

**CHICO STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**ASSESSMENT SUMMARY UPDATE**

PROGRAM: BA in Communication Studies

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
Fa16-Sp17	<p><u>LG 1</u> SLO X: Differentiate between various approaches to the study of communication.*</p> <p><u>LG 2</u> SLO A: Apply communication theories, perspectives, principles, and concepts. SLO B: Critique communication theories, perspectives, principles, and concepts. SLO E: Demonstrate the ability to research, analyze, and reason from evidence to reach an effective conclusion/outcome.</p> <p><u>LG 3</u> SLO Y: Engage in communication scholarship using disciplinary research traditions.* SLO A: Formulate</p>	<p>LG 1, SLO A and LG 2, SLOs A and B were assessed with a series of closed-ended questions measuring students' understanding of a quantitative approach to the study of communication. The assessment used a repeated measures (pretest-posttest) design. Data were collected fall 2016 and spring 2017 from four sections of CMST 332: Communication Research (N=73).</p> <p>LG 2, SLO E, and LG3, SLOs Y, A, Z, B, C, and D were assessed with an assessment rubric containing three categories of evaluation (Effective, Acceptable, Unacceptable), designed to evaluate an APA-style quantitative research proposal.</p>	<p>A majority of student scores increased (n=66). The average increase when all scores were included (N=73) was 8.23 points (SD = 6.98), an increase of 11%.</p> <p>A paired <i>t</i>-test was conducted to determine if there was a difference in student scores from pretest (<math>M = 46.36, SD = 6.41</math>) to posttest (<math>M = 54.59, SD = 7.52</math>). A significant difference was noted, <math>t(72) = 10.08, p &lt; .001</math>, suggesting that student understanding of course material increased significantly over the course of the semester. Effect size was calculated using Cohen's <math>d = 1.18</math>, reflecting a large effect.</p> <p>The rubric results for the quantitative research proposal were mixed, which was not unexpected, and was reflected in the benchmarks set for this part of the assessment. Overall,</p>	<p>The CMST faculty discussed the findings in Fall 2017 and the implementation of new PLOs and SLOs.</p> <p>The PLO and SLOs assessed received agreement that these new SLOs are a good addition to our Program Learning Goals. It is important to our students and our curriculum, and can be assessed appropriately within our curriculum. The challenge to be addressed -- how to move beyond one course that basically introduces, practices and masters these skills? Mastery should come in an upper-division course, where students can propose and conduct a study, or conduct a study proposed in a previous class, such as 332. Unfortunately, there was no shared agreement as to where, or if, that could happen. Right now there are no senior classes where primarily quantitative research is being conducted, but that does not mean it can't happen. The CMST faculty will be</p>

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
	<p>questions appropriate for communication scholarship.</p> <p>SLO Z: Locate and use information relevant to various goals, audiences, purposes and contexts.*</p> <p>SLO B: Construct effective messages for a variety of contexts, situations, &amp; audiences.</p> <p>SLO C: Demonstrate proficiency in the use of written English, including proper spelling, grammar, &amp; punctuation.</p> <p>SLO D: Demonstrate proficiency in formal writing, including correct use of a designated style of source citations, such as APA.</p> <p>*SLOs were revised/added during the revision process, after the assessment activity for 2016-17 was underway.</p>		<p>students met benchmarks for LG 2, SLO E, and LG3, SLOs Y, A, Z, B, with a majority of students achieving in the acceptable level as expected. Students exceeded benchmarks for SLO 3 C and D, with roughly 50% achieving effective and very few if any being unacceptable.</p>	<p>considering that option.</p> <p>As this was the first attempt to assess a new area in our curriculum, the conversation will continue, especially as we engage in our Annual Program Review during 17-18, as we reflect on our curriculum and new Learning goals and SLOs. Findings such as these will be drawn upon when planning any changes or revisions.</p>
Fa15-Sp16	2.1 Students will communicate appropriately & effectively within various	Embedded Survey completed by Internship Supervisors and Students for Fall15, S16, SMR16.	Ratings provided by supervisors across all three semesters indicated students not only met, but exceeded Benchmark goals,	The Faculty determined no significant change or revision to current curriculum is called for, based on this assessment project. In fact, the

