MALONE UNIVERSITY
CHRIST'S KINGDOM FIRST

Date: 2017-2018 Assessment Report

Communication Arts

Assessed by: Communication, Visual, and Performing Arts Department

Mission Statement: "We, the Communication, Visual, and Performing Arts Department, commit to develop artists and communicators rooted in communities, acting as agents of truth, reflection, transformation and reconciliation in a way that celebrates God's grace and faithfulness."

Program Goals:

The overall goals of the Communication Arts program are:

- To provide students opportunities to develop the knowledge, skills, and values necessary for work in a variety of communication contexts.
- To provide students opportunities to develop written and oral communication competence
- To provide students opportunities to develop an orientation for meaningful vocation in a wide variety of communication related careers and activities
- To provide students opportunities to develop the ability to analyze and critique the relationship between communication and culture
- To provide students opportunities to develop the ability for meaningful participation in communities.

Program Intended Learning Outcomes (PILO)	Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success	Summary of Data Collected	Use of Results
O1. Students will demonstrate effective competency in the accepted forms and practices of the disciplinary areas.	Student summative works will be collected from selected core and upper division courses and be evaluated by faculty using rubrics of effective competency for that disciplinary area; at least 80% of the works will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendix 2)**	Summative Works were scored according to rubrics. Proficiency at the 80% or higher level was demonstrated for summative works in all areas **(Appendix 2)** with the exception of the scores in Scriptwriting. This was an unexpected decrease**.** However, this course included non-majors. The Media production scores increased in meaningful ways and met the benchmarks.	CURRICULUM: Faculty will continue to monitor the student outcome data in the Scriptwriting course. ASSESSMENT: Revisions to collecting data from Scriptwriting will be considered to only include majors.
	Interns' forms and practices will be evaluated by site supervisors using a department provided rubric, at least 80% of the evaluations will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(See Appendix 3)**	Many of the interns' forms and practices met or exceeded criterion levels. **(Appendix 3).** However the upper benchmark was not reached for timeliness, self-motivation, assessing strengths and weaknesses and setting goals, and understanding the organization. The sample size was small and impacted by the poor performance of two students.	CURRCIULUM: The Internship coordinator continues to monitor these things in order to determine if the poor performance was an anomaly. CURRICULUM: The Internship Coordinator will review the rubric with students several times during the internship for self-evaluation.

O2.Students will demonstrate their ability to write appropriately and effectively in a variety of communication contexts.	Student summative works will be collected from selected core and upper division writing intensive courses and be evaluated by faculty using rubrics of effective competency for that disciplinary area; at least 80% of the works will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendix 4.1)**	All of the criterion levels were met for the writing summative works. **(Appendix 4.1)**	CURRICULUM: Faculty continue to monitor this area and scheduled a reassessment in two years (2019-2020) assessment cycle) to consider if a curriculum change is warranted. (what we said before)
	Short thesis papers written in the Senior Capstone class will be evaluated by a faculty member using a rubric for appropriate and effective writing; at least 80% of the works will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendix 4.2)**	These met the upper and lower benchmarks (83% were at good/excellent and none in the poor rating) **(Appendix 4.2)** Although the criterion levels were met, the distribution of scores shifted downward in comparison to other years.	CURRICULUM: Faculty will review writing rubric and implement reviews for writing in the Capstone course.

10-18

O3. Students will demonstrate knowledge, application, effectiveness and appropriateness in oral communication contexts.	Student summative works in Oral Communication will be collected from selected core and upper division courses and be evaluated using a rubric for demonstrated knowledge, application, effectiveness and appropriateness; at least 80% of the works will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendix 4.3)**	90% of the oral communication works met the upper criterion and none were in the lower. **(Appendix 4.3)**	CURRICULUM: Faculty who teach upper division classes that have oral presentations will continue to emphasize the transferability of skills from Menu 1 courses and remind and reinforce oral communication skills across the curriculum.
	Oral presentations from a course in Core Menu 1 will be evaluated by a faculty member using a rubric for demonstrated knowledge, application, effectiveness and appropriateness; at least 80% of the presentations will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendix 4.4)**	97% of the oral presentations met the upper criterion and no presentations fell below the lower criterion. This data suggests that students are developing the requisite skills in this area. **(Appendix 4.4)**	

