MALONE UNIVERSITY
CHRIST'S KINGDOM FIRST

Date: 2015-2016 Assessment Report

Communication Arts

Assessed by: Communication Arts Department

Mission Statement: "We, the Communication Arts Department, commit to develop 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 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.

8-30-16

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).** The improvement in scores in the Media Production area continued and it appears that the curricular changes and larger sample size were helpful in more accurately assessing this area as well as improved performance. Although summative work data for the Web Publishing met all criterion levels, the exit interview with graduating seniors indicated significant weaknesses with this course and student's self=perception of having obtained the necessary skills in this area.	PERSONNEL: The hiring of a full-time tenure track faculty member for the media area will result in stronger long-term performance for the media related outcomes. ASSESSMENT: The department continued to collect more samples in each area this year to continue to strengthen reliability of data. Revisions to the graphic design rubric will be made. CURRICULUM: Two full-time faculty will team teach the Web Design and Social Media course and restructure in response to the data. CURRICULUM: The internship course was split into an internship prep/internship sequence in order to further address these forms and practices.
	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)**	All of the interns' forms and practices met or exceeded criterion levels. **(Appendix 3).** Last year's lower scores in the area of "self-motivation" were not seen in this data as 100% scored at the excellent rank. Interventions appear to have addressed the issues.	

| 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)**

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)** | 75% of the writing was judged as proficient and no writing samples were judged as poor which met the lower benchmark but fell short of the upper criterion level. There was a decrease in **(Appendix 4.1)**

These met the upper and lower benchmarks (80% at good/excellent and none in the poor rating) **(Appendix 4.2)**

Our change in data collection to increase the sample size gave us a more accurate picture of the degree to which students are demonstrating the requisite skills in writing. The summative works showed a decline in the overall mean and continued the trend of more works scoring in the good or acceptable range. The loss of our Contexts of Journalism course when the program appears to be impacting student writing as they are missing the writing instruction that happened in that course. | ASSESSMENT: The department decided to continue the more comprehensive summative works collection in order to avoid low sample size and produce better data for this and other outcomes.

CURRICULUM: Faculty agreed to modify the PR Writing course to include some of the missing components from the Contexts of Journalism course. Faculty are reinforcing and emphasizing good writing in lower division courses. In addition faculty are encouraging students to take writing courses in the English department to supplement their skills (Style and Usage, Essay Writing.)

CURRICULUM: Faculty continue to monitor this area and scheduled a reassessment in two years (2017-2018 assessment cycle) to consider if a curriculum change is warranted. |

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 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 4.3)**	94% 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 4.3)**	ASSESSMENT: The department continued to implement the plan to collect and utilize additional oral communication summative works from upper division courses to evaluate this outcome.
	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)**	94% 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)** Scores from both measures met the criterion levels but the distribution of scores and means were lower for the oral communication in upper division courses than in the Menu 1 core courses that focus on oral communication explicitly.	COURSES: Faculty who teach upper division classes that have oral presentations will emphasize the transferability of skills from Menu 1 courses and remind and reinforce oral communication skills.

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)**	88% of the position papers were judged as proficient (with a mean score of 4.55). No scores fell below the lower criterion.. **(Appendix 5.1)**	PROGRAM: The department will continue to use formal events to reinforce this outcome by asking students to articulate their philosophies and match with departmental mission through "My Major, My Story." These will also be made available in other venues.
	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)**	35% of the reflection papers met the upper benchmark; the lower benchmark was also not met. The overall mean dropped a full category (from 4.19 to 3.15)**(Appendix 5.2)** The drop in scores in this measure was significant when compared to previous years. Utilizing the new assessment aggregate data as a result of last year's results enabled us to identify potential reasons for the lower scores.	ASSESSMENT: The prompt used for the reflection papers between the internship and senior capstone courses will be re-worked to ensure that the same things are being assessed. CURRICULUM: The internship course was split into an internship prep/internship sequence and readings were changed in order to strengthen student mastery of the related ideas in the internship course.

