Communication Studies Emphasis

Academic Year	N	Range of Student Scores	Mean of Student Scores	Percentage Pass Rate
2019-20	ND-COVID	NA	NA	NA
2018-19	1	NA	NA	0%
2017-18*	0	NA	NA	NA

The data reporting format changed in 2017-18. No students with a Communication Studies Emphasis completed a Senior Project in 2017-18.

Year	Projects	Projects Scoring > 40.5	Percentage Scoring > 40.5	Average Score
2016-17	2	0	0%	25.6
2015-16	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	6	2	33.3	34.5

.

NA = There is no data available for two years. Either no student projects were completed that year or we failed to collect the data.

* = The pass rate was raised for the year 2017-18.

ND = We do not have the original individual scores. Therefore, we cannot take the average of two averages.

8.1.1.4 Analysis

Due to the COVID-19 event and the move to fully online teaching after spring break, Spring 2020 data collection was suspended.

8.2 Criterion

Criterion 2.2: Students will exhibit the ability to defend (in writing) the use of selected model/standards in appraising communication during Senior Projects. The standards which will be assessed are: writes with a clear purpose; inteterests the reader; treats the topic freshly, perceptively, and with intellectual rigor; focus is coherent; development is uniform; if researched, the resources are relevant, credible, current, and skillfully used; tone/voice are audience appropriate; sentences are clear and varied and demonstrate a maturity of structure; writing meets demands of the rhetorical situation (i.e., the structure of the argument is adapted well to the audience's understanding); writing follows accepted conventions in word and sentence mechanics; is the work as a whole beneficial, engaging, memorable, and written in such a way that readers would recommend it to others. The courses used were COMM 4183 (Theories of Human Communication), COMM 2553 (Interpersonal Communication), COMM 3213 (Persuasion). We will also use a Theatre History/Analysis course (i.e., either COMM 3353 Theatre History and Dramatic Lit: Greeks to 1875, COMM 3363 Theatre History and Dramatic Lit: The Modern Era, or COMM 3593 Dramatic and Rhetorical Analysis).

8.2.1 Instrument/Measurement

Instrument/Measurement: The rubric used for assessment in Criterion 9.2 is identical to the rubric used to assess the written portion of the senior project. Criterion 2.2 assessed embedded student papers from select COMM courses (i.e., The Competent Writer). The courses used were Theories of Human Communication (COMM 4183), Persuasion (COMM 3213), Interpersonal Communication (COMM 2153) and/or Theatre History COMM Theatre History (COMM 3353 or COMM 3363). Assessors tried to judge the students' use of models and standards in writing. The rubric has 6 categories that are rated from 1-9. Therefore, once again, the evaluation ranged from 6-54.

8.2.1.1 Population

Communication Studies majors.

8.2.1.2 Standard

75% of papers will score 40.5 (i.e., 75%) or above on a 54-point scale.

8.2.1.3 Data Table (Results)

Table 8.2.
Evaluations of Student Papers Embedded in Courses

Academic Year	N	Range of Student Scores	Mean of Student Scores	Percentage Pass Rate
2019-20	ND-COVID19			
2018-19	4	23-54	42.5	25%
2017-18	3	23-50	38.67	67%

The data reporting format changed in 2017-18.

Year	Number of Papers	Papers Scoring > 38	Percentage of Papers Scoring >38
2016-17	5	4	80%
2015-16	1	1	100%
2014-15	5	5	100%

ND = Data was not collected in 2012-13.
* = The pass rate was raised in 2017-18.

8.2.1.4 Analysis

- Due to the COVID-19 event and the move to fully online teaching after spring break, Spring 2020 data collection was suspended.

9 Student Learning Outcome

Each student in the department will fill out the Interpersonal Communication Rating Scale each year, assessing themselves on their micro- and macro-skills in communication (see the distinction between the micro- and macro-skills in the Criteria sections below).