| O4. Students will articulate a philosophy of work and vocation that reflects an understanding of the nature of work and the relationships between gifts, calling and vocation. | Student work and vocation position papers from the Senior Capstone course will be evaluated by a faculty member using a rubric for understanding the nature of work and the relationships between gifts, calling and vocation; at least 80% of the papers will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendix 5.1)** | 77% of the position papers were judged as proficient (with a mean score of 4.26). No scores fell below the lower criterion. **(Appendix 5.1).** This is a marked drop from the previous two years. | CURRICULUM: The faculty teaching the internship course and capstone course will meet to discuss additional ideas about ensuring shared vocabulary and introduction with and engagement with ideas.

CURRICULUM: Faculty will continue to use more explicit prompts and scaffolded assignments. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Internship Reflection papers will be evaluated by a faculty member using a rubric for understanding the nature of work and the relationships between gifts, calling and vocation;, at least 80% of the papers will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendix 5.2)** | 82% of the reflection papers met the upper benchmark; the lower benchmark was also met. The overall mean was 3.97. **(Appendix 5.2)** Although the mean score of the Capstone papers was higher than the internship papers, the distribution of scores was lower. When data from both were analyzed together, the criterion levels were met. | CURRICULUM: Faculty will present information about ideas/vocabulary at a department meeting and identify way in which these things can be reinforced in lower division courses. |
| O5. Students will demonstrate the application of communication theories in various life situations | Students in Communication Theory will give evidence of specific ways in which communication theories are and are not applicable to particular situations. Data will be collected as part of a cumulative final exam in the course. Responses will be evaluated by faculty using a rubric for the application of communication theories. At least 80% of the works will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(See Appendix 6.1)** | 80 percent (80%) of the rankings for applying communication theories were at the good or excellent level; none fell in the poor level. This met both the upper and lower benchmarks **(Appendix 6.1)** | PROGRAM: Faculty maintained current programmatic, curricular and assessment practices to build on these ongoing areas of strength. |

O6. Students will apply communication concepts and skills to personal interaction and group settings.	Internship supervisors will evaluate skills in personal and group interaction using a rubric, at least 80% of the evaluations will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(See Appendices 7.1 & 7.2)**	All of the evaluations for students in internship courses met the upper and lower benchmarks. 86% of the scores for interpersonal skills were in the upper proficiency range, none were in the poor range. 84% of the group setting skills were in the upper proficiency range, none were in the poor range. **(Appendices 7.1 & 7.2)**	PROGRAM: Faculty maintained current programmatic, curricular and assessment practices to build on these ongoing areas of strength.
	Students participating in group projects in upper division core and Applied courses will be evaluated by group members using a rubric for communication concepts and skills in personal interaction and group setting: at least 80% of the evaluations will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(See Appendices 7.3 & 7.4)**	All of the evaluations for students in upper division courses met the upper and lower benchmarks. 85% of the scores for interpersonal skills were in the upper proficiency range, none were in the poor range. 93% of the group setting skills were in the upper proficiency range, none were in the poor range. **(Appendices 7.3 & 7.4)** The increased sample size enables us to have more confidence in the consistency of scores. It also seems that review of the forms did yield more discriminating scores.	ASSESSMENT: Faculty will continue to review instruction materials with students prior to the completion of these forms to make sure that the forms reflect more nuanced performance. Faculty will continue to collect peer evaluations from group members in any upper division and applied classes where there are group projects.