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
	<p>organizational contexts.</p> <p>2.2 Students will communicate appropriately &amp; effectively within groups.</p> <p>2.3 Demonstrate the ability to analyze a problem &amp; devise a solution in a group.</p> <p>3.1 Students will be capable of effectively monitoring, analyzing, &amp; adjusting their own communication behavior.</p> <p>3.2 Students can demonstrate appropriate &amp; effective conflict management strategies.</p> <p>3.3 Students will be capable of addressing perceptual differences in relational communication for effective outcomes.</p> <p>4.1 Demonstrate the ability to research, analyze, &amp; reason from evidence to reach an effective conclusion or outcome.</p> <p>4.2 Demonstrate the ability to effectively deliver formal presentations before a variety of live audiences.</p>	<p>Survey included closed-ended items for SLOs and open-ended questions for comments. Frequency analysis was performed with quantitative data and qualitative data was analyzed for recurring and emergent themes.</p>	<p>as the majority of students in every category was rated as Superior, with the next highest rating Acceptable, and only 3-5% receiving Unacceptable ratings</p> <p>Student ratings of their own performance was slightly more rigorous than the supervisors, a finding we had in the previous use of this survey. However, the student ratings also exceeded the Benchmark goals set.</p> <p>Strength Comments overall showed a tremendous appreciation for the students and the work they performed, recognition of rewards and benefits from employing the interns, as well as appreciation for the interns, in addition to confirming key skills and knowledge.</p> <p>Comments for student weakness areas indicated most interns had no weaknesses or as having insignificant weaknesses that would likely improve with more experience</p>	<p>findings affirm our current design and practice. The findings will be used to support and encourage students about the benefits of the internship course, as well as highlight the kinds of strengths reported by supervisors. The perceived weaknesses will also be used, (1) specifically to reinforce the importance of specific learning outcomes, such as writing, communication competence, and problem solving, in CMST courses that prepare students for the Internship course and (2) to address the importance of confidence, as most employers said students were very skilled, but a few needed confidence to act or take initiative with their skills.</p> <p>Plan: CMST Faculty revised Program Goals and SLOs following new Learning Outcomes in Communication from our National Association. These will be implemented and assessed in 16-17.</p>

<b>Year of review</b>	<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	<b>Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?</b>
	5. 1 Demonstrate proficiency in the use of written English, including proper spelling, grammar, & punctuation. 5.3 Students can construct appropriate messages for a variety of contexts/situations.			

