MALONE UNIVERSITY
CHRIST'S KINGDOM FIRST

Date: 2016-2017 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 the Media Production area. This was an unexpected decrease**.** However, this course included non-majors and introductory work. The re-design of the Web and Social Media course appears to have strengthened student outcomes.	ASSESSMENT: Revisions to the media production rubric will be considered.

CURRICULUM: Faculty will continue to monitor the student outcome data in the Web and Social Media Course.

CURRICULUM: Faculty will review media production rubric components explicitly with students. |
| | 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).** Continued monitoring previous years' lower scores in the area of "self-motivation" demonstrate that interventions appear to have addressed the issues. Although all scores meet criterion level, scores related to application of communication skills within an organization were lower than the other overall scores. | CURRICULUM: The internship coordinator will address the transferability of skills. |

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)**	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.
	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 (100% at good/excellent and none in the poor rating) **(Appendix 4.2)** We are continuing to monitor this for an additional year before determining if any other curricular changes are warranted.	CURRICULUM: Faculty are continuing to reinforce and emphasize good writing in lower division courses. In addition faculty are continuing to encourage 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 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)**	None assessed this year. **(Appendix 4.3)**	ASSESSMENT: The department revised and reassessed which upper division courses were appropriate for collecting additional oral communication summative works.
	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)**	87% 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)**	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.

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)**	90% of the position papers were judged as proficient (with a mean score of 4.65). 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)**	100% of the reflection papers met the upper benchmark; the lower benchmark was also met. The overall mean was 4.64 which was the highest in five years. **(Appendix 5.2)**	ASSESSMENT: The prompt used for the reflection papers between the internship and senior capstone courses was re-worked to ensure that the same things are being assessed.

CURRICULUM: The internship course and capstone course will meet to discuss what ideas are being communicated and to develop shared vocabulary. |

10-17

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)**	86 percent (86%) 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 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. 97% 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. 88% of the scores for interpersonal were in the upper proficiency range, none were in the poor range. 89% of the group setting skills were in the upper proficiency range, none were in the poor range. **(Appendices 7.3 & 7.4)** Although these scores met both benchmarks they were somewhat lower compared to the previous years. We were did not have the same sample size which would enable us to have a more defined picture of student mastery of these skills and will be addressing the data collection issue.	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 where there are group projects.

Appendices Table of Contents

Communication Arts Assessment Data

10-17

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)**

	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 2016-2017 (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

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
(5) Excellent	.48	.66	.68	**None**	**1.00**
(4) Good	.35	.23	.14	**assessed**	
(3) Acceptable	.17	.13	.10	**this year**	
(2) Marginal		.12	.04		
(1) Poor			.04		
Mean rank	4.26	4.35	4.39		**5.00**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.83	.88	.82		**1.00**
N =	23	33	28		**5**

2.2 PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAM PLANNING CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

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

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

2.3 MEDIA PRODUCTION CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.56	.25	.40	.40	**.00**
Good	.22	.25	.20	.40	**.64**
Acceptable	.22	.25	.40	.20	**.36**
Marginal					
Poor		.25			
Mean rank	4.23	3.33	4.14	4.30	**3.79**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.78	.50	.60	.80	**.64**
N =	9	4	5	15	**14**

Sixty-four (64%) of the Media Production Summative Works merited a rating of "good" or higher, with a mean score of 3.79. The lower benchmark was met, but the higher benchmark was not.

10-17

2.4 GRAPHIC DESIGN CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	1.00	None assessed in this year	None assessed in this year	.60	**.75**
Good				.27	**.25**
Acceptable				.07	
Marginal				.07	
Poor					
Mean rank	5			4.31	**4.57**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00			.87	**1.00**
N =	2			15	**12**

2.5 ACTING – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
Excellent	1.00	.75	.80	.47	**.46**
Good			.20	.33	**.39**
Acceptable		.25		.20	**15**
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean rank	5.0	4.33	4.78	4.17	**4.28**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	.75	1.00	.80	**.85**
N =	2	4	10	36	**13**

2.6 WEB PUBLISHING CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.67	.33	.40	.40	**.71**
Good	.33	.67	.60	.60	**.23**
Acceptable					**.06**

10-17

Marginal					
Poor					
Mean rank	4.69	4.33	4.14	4.2	**4.4**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
N =	6	3	5	5	**17**

2.7 SCRIPTWRITING CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.50	1.00	None assessed this year	.25	None assessed this year
Good	.50			.59	
Acceptable				.08	
Marginal				.08	
Poor					
Mean rank	3.83	4.7		4.0	
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good")	.50	1.00		.84	
N =	2	2		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
Excellent	.38	.67	.67	None assessed this year	.39
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 2016-2017 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.