10-18

Appendices Table of Contents: 2017-2018

Communication Arts Assessment Data

APPENDIX 1: COMMUNICATION ARTS DEPARTMENT MISSION AND ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
[Revised and adopted 6/17]

Communication, Visual, and Performing Arts Department Mission Statement: "We, the Communication Arts Department, commit to develop artists and communicators rooted in communities, acting as agents of truth, reflection, transformation and reconciliation in a way that celebrates God's grace and faithfulness."

PROGRAM GOALS *The overall goals of the Communication Arts department are to provide students opportunities to:*	PROGRAM INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES: *Graduates of the Communication Arts Department will meet the following objectives:*	MEANS OF ASSESSMENT AND CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS
G1 To provide students opportunities to develop the knowledge, skills, and values necessary for work in a variety of communication contexts.	O1. Students will demonstrate effective competency in the accepted forms and practices of the disciplinary areas.	Student summative works will be collected from selected core and upper division courses and be evaluated by faculty using rubrics of effective competency for that disciplinary area; at least 80% of the works will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendix 2)** Intern's forms and practices will be evaluated by site supervisors using a department provided rubric, at least 80% of the evaluations will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendix 3)**
G2 To provide students opportunities to develop written and oral communication competence	O2.Students will demonstrate their ability to write appropriately and effectively in a variety of communication contexts.	Student summative works will be collected from selected core and upper division writing intensive courses and be evaluated by faculty using rubrics of effective competency for that disciplinary area; at least 80% of the works will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendix 4.1)**

10-18

	O3. Students will demonstrate knowledge, application, effectiveness and appropriateness in oral communication contexts.	Short thesis papers written in the Senior Capstone class will be evaluated by a faculty member using a rubric for appropriate and effective writing; at least 80% of the works will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendix 4.2)**
		Oral presentations from a course in Core Menu 2 will be evaluated by a faculty member using a rubric for demonstrated knowledge, application, effectiveness and appropriateness; at least 80% of the presentations will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendix 4.3)**
		Student summative works in Oral Communication will be collected from selected core and upper courses and be evaluated by faculty using a rubric for demonstrated knowledge, application, effectiveness and appropriateness; at least 80% of the works will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendix 4.4)**
G3 To provide students opportunities to develop an orientation for meaningful vocation in a wide variety of communication related careers and activities	O4. Students will articulate a philosophy of work and vocation that reflects an understanding of the nature of work and the relationships between gifts, calling and vocation.	Student work and vocation position papers from the Senior Capstone course will be evaluated using a rubric for understanding the nature of work and the relationships between gifts, calling and vocation; at least 80% of the papers will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendix 5.1)**
		Internship Reflection papers will be evaluated by a faculty member using a rubric for understanding the nature of work and the relationships between gifts, calling and vocation;, at least 80% of the papers will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendix 5.2)**
G4. To provide students opportunities to develop the ability to analyze and critique the relationship between communication and culture	O5. Students will demonstrate the application of communication theories in various life situations	Students in Communication Theory will give evidence of specific ways in which communication theories are and are not applicable to particular situations. Data will be collected as part of a cumulative final exam in the course. Responses will be evaluated by faculty using a rubric for the application of communication theories. At least 80% of the works will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendix 6)**
G5. To provide students opportunities to develop the ability for meaningful	O6. Students will apply communication concepts and skills to personal interaction and group settings.	Internship supervisors will evaluate skills in personal and group interaction using a rubric, at least 80% of the evaluations will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendices 7.1 & 7.2)**

participation in communities.		Students participating in group projects in upper division core and Applied courses will be evaluated by group members using a rubric for communication concepts and skills in personal interaction and group setting: at least 80% of the evaluations will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendices 7.3 & 7.4)**

APPENDIX 2: COMMUNICATION ARTS SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT DATA FOR 2017-2018 (FIVE YEAR) FOR SUMMATIVE WORKS

O1. Students will demonstrate effective competency in the accepted forms and practices of the disciplinary areas.	Student summative works will be collected from selected core and upper division courses and be evaluated by faculty using rubrics of effective competency for that disciplinary area; at least 80% of the works will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. **(Appendix 2)**

The Communication Arts faculty reviewed a sample of collected summative works from related Core and upper division courses and coded them using a 1-5 scale (5= Excellent, 4 = Good, 3 = Acceptable, 2 = Marginal, 1 = Poor) according to the criteria in the rubrics.