9.1 Criterion

Each student in the department will fill out the Interpersonal Communication Rating Scale each year rating thier micro-skills in communication (e.g., vocal variety, speaking fluency, volume, posture, eye contact, smiling/laughing, etc.).

9.1.1 Instrument/Measurement IRC

We will use the Interpersonal Communication Rating Scale (see 9.1.1).

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

IRC

9.1.1.1 Population

All Communication Studies majors and minors.

9.1.1.2 Standard

Out of the highest possible score of 125 on the micro items, 75% of our students will be expected to score 75% (i.e., 93.75) or higher.

9.1.1.3 Data Table (Results)

IRC Micro-Data Table
9.1

Year	N	Range of Student Scores	Mean of Student Scores	Percentage Pass Rate

2019-20*	4	82-96	88.75	25%
2018-19	20	62-122	94.75	55%
2017-18	31	73-118	98	64.45%

*Our program experienced a major realignment during this time. We separated from Performance. Therefore, our N was substantially smaller.

9.1.1.4 Analysis

1. **Was your standard met/not met for the year?** No.
2. **Whether met or not met, tell how the students performed in relation to the standard (use the mean, range, and pass rate).** The N was 4, the range was 82-96. the mean was 88.75, and the pass rate was 25%.
3. **Discuss possible reasons for why students met or did not meet the standard this year.** We had a good group of students who all scored near the passing number, but three of the four fell slightly short.
4. **Look at the 5-year data for trends and discuss those. Note if student scores seem to be increasing/decreasing with time and if so, reasons why.** This year the scores were bunched together. In the past there was a wide gap between the high and low scores.
5. **Using this information, make data-driven decisions about your program—and add this information (only from #5) to Current Actions and/or Changes.** We need to help the students understand that they are all above-average communicators. We believe they rated themselves too low.

9.2 Criterion

Each student in the department will fill out the Interpersonal Communication Rating Scale each year, assessing themselves on their macro-skills in communication (i.e., global conversation skill, sociability, competence, appropriateness, effectiveness).

9.2.1 Instrument/Measurement IRC

We will use the last six questions on the Interpersonal Rating Scale (see 9.1.1).

9.2.1.1 Population

All Communication Studies majors and minors.

9.2.1.2 Standard

Out of a highest possible score of 35 on the macro items, 75% of our students will be expected to score 75% (i.e., 26.5) or higher.

9.2.1.3 Data Table (Results)

IRC Macro-Data Table
9.2

Year	N	Range of Student Scores	Mean of Student Scores	Percentage Pass
2019-20*	4	22-30	25.75	25%
2018-19	20	18-35	27.4	60%
2017-18	31	17-35	28	58%

*Our program experienced a major realignment during this time. We separated from Performance. Therefore, our N was substantially smaller.

9.2.1.4 Analysis

1. **Was your standard met/not met for the year?** No. .
2. **Whether met or not met, tell how the students performed in relation to the**

standard (use the mean, range, and pass rate). The N was 4, the range was 22-30, the mean was 25, the pass rate was 25%.

3. **Discuss possible reasons for why students met or did not meet the standard this year.** The low N didn't help. The students rated themselves as relatively poor communicators when they actually are quite good.

4. **Look at the 5-year data for trends and discuss those. Note if student scores seem to be increasing/decreasing with time and if so, reasons why.** This year's scores were bunched together. In the past the high scores were higher and the low scores were lower.

5. **Using this information, make data-driven decisions about your program—and add this information (only from #5) to Current Actions and/or Changes.** We need to help the students understand that what they've learned has made them good communicators.

10 Student Information for this Academic Year

Student Information for this Academic Year

Total, *unduplicated* number of students assessed this academic year	3*
Program census for Fall	23
Program census for Spring	20
Total number of Summer/Fall Program graduates	2
Total number of Spring graduates	1
Mean major GPA of Summer/Fall graduates	3.09
Mean major GPA of Spring graduates	3.35

*The reason for the discrepancy between the unduplicated students assessed and the total students in program is that Theater students were counted in the total students.