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)**	83 percent (83%) 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 and although a slight drop from the previous assessment cycle, continues the improvement trajectory **(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. 100% of the scores for interpersonal and group skills were in the upper proficiency range, none were in the poor range. 95% 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 applied and upper division courses met the upper and lower benchmarks. 95% of the scores for interpersonal and group skills were in the upper proficiency range, none were in the poor range. 86% of the group setting skills were in the upper proficiency range, none were in the poor range. **(Appendices 7.1 & 7.2)** Although these scores met both benchmarks they were somewhat compared to previous years but the new data collection enables us to have a more accurate picture of student mastery of these skills.	ASSESSMENT: Faculty will 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.

8-30-16

Appendices Table of Contents
Communication Arts Assessment Data

APPENDIX 1: COMMUNICATION ARTS DEPARTMENT MISSION AND ASSESSMENT
PROGRAM
[Revised and adopted 10/7/13]

Communication Arts Department Mission Statement: "We, the Communication Arts Department,
commit to develop 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)** 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)**
	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. **(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 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)** 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 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. **(Appendices 7.1 & 7.2)** 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 2015-2016 (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. In 2014-2015 we made a shift in how we would collect this data (from relying on student initiated submissions in a Capstone course to the selection of works from the summative course in the area) in order to address a shortcoming of our data wherein some individual categories had relatively few representative works. Initially we began with a sample from each course, but will be moving to a representative work from each student in order to give us a broader understanding. Individual results should still be read with care and interpreted in the context of the overall scores and across time. The comparative data for the Summative (formerly "Best") Works Assessment from 2011-2012 through 2015-2016 follows.

2.1 PUBLIC RELATIONS WRITING CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
(5) Excellent	.23	.48	.66	.68	**None assessed this year**
(4) Good	.41	.35	.23	.14	
(3) Acceptable	.32	.17	.13	.10	
(2) Marginal	.05		.12	.04	
(1) Poor				.04	
Mean rank	3.82	4.26	4.35	4.39	
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.64	.83	.88	.82	
N =	22	23	33	28	

2.2 PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAM PLANNING CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

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

One hundred percent (100%) of the summative works of the summative works met the "good" or "excellent" benchmark and none were in the lower benchmark area.

2.3 MEDIA PRODUCTION CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellent	.56	.56	.25	.40	**.40**
Good	.19	.22	.25	.20	**.40**
Acceptable	.6	.22	.25	.40	**.20**
Marginal	.19				
Poor			.25		
Mean rank	4.13	4.23	3.33	4.14	**4.30**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.75	.78	.50	.60	**.80**
N =	16	9	4	5	**15**

Eighty percent (80%) of the Media Production Summative Works merited a rating of "good" or higher, with a mean score of 4.30. No works were scored as marginal or poor which meets both the upper and lower benchmarks. It appears that the curricular change and larger sample size point to improvements in this area that we will continue to monitor.

2.4 GRAPHIC DESIGN CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellent	.60	1.00	None assessed in this year	None assessed in this year	**.60**
Good	.20				**.27**
Acceptable	.20				**.07**
Marginal					**.07**
Poor					
Mean rank	4.4	5			**4.31**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.80	1.00			**.87**
N =	5	2			**15**

Eighty-seven percent (87%) of the summative works met the "good" or "excellent" benchmark and none were in the lower benchmark area. Our assessment structure with a larger sample size gives us more confidence that students have the requisite skills in this area. We will revise the rubric for assessing this based on the recommendation of the faculty member.

2.5 ACTING – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellent		1.00	.75	.80	**.47**
Good	1.00			.20	**.33**
Acceptable			.25		**.20**
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean rank	4.0	5.0	4.33	4.78	**4.17**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	.75	1.00	**.80**
N =	2	2	4	10	**36**

Eighty percent (80%) of the Summative Works merited a rating of "good" or higher, with a mean score of 4.17 which met all criterion levels. This demonstrates that students have the requisite skills for this area.