Breaking the data down into subgroups allows evaluation of student performance based on criteria relevant to the particular examples of work being submitted. Representative work from each student gives us a helpful understanding about the degree to which students have achieved the requisite skills in a particular area. Individual results should still be read with care and interpreted in the context of the overall scores and across time.

2.1 PUBLIC RELATIONS WRITING CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
(5) Excellent	.66	.68	**None assessed this year**	1.00	**None assessed this year**
(4) Good	.23	.14			
(3) Acceptable	.13	.10			
(2) Marginal	.12	.04			
(1) Poor		.04			
Mean rank	4.35	4.39		5.00	
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.88	.82		1.00	
N =	33	28		5	

[Alternate year course that yields best works in this area.]

2.2 PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAM PLANNING CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
(5) Excellent	None assessed this year	.50	None assessed this year	**.33**
(4) Good		.50		**.67**
(3) Acceptable				
(2) Marginal				
(1) Poor				
Mean rank		4.25		**4.58**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"		1.00		**1.00**
N =		2		**3**

2.3 MEDIA PRODUCTION CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.25	.40	.40	.00	**.50**
Good	.25	.20	.40	.64	**.33**
Acceptable	.25	.40	.20	.36	**.17**
Marginal					
Poor	.25				
Mean rank	3.33	4.14	4.30	3.79	**4.37**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.50	.60	.80	.64	**.83**
N =	4	5	15	14	**6**

2.4 GRAPHIC DESIGN CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**

Excellent	None assessed in this year	None assessed in this year	.60	.75	**.42**
Good			.27	.25	**.42**
Acceptable			.07		**.16**
Marginal			.07		
Poor					
Mean rank			4.31	4.57	**4.27**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"			.87	1.00	**.84**
N =			15	12	**12**

2.5 ACTING – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.75	.80	.47	.46	**.53**
Good		.20	.33	.39	**.29**
Acceptable	.25		.20	.15	**.1**
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean rank	4.33	4.78	4.17	4.28	**17**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.75	1.00	.80	.85	**.82**
N =	4	10	36	13	**4.44**

2.6 WEB PUBLISHING CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.33	.40	.40	.71	**.58**
Good	.67	.60	.60	.23	**.25**
Acceptable				.06	**.13**
Marginal					**.04**
Poor					
Mean rank	4.33	4.14	4.2	4.4	**4.41**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	.94	**.83**
N =	3	5	5	17	**24**

2.7 SCRIPTWRITING CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.50	1.00		.25		**.33**

10-18

Good	.50		None assessed this year	.59	None assessed this year	.42
Acceptable				.08		.25
Marginal				.08		
Poor						
Mean rank	3.83	4.7		4.0		4.03
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good")	.50	1.00		.84		.75
N =	2	2		12		12

[Alternate year course that yields best works in this area.]

2.8 DIRECTING CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
Excellent	.38	.67	.67	None assessed this year	.39	None assessed this year
Good	.50	.17	.33		.46	
Acceptable	.13	.17			.15	
Marginal						
Poor						
Mean rank	4.3	4.27	4.67		4.21	
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.88	.83	1.00		.85	
N =	8	6	3		13	

APPENDIX 3: COMMUNICATION ARTS SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT DATA FOR 2017-2018 FOR INTERNSHIPS

O1. Students will demonstrate effective competency in the accepted forms and practices of the disciplinary areas.	Intern's forms and practices will be evaluated by site supervisors using a department provided rubric, at least 80% of the evaluations will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor.

