



Date: 2019-2020 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 |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>O1. Students will demonstrate effective competency in the accepted forms and practices of the disciplinary areas.</p> | <p>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)</p> <p>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)</p> | <p>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 Media Production</p> <p>This was not assessed</p> | <p>CURRICULUM: Given that the Media production scores met the benchmark for two years after modifications were made and that the enrollment numbers were substantively lower this cycle, faculty will continue to monitor the student outcome data.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>O2.Students will demonstrate their ability to write appropriately and effectively in a variety of communication contexts.</p> | <p>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)</p> <p>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)</p> | <p>None assessed this year.</p> <p>These met the upper and lower benchmarks (94% were at good/excellent and none in the poor rating) (Appendix 4.2) The distribution of scores is markedly improved from the previous year.</p> | <p>CURRICULUM: Faculty continue to review the writing rubric and implement reviews for writing in the Capstone course.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>O3. Students will demonstrate knowledge, application, effectiveness and appropriateness in oral communication contexts.</p> | <p>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)</p> <p>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)</p> | <p>These met the upper and lower benchmarks (93% were at good/excellent and none in the poor rating) (Appendix 4.2)</p> <p>No presentations fell below the lower criterion but only 70% of the oral presentations met the upper criterion. (Appendix 4.4) The overall mean dropped from the previous assessment cycle, as did the percentage at the “excellent” level. The course is now being taught by adjunct faculty.</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>ASSESSMENT: Full time faculty will work with adjuncts to review the assessment rubric</p> <p>ASSESSMENT: The department will monitor the data to see if the change to adjunct teaching is impacting student outcomes.</p> |
|--|--|---|---|

Academic Program Assessment Template

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>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)</p> <p>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)</p> | <p>94% of the position papers were judged as proficient (with a mean score of 4.65) which was a significant improvement from the previous assessment cycle. No scores fell below the lower criterion. (Appendix 5.1).</p> <p>None were assessed. (Appendix 5.2)</p> | <p>CURRICULUM: The faculty teaching the internship course and capstone course develop a concept document for the department to foster shared vocabulary and introduction with and engagement with ideas.</p> <p>CURRICULUM: Faculty will continue to use explicit prompts and scaffolded assignments. Additionally, the PathwayU assessment will be incorporated in to the assignments.</p> <p>PROGRAM: Faculty will connect students with the Pendle Hill initiative in explicit ways.</p> |
| <p>O5. Students will demonstrate the application of communication theories in various life situations</p> | <p>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)</p> | <p>85 percent (85%) 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)</p> | <p>PROGRAM: Faculty maintained current programmatic, curricular and assessment practices to build on these ongoing areas of strength.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>O6. Students will apply communication concepts and skills to personal interaction and group settings.</p> | <p>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)</p> <p>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)</p> | <p>None were assessed this year (Appendices 7.1 & 7.2)</p> <p>The evaluations for students in upper division courses met the upper and lower benchmarks for interpersonal skills with 905% of the scores in the upper proficiency range, none were in the poor range. (Appendix 7.3)</p> <p>96% of the group setting skills were in the upper proficiency range, none were in the poor range. (Appendix 7.4) This was a marked increase from previous years.</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>CURRICULUM: When students are assigned group projects faculty will build in the element of discussion of group work behaviors and expectations within the small work groups.</p> |
|--|--|---|---|