2.6 WEB PUBLISHING CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellent	.67	.33	.40	**.40**
Good	.33	.67	.60	**.60**
Acceptable				
Marginal				
Poor				
Mean rank	4.69	4.33	4.14	**4.2**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	**1.00**
N =	6	3	5	**5**

One hundred percent (100%) of the Summative Works merited a rating of "good" or higher, with a mean score of 4.2, which meets all criterion levels. This year's data suggests that overall, students have developed the requisite skills for this area. Although this data was strong, exit interview data suggested significant weaknesses in the course and the course will now be team taught by two full time faculty.

2.7 SCRIPTWRITING CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellent	.47	.50	1.00	None	**.25**
Good	.47	.50		assessed	**.59**
Acceptable	.6			this year	**.08**
Marginal					**.08**
Poor					
Mean rank	4.4	3.83	4.7		**4.0**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good")	.94	.50	1.00		**.84**
N =	17	2	2		**12**

Eighty four percent (84%) of the Summative Works in this category were at the "good" or better level and none were in the poor ranking which meets all criterion levels. Overall, students have developed the requisite skills for this area.

2.8 DIRECTING CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	
Excellent	None assessed this year	.38	.67	.67	None assessed this year
Good		.50	.17	.33	
Acceptable		.13	.17		
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean rank		4.3	4.27	4.67	
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"		.88	.83	1.00	
N =		8	6	3	

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.

	2012-2013	2013-2014 a	2013-2014 b	2014-2015a	2014-2015b	2015-2016a	2015-2016b
Excellent	.82	64.3	64.3	**.70**	**.65**	**.93**	**.71**
Good	.18	28.6	35.7	**.20**	**.20**	**.07**	**.29**
Acceptable		7.1		**.10**	**.05**		
Marginal							
Poor							
Mean ranks	4.82	4.57	4.65	**4.6**	**4.4**	**4.93**	**4.71**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	**.90**	**.85**	**1.00**	**1.00**
N =	11	14	14	**20**	**20**	**15**	**14**

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.

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
Excellent	1.00	1.00	.86	.75	**.87**
Good			.14	.25	**.13**
Acceptable					
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	5.00	5.00	4.86	4.75	**4.87**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	**1.00**
N =	7	11	14	20	**15**

3.3 Exhibited self-motivation in their approach to work.

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
Excellent	.86	.80	64.3	.70	1.00
Good	.14	.10	35.7	.10	
Acceptable		.10		.15	
Marginal				.05	
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.86	4.70	4.64	4.45	5.00
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	.90	1.00	.80	1.00
N =	7	10	14	20	15

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

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
Excellent	.72	.64	.71	.50	.87
Good	.14	.36	.29	.35	.13
Acceptable	.14			.15	
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.57	4.64	4.71	4.35	4.80
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.86	1.00	1.00	.85	1.00
N =	7	11	14	20	15

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.

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellent	.86	.91	.86	.85	**.87**
Good	.14	.09	.07	.10	**.07**
Acceptable			.07	.05	**.06**
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.86	4.91	4.79	4.80	**4.80**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	92.9	.95	**.94**
N =	7	11	14	20	**15**

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

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellent	.86	.91	.79	.75	**.73**
Good	.14	.09	.21	.20	**.27**
Acceptable				.05	
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.86	4.91	4.79	4.70	**4.73**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	.95	**1.00**
N =	7	11	14	20	**15**

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

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellent	.86	.91	.71	.80	**.80**
Good	.14	.09	.29	.20	**.20**
Acceptable					
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.86	4.91	4.79	4.80	**4.80**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	**1.00**
N =	7	11	14	20	**15**

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

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellent	.72	1.00	.79	.80	**.73**
Good	.28		.21	.20	**.27**
Acceptable					
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.71	5.00	4.79	4.79	**4.73**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	**1.00**
N =	7	11	14	20	**15**

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

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellent	1.00	.91	.64	.70	**1.00**
Good		.09	.29	.15	
Acceptable			.07	.15	
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	5.00	4.91	4.57	4.55	**5.00**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	.93	.85	**1.00**
N =	6	11	14	20	**15**