INTERNSHIP EVALUATION

3.1 a) Prompt in reporting to work, meetings, and in completing assignments/projects. b) Keeps in touch, meets expectations regarding deadlines, returns messages/calls.

	2014-2015a	2014-2015b	2015-2016a	2015-2016b	2016-2017a	2016-2017b	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.70	.65	.93	.71	.89	.89	**.67**
Good	.20	.20	.07	.29	.11	.11	
Acceptable	.10	.05					**.17**
Marginal							
Poor							**.17**
Mean ranks	4.6	4.4	4.93	4.71	4.89	4.89	**4.00**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.90	.85	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	**.67**
N =	20	20	15	14	9	9	**6**

3.2 Character and attitude brings sense of ethical values and integrity to the office, clients of the organization, and other people with whom he or she had contact.

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.86	.75	.87	1.00	**.72**
Good	.14	.25	.13		**.14**
Acceptable					
Marginal					**.14**
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.86	4.75	4.87	5.00	**4.43**

% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	.86
N =	14	20	15	9	7

3.3 Exhibited self-motivation in their approach to work.

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	64.3	.70	1.00	.89	**.72**
Good	35.7	.10		.11	
Acceptable		.15			**.14**
Marginal		.05			
Poor					**.14**
Mean ranks	4.64	4.45	5.00	4.89	**4.14**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	.80	1.00	1.00	**.72**
N =	14	20	15	9	**7**

3.4 Sought to understand their personal strengths and weaknesses and to build upon these through setting appropriate priorities and goals.

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.71	.50	.87	1.00	**.58**
Good	.29	.35	.13		**.14**
Acceptable		.15			**.14**
Marginal					**.14**
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.71	4.35	4.80	5.00	**4.14**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	.85	1.00	1.00	**.72**
N =	14	20	15	9	**7**

3.5 Established appropriate working relationships with colleagues in the office, clients of the organization and other people with whom she or he had contact.

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.86	.85	.87	1.00	**.57**

Good	.07	.10	.07		**.29**
Acceptable	.07	.05	.06		**.14**
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.79	4.80	4.80	5.00	**4.43**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	92.9	.95	.94	1.00	**.86**
N =	14	20	15	9	**7**

3.6 Was able to articulate the service provided by the organization and how this service benefited the larger local community.

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.79	.75	.73	.56	**.43**
Good	.21	.20	.27	.44	**.29**
Acceptable		.05			**.29**
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.56	**4.13**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	.95	1.00	1.00	**.71**
N =	14	20	15	9	**7**

3.7 Able to apply his or her communication skills in the context of the organization's goals and objectives.

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.71	.80	.80	.78	**.57**
Good	.29	.20	.20	.22	**.29**
Acceptable					**.14**
Marginal					
Poor					

Mean ranks	4.79	4.80	4.80	4.78	**4.43**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	**.86**
N =	14	20	15	9	**7**

3.8 Was able to understand and support the mission and goals of the organization and confidently work within these expectations.

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.79	.80	.73	.78	**.43**
Good	.21	.20	.27	.22	**.29**
Acceptable					**.14**
Marginal					**.14**
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.79	4.79	4.73	4.78	**4.0**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	**.72**
N =	14	20	15	9	**7**

3.9 I would be willing to recommend this intern to another organization for service or employment.

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017=2018**
Excellent	.64	.70	1.00	1.00	**.57**
Good	.29	.15			**.29**
Acceptable	.07	.15			**.14**
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.57	4.55	5.00	5.00	**4.29**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.93	.85	1.00	1.00	**.86**
N =	14	20	15	9	**7**

3.10 I would be willing to host another intern from Malone University at some future time.

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.86	.90	.87	.88	**.71**
Good	.07	.10	.13	.12	**.29**
Acceptable	.07				
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.8	4.7	4.73	4.88	**4.71**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.93	1.00	1.00	1.00	**1.00**
N =	14	20	15	9	**7**