	2013-2014 b	2014-2015a	2014-2015b	2015-2016a	2015-2016b	2016-2017a	2016-2017b
Excellent	64.3	.70	.65	.93	.71	**.89**	**.89**
Good	35.7	.20	.20	.07	.29	**.11**	**.11**
Acceptable		.10	.05				
Marginal							
Poor							
Mean ranks	4.65	4.6	4.4	4.93	4.71	**4.89**	**4.89**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	.90	.85	1.00	1.00	**1.00**	**1.00**
N =	14	20	20	15	14	**9**	**9**

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.

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
Excellent	1.00	.86	.75	.87	**1.00**
Good		.14	.25	.13	
Acceptable					
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	5.00	4.86	4.75	4.87	**5.00**

10-17

% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	**1.00**
N =	11	14	20	15	**9**

3.3 Exhibited self-motivation in their approach to work.

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.80	64.3	.70	1.00	**.89**
Good	.10	35.7	.10		**.11**
Acceptable	.10		.15		
Marginal			.05		
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.70	4.64	4.45	5.00	**4.89**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.90	1.00	.80	1.00	**1.00**
N =	10	14	20	15	**9**

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

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.64	.71	.50	.87	**1.00**
Good	.36	.29	.35	.13	
Acceptable			.15		
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.64	4.71	4.35	4.80	**5.00**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	.85	1.00	**1.00**
N =	11	14	20	15	**9**

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.

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.91	.86	.85	**.87**	**1.00**

Good	.09	.07	.10	**.07**	
Acceptable		.07	.05	**.06**	
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.91	4.79	4.80	**4.80**	**5.00**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	92.9	.95	**.94**	**1.00**
N =	11	14	20	**15**	**9**

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

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.91	.79	.75	.73	**.56**
Good	.09	.21	.20	.27	**.44**
Acceptable			.05		
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.91	4.79	4.70	4.73	**4.56**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	.95	1.00	**1.00**
N =	11	14	20	15	**9**

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

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.91	.71	.80	.80	**.78**
Good	.09	.29	.20	.20	**.22**
Acceptable					
Marginal					
Poor					

Mean ranks	4.91	4.79	4.80	4.80	**4.78**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	**1.00**
N =	11	14	20	15	**9**

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

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	1.00	.79	.80	.73	**.78**
Good		.21	.20	.27	**.22**
Acceptable					
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	5.00	4.79	4.79	4.73	**4.78**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	**1.00**
N =	11	14	20	15	**9**

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

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.91	.64	.70	1.00	**1.00**
Good	.09	.29	.15		
Acceptable		.07	.15		
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.91	4.57	4.55	5.00	**5.00**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	.93	.85	1.00	**1.00**
N =	11	14	20	15	**9**

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

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	1.00	.86	.90	.87	**.88**
Good		.07	.10	.13	**.12**
Acceptable		.07			
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	5.00	4.8	4.7	4.73	**4.88**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	.93	1.00	1.00	**1.00**
N =	11	14	20	15	**9**

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

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.91	.64	.70	.93	**.78**
Good	.09	.36	.25	.07	**.22**

Acceptable			.05		
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.91	4.6	4.65	4.93	**4.78**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	.95	1.00	**1.00**
N =	11	14	20	15	**9**

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 as well as the internship preparation course helps students develop the skills assessed. 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. Although the scores all meet the benchmark levels, the lower scores within the upper benchmark relate to applied communication within the specific organization. This will be an added focus by the internship coordinator.