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

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**
Excellent	.86	1.00	.86	**.90**	**.87**
Good			.07	**.10**	**.13**
Acceptable	.14		.07		
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.71	5.00	4.8	**4.7**	**4.73**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.86	1.00	.93	**1.00**	**1.00**
N =	7	11	14	**20**	**15**

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

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	**2014-2015**	
Excellent	.86	.91	.64	**.70**	**.93**
Good	.14	.09	.36	**.25**	**.07**
Acceptable				**.05**	
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.86	4.91	4.6	**4.65**	**4.93**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	**.95**	**1.00**
N =	7	11	14	**20**	**15**

All of the interns' forms and practices meet or exceed the criterion levels. This is consistent with last year's data. These outcomes are an indication that the intentional mentorship by a full-time faculty member in the internship course helps students develop the skills above. It is

an indication that the increased focus in the internship course is helping students in the development of their skills. This suggests that students are well prepared to transition from the classroom to the workplace. We were monitoring self-motivation and that meets the criterion levels this year. We made a curricular change and split the internship course into a prep/internship sequence. More focused and specific preparation will address all areas more specifically.

| 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

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellent	.47	.59	.58	.20	**.07**
Good	.29	.24	.31	.60	**.68**
Acceptable	.14	.17	.11	.20	**.16**
Marginal	.10				**.09**
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.14	4.32	4.39	4.0	**3.85**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.76	.83	.89	.80	**.75**
N =	51	29	26	5	**44**

Seventy-five percent (75%) of the Writing Summative Works merited a rating of "good" or higher, with a mean score of 3.85 and none were considered poor which falls short of the upper criterion level but meets the lower one.

4.2 WRITING CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF SENIOR THESIS RANKINGS

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellent	.59	.44	None	.40	**.50**
Good	.35	.50	assessed	.40	**.33**
Acceptable	.07	.06	this year	.20	**.17**
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.5	4.4		4.2	**4.33**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.94	.94		.80	**.83**
N =	46	32		15	**24**

Eighty-three percent (83%) of the thesis papers merited a rating of "good" or higher with a mean score of 4.33. None fell in the "poor" rating.

The loss of the Contexts of Journalism course with the cut of that program has resulted in negative impacts on student preparation in the area of writing. Faculty are moving some of those instructional units in to the PR Writing course and all department faculty will work to reinforce and emphasize good writing in earlier classes. Faculty will encourage students to take additional writing courses offered in the English department. We will monitor the data in this area for the next two years and then reassess if a curriculum change is merited.

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

	2015-2016
Excellent	**.31**
Good	**.63**
Acceptable	**.06**
Marginal	
Poor	
Mean rank	**4.25**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	**.94**
N =	**16**

4.4 ORAL COMMUNICATION (MENU 1) – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS *This is from Menu 1 classes and the last two years' data (last 2 columns) is compared to previous year's best works.*

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellent	.80	.50		.72	**.50**
Good	.20	.50	1.00	.22	**.44**
Acceptable				.06	**.06**
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean rank	4.8	4.5	3.93	4.67	**4.36**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	.94	**.94**
N =	5	4	2	18	**18**

Ninety-four percent (94%) of both oral communication measures merited a rating of "good" or higher with a mean score of 4.33. None fell in the "poor" rating. The mean from the Core Menu 1 was 4.36 compared to a mean of 4.25 in the upper division oral communication group. The distribution of scores was also slightly different between the two means of assessment with a more equivalent distribution between "excellent" and "good" in Core Menu 1 compared to approximately two thirds of the scores in upper division meriting a ranking of "good."

Faculty will continue to emphasize the transferability of skills from the Menu 1 courses by reminding and working on them in classes that have oral presentations.