3.11 The overall performance of this intern met the expectations for our organization.

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.64	.70	.93	.78	**.43**
Good	.36	.25	.07	.22	**.43**

Acceptable		.05			
Marginal					**.14**
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.6	4.65	4.93	4.78	**4.21**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	.95	1.00	1.00	**.86**
N =	14	20	15	9	**7**

APPENDIX 4: COMMUNICATION ARTS SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT DATA FOR 2017-2018 (FIVE YEAR) ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

G2 To provide students opportunities to develop written and oral communication competence	O2.Students will demonstrate their ability to write appropriately and effectively in a variety of communication contexts.	Student summative works will be collected from selected core and upper division writing intensive courses and be evaluated by faculty using rubrics of effective competency for that disciplinary area; at least 80% of the works will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. Short thesis papers written in the Senior Capstone class will be evaluated by a faculty member using a rubric for appropriate and effective writing; at least 80% of the works will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor.
	O3. Students will demonstrate knowledge, application, effectiveness and appropriateness in oral communication contexts.	Oral presentations from a course in Core Menu 2 will be evaluated by a faculty member using a rubric for demonstrated knowledge, application, effectiveness and appropriateness; at least 80% of the presentations will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. Student summative works in Oral Communication will be collected from selected core and upper courses and be evaluated by faculty using a rubric for demonstrated knowledge, application, effectiveness and appropriateness; at least 80% of the works will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor.

4.1 WRITING CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF SUMMATIVE WORKS RANKINGS

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.58	.20	.07	.43	
Good	.31	.60	.68	.50	
Acceptable	.11	.20	.16		
Marginal				.09	.07	
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.39	4.0	3.85	4.11	
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.89	.80	.75	.93	
N =	26	5	44	14	

4.2 WRITING CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF SENIOR THESIS RANKINGS

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	None assessed this year	.40	.50	.64	**.25**
Good		.40	.33	.36	**.58**
Acceptable		.20	.17		**.17**
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks		4.2	4.33	4.57	**4.33**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"		.80	.83	1.00	**.83**
N =		15	24	11	**12**

10-18

4.3 ORAL COMMUNICATION (SUMMATIVE-UPPER DIVISION) – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2015-2016	**2016-2017**	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.31	**None**	**.45**
Good	.63	**assessed this**	**.45**
Acceptable	.06	**year**	**.10**
Marginal			
Poor			
Mean rank	4.25		**4.40**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.94		**.90**
N =	16		**20**

4.4 ORAL COMMUNICATION (MENU 1) – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent		.72	.50	.59	**.74**
Good	1.00	.22	.44	.28	**.23**
Acceptable		.06	.06	.13	**.03**
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean rank	3.93	4.67	4.36	4.44	**4.61**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	.94	.94	.87	**.97**
N =	2	18	18	29	**35**

APPENDIX 5: COMMUNICATION ARTS SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT DATA FOR 2017-2018 (FIVE YEAR) MEANINGFUL VOCATION

G3 To provide students opportunities to develop an orientation for meaningful vocation in a wide variety of communication related careers and activities	O4. Students will articulate a philosophy of work and vocation that reflects an understanding of the nature of work and the relationships between gifts, calling and vocation.	Student work and vocation position papers from the Senior Capstone course will be evaluated using a rubric for understanding the nature of work and the relationships between gifts, calling and vocation; at least 80% of the papers will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor.