11 Interpretation of Student Information for this Academic Year

We had a low enrollment year. It seems like everyone is graduating or transferring. We're doing the best we can to help the students get the classes they need to graduate by offering TBAs.

12 Summary Table of Student Learning Outcomes/Criteria Summary Table

Summary Table of Student Learning Outcomes/Criteria				
Student Learning Outcomes	**Criteria**	**Measure**	**Met**	**Not Met**
SLO1: Senior students in Communication Studies will employ theoretical and practical tools appropriately when creating their own communication and when evaluating communication created by others.	1.1: Faculty evaluation of the oral presentation portion of the Senior Communication Studies Project	Direct	ND-COVID19	
	1.2: Faculty evaluation of oral presentations by program majors in selected Communication Studies courses as an embedded assessment tool. The selected courses are: COMM 2237 (Argumentation & Debate), COMM 33243 (Presentational Communication), and COMM 3613 (Group Dynamics).	Direct	ND-COVID19	
SLO2: Communication Studies students will possess the ability to defend the use of selected models/standards in	2.1: The opinions of faculty concerning students' abilities to defend the use of selected model/standards in appraising communication during Senior Projects.	Direct	ND-COVID19	
	2.2: The opinions of faculty concerning	Direct		

appraising communication.	students' abilities to defend the use of selected model/standards in appraising communication in research papers		ND-COVID19	
SLO3: Student in the department will fill out the Interpersonal Communication Rating Scale each year, assessing themselves on their micro- and macro-skills in communication (see the distinction between the micro- and macro-skills in the Criteria sections above).	3.1: Each student in the department will fill out the Interpersonal Communication Rating Scale each year rating thier micro-skills in communication (e.g., vocal variety, speaking fluency, volume, posture, eye contact, smiling/laughing, etc.). 3.2: Each student in the department will fill out the Interpersonal Communication Rating Scale each year, assessing themselves on their macro-skills in communication (i.e., global conversation skill, sociability, competence, appropriateness, effectiveness).	Indirect Indirect		

SLO 3.1 & SLO 3.2 weren't met. I cannot seem to get the cursor into the box. Sorry.

13 Faculty Meeting

The two members of the program communicated via email 6-10 and 6-11 about the report.

14 Sharing with Stakeholders

Sharing with Stakeholders

This Program assessment report will be made available on the website of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness: **https://www.ecok.edu.academic-affairs-programs/institutional-effectiveness** **as well as on the Communication and Performance Studies Webpage.**

15 Summary of Actions Related to Assessment Data

15.1 Current Actions and/or Changes

1. Due to the COVID-19 event and the move to fully online teaching after spring break, Spring 2020 data collection was suspended.
2. For the last few years we have had low enrollment. Therefore, we have had very few Senior Projects.
3. We need to help the students understand that they are all above-average communicators. We believe they rated themselves too low.
4. We need to help the students understand that what they've learned has made them good communicators.

15.2 Summary of Latest UAC Review and Status Update

Strengths:
* Strong tables.
* Good analysis when data was available.
* Program goals were easily connected and clearly stated.
* Consistent measures across program.

Areas of Concern:

    * Standards seem low for upper level evaluations.
    * Not clear if scores are summarized across courses or individualized.

    Opportunities:
    * Some analysis could identify an action/outcome for the analysis.

    UAC Conclusion:
    X Approved as Submitted

15.3 Summary of Last 5 Years' Actions/Changes and Updates Summary of Changes for Last 5 Years

The fall semester was interrupted by the COVID19 virus. The pandemic had an impact on virtually every aspect of academics at ECU.

We changed the structure of our department. Theatre will be joined with Music and will named Performing Arts. Communication Studies will be joined with Art, Graphic Design, and Mass Communication.

Donna Graves will take over the responsibilities of Department Chair.

We are "mothballing" the Speech/Theatre/Debate Teacher Certification program due to lack of student participation.

We experienced a substantial amount of turnover in faculty.

End of report