APPENDIX 5: COMMUNICATION ARTS SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT DATA FOR
2015-2016 (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 by faculty teams 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

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellence	.52	.50	.48	.56	**.60**
Good	.22	.38	.52	.22	**.28**
Acceptable	.13	.13		.22	**.12**
Marginal	.13				
Poor					
Mean	4.1	4.4	4.5	4.28	**4.55**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.74	.88	1.00	.78	**.88**
N=	23	16	23	18	**25**

Eighty-eight (88%) of the Capstone work and vocation assessments merited a rating of "good" or higher with a mean score of 4.55 and met both upper and lower benchmarks.

5.2 WORK AND VOCATION DATA—INTERNSHIP PAPERS

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
Excellent	.25	.29	.47	.37	.20
Good	.25	.41	.41	.48	.15
Acceptable	.25	.24	.11	.11	.35
Marginal	.25	.06		.04	.20
Poor					.10
Mean	3.75	3.94	4.35	4.19	3.15
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.50	.70	.88	.85	.35
N=	4	17	17	27	20

Neither the upper or lower benchmarks were met for this measure. Thirty-five percent (35%) of the internship work and vocation papers scored at the "good" or higher level and 10% scored at the poor level.

	2014-2015	2015-2016
Excellence	.44	.42
Good	.38	.18
Acceptable	.11	.16
Marginal	.04	.20
Poor		.04
Mean	4.22	3.93
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.82	.60
N=	45	45

The aggregate data supports and clarifies this data. The Internship course has been divided into a prep/internship sequence which will enable these things to be addressed more specifically and several readings will be changed. Faculty in both the internship and capstone courses will modify the prompt for the assessment to ensure that similar things are being assessed for each measure.

APPENDIX 6: COMMUNICATION ARTS SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT DATA FOR
2015-2016 (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

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
Excellent	.44	.38	.41	.54	.57
Good	.30	.29	.36	.42	.26
Acceptable	.26	.24	.18	.04	.17
Marginal		.10	.05		
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.5	4.39
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.74	.67	.77	.96	.83
N =	23	21	22	26	23

Eighty three percent (83%) of the rankings for applying communication theories were at the good or excellent level; none fell in the poor level.

APPENDIX 7: COMMUNICATION ARTS SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT DATA FOR 2015-2016 (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

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellent	.86	.73	.79	.80	**.87**
Good	.14	.27	.21	.20	**.13**
Acceptable					
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.86	4.73	4.8	4.8	**4.87**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	**1.00**
N =	7	11	14	20	**15**

7.2 INTERNSHIP SUPERVISOR EVALUATIONS—GROUP SKILLS

	2010-2011	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellent	.57	.76	.50	.65	**.87**
Good	.28	.21	.50	.30	**.13**
Acceptable	.15	.03		.05	
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.32	4.73	4.45	4.69	**4.80**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.85	.97	1.00	.95	**1.00**
N =	7	33	33	20	**15**

All of the evaluations for students in internships met the upper and lower benchmarks. One hundred percent (100%) of the scores for interpersonal and group skills were in the upper proficiency range, none were in the poor range. Ninety-five percent (95%) of the group setting skills were in the upper proficiency range, and none were in the poor range. This measure corresponds with and corroborates data from the peer evaluations in Applied courses.

7.3 PEER EVALUATIONS—INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellent	.65	.82	.63	100	**.61**
Good	.29	.14	.29		**.34**
Acceptable	.06	.04	.08		**.04**
Marginal					**.01**
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.6	4.8	4.5		**4.54**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.94	.96	.92		**.95**
N =	31	22	38	6	**77**

7.4 PEER EVALUATIONS—GROUP SKILLS

	2010-2011	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**
Excellent	.51	.62	.61	100	**.58**
Good	.30	.24	.29		**.28**
Acceptable	.15	.14	.1		**.13**
Marginal					**.01**
Poor	.04				
Mean ranks	4.22	4.48	4.45		**4.40**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.81	.86	.9		**.86**
N =	31	66	38	6	**77**

All of the evaluations for students in applied and upper division courses met the upper and lower benchmarks. The changes in our data collection gave us better representation and we will be able to more accurately assess this area with similar sample sizes in the future.