5.1 WORK AND VOCATION DATA—CAPSTONE PAPERS

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellence	.48	.56	.60	.80	**.46**
Good	.52	.22	.28	.10	**.31**
Acceptable		.22	.12	.10	**.23**
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean	4.5	4.28	4.55	4.65	**4.26**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	.78	.88	.90	**.77**
N=	23	18	25	10	**13**

5.2 WORK AND VOCATION DATA—INTERNSHIP PAPERS

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.47	.37	.20	.80	**.36**
Good	.41	.48	.15	.20	**.46**
Acceptable	.11	.11	.35		**.09**
Marginal		.04	.20		**.09**
Poor			.10		
Mean	4.35	4.19	3.15	4.64	**3.97**

10-18

% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.88	.85	.35	1.00	**.82**
N=	17	27	20	10	**11**

COMBINED WORK AND VOCATION

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellence	.44	.42	.80	**.42**
Good	.38	.18	.15	**.38**
Acceptable	.11	.16	.05	**.16**
Marginal	.04	.20		**.04**
Poor		.04		
Mean	4.22	3.93	4.65	**4.13**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.82	.60	.95	**.80**
N=	45	45	20	**24**

APPENDIX 6: COMMUNICATION ARTS SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT DATA FOR 2017-2018 (FIVE-YEAR) APPLICATION OF COMMUNICATION THEORIES

G4. To provide students opportunities to develop the ability to analyze and critique the relationship between communication and culture	O5. Students will demonstrate the application of communication theories in various life situations	Students in Communication Theory will give evidence of specific ways in which communication theories are and are not applicable to particular situations. Data will be collected as part of a cumulative final exam in the course. Responses will be evaluated by faculty using a rubric for the application of communication theories. At least 80% of the works will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor.

6.1 APPLICATION OF THEORY—PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.41	.54	.57	.55	**.27**
Good	.36	.42	.26	.31	**.53**
Acceptable	.18	.04	.17	.14	
Marginal	.05				
Poor					**.02**
Mean ranks	4.1	4.5	4.39	4.40	**4.10**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.77	.96	.83	.86	**.80**
N =	22	26	23	22	**45**

APPENDIX 7: COMMUNICATION ARTS SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT DATA FOR 2017-2018 (FIVE-YEAR) INTERPERSONAL AND GROUP COMMUNICATION

G5. To provide students opportunities to develop the ability for meaningful participation in communities.	O6. Students will apply communication concepts and skills to personal interaction and group settings.	Internship supervisors will evaluate skills in personal and group interaction using a rubric, at least 80% of the evaluations will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. Students participating in group projects in upper division core and Applied courses will be evaluated by group members using a rubric for communication concepts and skills in personal interaction and group setting: at least 80% of the evaluations will be judged as proficient (score of 4 or higher); not more than 5% will be considered poor. *(Data from upper division core courses will be gathered in the 2012-2013 assessment cycle.)*

7.1 INTERNSHIP SUPERVISOR EVALUATIONS—INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.79	.80	.87	1.00	**.72**
Good	.21	.20	.13		**.14**
Acceptable					**.14**
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.8	4.8	4.87	5.00	**4.57**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	**.86**
N =	14	20	15	9	**7**

7.2 INTERNSHIP SUPERVISOR EVALUATIONS—GROUP SKILLS

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.50	.65	.87	.97	**.67**
Good	.50	.30	.13	.03	**.17**
Acceptable		.05			**.17**
Marginal					
Poor					

10-18

Mean ranks	4.45	4.69	4.80	4.97	**4.50**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	.95	1.00	1.00	**.84**
N =	33	20	15	9	**6**

7.3 PEER EVALUATIONS—INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.63	100	.61	.59	**.64**
Good	.29			.34	.29	**.22**
Acceptable	.08		.04	.12	**.13**
Marginal			.01		
Poor					**.01**
Mean ranks	4.5		4.54	4.47	**4.46**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.92		.95	.88	**.85**
N =	38	6	77	17	**68**

7.4 PEER EVALUATIONS—GROUP SKILLS

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	**2017-2018**
Excellent	.61	100	.58	.65	**.62**
Good	.29		.28	.24	**.31**
Acceptable	.1		.13	.11	**.05**
Marginal			.01		**.01**
Poor					**.01**
Mean ranks	4.45		4.40	4.37	**4.43**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.9		.86	.88	**.93**
N =	38	6	77	17	**68**