APPENDIX 4: COMMUNICATION ARTS SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT DATA FOR 2016-2017 (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

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.59	.58	.20	.07	**.43**
Good	.24	.31	.60	.68	**.50**
Acceptable	.17	.11	.20	.16	
Marginal				.09	**.07**
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.32	4.39	4.0	3.85	**4.11**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.83	.89	.80	.75	**.93**
N =	29	26	5	44	**14**

4.2 WRITING CRITERIA – PERCENTAGE OF SENIOR THESIS RANKINGS

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.44	None	.40	.50	**.64**
Good	.50	assessed	.40	.33	**.36**
Acceptable	.06	this year	.20	.17	
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.4		4.2	4.33	**4.57**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.94		.80	.83	**1.00**
N =	32		15	24	**11**

The criterion levels for both writing outcomes were met and mean scores and the distribution of those scores improved. This is an early indication that the efforts of faculty to reinforce and emphasize good in earlier classes and encouraging students to take additional writing courses offered in the English department is working to result in better student writing

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

	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.31	**None assessed this year**
Good	.63	
Acceptable	.06	
Marginal		
Poor		

Mean rank	4.25
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.94
N =	16

The department faculty will reconsider which courses yield summative works in this area.

4.4 ORAL COMMUNICATION (MENU 1) – PERCENTAGE OF RANKINGS

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.50		.72	.50	**.59**
Good	.50	1.00	.22	.44	**.28**
Acceptable			.06	.06	**.13**
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean rank	4.5	3.93	4.67	4.36	**4.44**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	.94	.94	**.87**
N =	4	2	18	18	**29**

All of the oral communication Menu 1 scores met the criterion levels. The mean of 4.44 was higher than the previous year.

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 2016-2017 (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

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellence	.50	.48	.56	.60	**.80**
Good	.38	.52	.22	.28	**.10**
Acceptable	.13		.22	.12	**.10**
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean	4.4	4.5	4.28	4.55	**4.65**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.88	1.00	.78	.88	**.90**
N=	16	23	18	25	**10**

5.2 WORK AND VOCATION DATA—INTERNSHIP PAPERS

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.29	.47	.37	.20	**.80**
Good	.41	.41	.48	.15	**.20**
Acceptable	.24	.11	.11	.35	
Marginal	.06		.04	.20	
Poor				.10	
Mean	3.94	4.35	4.19	3.15	**4.64**

% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.70	.88	.85	.35	**1.00**
N=	17	17	27	20	**10**

COMBINED WORK AND VOCATION

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

The modified prompt and increased attention to weaknesses in this area appear to be addressed as the scores for both the internship and capstone courses met the criterion levels and show overall improvement.

APPENDIX 6: COMMUNICATION ARTS SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT DATA FOR 2016-2017 (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

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.38	.41	.54	.57	**.55**
Good	.29	.36	.42	.26	**.31**
Acceptable	.24	.18	.04	.17	**.14**
Marginal	.10	.05			
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.0	4.1	4.5	4.39	**4.40**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.67	.77	.96	.83	**.86**
N =	21	22	26	23	**22**

Eighty- six percent (86%) 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 2016-2017 (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

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.73	.79	.80	.87	**1.00**
Good	.27	.21	.20	.13	
Acceptable					
Marginal					
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.73	4.8	4.8	4.87	**5.00**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	**1.00**
N =	11	14	20	15	**9**

7.2 INTERNSHIP SUPERVISOR EVALUATIONS—GROUP SKILLS

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.76	.50	.65	.87	**.97**
Good	.21	.50	.30	.13	**.03**
Acceptable	.03		.05		
Marginal					
Poor					

Mean ranks	4.73	4.45	4.69	4.80	**4.97**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.97	1.00	.95	1.00	**1.00**
N =	33	33	20	15	**9**

All of the evaluations for students in internships met the upper and lower benchmarks. This measure corresponds with and corroborates data from the peer evaluations in courses where these skills are assessed.

7.3 PEER EVALUATIONS—INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.82	.63	100	.61	**.59**
Good	.14	.29		.34	**.29**
Acceptable	.04	.08		.04	**.12**
Marginal				.01	
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.8	4.5		4.54	**4.47**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.96	.92		.95	**.88**
N =	22	38	6	77	**17**

7.4 PEER EVALUATIONS—GROUP SKILLS

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	**2016-2017**
Excellent	.62	.61	100	.58	**.65**
Good	.24	.29		.28	**.24**
Acceptable	.14	.1		.13	**.11**
Marginal				.01	
Poor					
Mean ranks	4.48	4.45		4.40	**4.37**
% of ranks at "Excellent, Good"	.86	.9		.86	**.88**
N =	66	38	6	77	**17**

All of the evaluations for students in applied and upper division courses met the upper and lower benchmarks. We need to re-evaluate and adjust the courses where we are collecting these evaluations as our efforts at increased sample size fell short this assessment cycle.