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
Fa14-Sp15	<p>Program Goal: Construct effective written messages in various formats and styles, to a variety of audiences.</p> <p>5.1 Demonstrate proficiency in the use of written English, including proper spelling, grammar, &amp; punctuation</p> <p>5.2 Demonstrate proficiency in formal writing, including correct use of a designated style of source citations, such as APA.</p> <p>5.3 Students can construct appropriate messages for a variety of contexts/situations.</p>	<p>Embedded assignments were used during the Fall 2014 semester to generate student works samples of written communication. The courses used were selected based on the CMST Program matrix, indicating where students are practicing the SLOs (CMST 331) and where students should be Mastering the SLOs (CMST 452 and 472).</p> <p>The CMST Written Communication Rubric was applied to papers selected from a larger pool of samples, by raters who calibrated with the Rubric and then were assigned papers.</p>	<p><b>5.1 – English Proficiency</b>  <b>Junior level Practice Course</b>  <i>CMST 331-02 – 94% (71%/23%/6%)</i>  <i>CMST 331-03 – 93% (29%/64%/7%)</i></p> <p><b>Senior Level Master Courses</b>  <i>CMST 452-01 - 93% (60%/33%/7%)</i>  <i>CMST 472-01 – 87% (27%, 60%, 13%)</i></p> <p><b>5.2 Documentation</b>  <b>Junior level Practice Course</b>  <i>CMST 331-02 -100% (82%/18%)</i>  <i>CMST 331-03 - 93% (36%/57%/7%)</i></p> <p><b>Senior Level Master Courses</b>  <i>CMST 452-01 – 93% (73%/20%/7%)</i>  <i>CMST 472-01 – 93% (20%/73%/7%)</i></p> <p><b>5.3 Organization</b>  <b>Junior level Practice Course</b>  <i>CMST 331-02 – 100% (47%/53%)</i>  <i>CMST 331-03 – 100% (36%/64%)</i></p> <p><b>Senior Level Master Courses</b>  <i>CMST 452-01 – 100% (53%/47%)</i>  <i>CMST 472-01 – 94% (27%/67%/6%)</i></p> <p><b>5.3 Content</b>  <b>Junior level Practice Course</b>  <i>CMST 331-02 – 94% (53%/41%/6%)</i>  <i>CMST 331-03 – 93% (22%/71%/7%)</i></p> <p><b>Senior Level Master Courses</b>  <i>CMST 452-01 – 93% (47%/47%/6%)</i>  <i>CMST 472-01 – 74% (26%/48%/26%)</i></p>	<p>The CMST Faculty would noted that overall, students are meeting the Benchmark for Proficiency that has been set, with one exception. In one class, the Benchmark was missed by 1%, but in all others the 75% at Adequate or better was far surpassed by 12-25%. In summary, the goal for CMST majors to communicate well in writing is broadly being achieved.</p> <p>More specifically, the Junior level work in the practice courses was actually rated as slightly more Proficient than the work in the Mastery courses. A similar finding to a previous assessment or writing. In most cases, there were slightly more Effective ratings than Adequate for the Practice courses. Also, there were more Inadequate ratings in most cases for the Mastery courses. There was also a clear difference between the two Practice and Mastery courses, with one section being rated more highly in 3 out of 4 areas.</p> <p>Faculty did calibrate with the rubric, and there were only four cases where there was a 1 level difference between raters (3 of those were a 3/2 split and only 1 was a 2/1), indicating the ratings were mostly consistent. What may have taken place is the pair of raters for a given section may have been consistently harder or easier than other pairs. It is also possible that for those rating the Mastery classes, more was expected for an effective rating. However, it is also possible that the work was accurately differentiated.</p> <p>The CMST Faculty were not able to reflect on the findings with any greater detail. The irony is it takes so much time to plan, gather, and conduct the actual assessment work, when it comes time to reflect back on the findings, it is time to move on to the next task. The plan was to consider how these courses are coordinated, how</p>

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
				students in the mastery courses can increase their achievements, and how to assess written communication in a more efficient manner.
Fa13-Sp14	4. Possess skills to effectively deliver formal & informal oral presentations to a variety of audiences in multiple contexts.	Effective oral communication in formal presentations by individuals and groups were assessed in the areas of Organization, Content & Delivery. Speeches were recorded from an upper-division CMST course.	Individual speakers were able to achieve an overall proficiency and above at 100% in the first course (18 students) and about 90% in the second (16 students). Specifically, in the first course 80% were rated and Good-Advanced with 20% at Proficiency in Organization; 50/50% between Advanced and Good in Content; 70% Advanced to Good in Delivery with 30% at Proficiency. In the second course, overall proficiency was 80%. Specifically in the second course 65% were rated and Good-Advanced with 40% at Proficiency in Organization ; 50% were Advanced and Good and 40% Proficient in Content; 50% Advanced to Good in Delivery with 40% at Proficiency.	There was a small difference in overall ratings between 2 semesters of individual speeches. The overall quality of individual speeches was acceptable or better, but the program would desire most all ratings in the Good or better range at this level.
	4.1 Demonstrate the ability to research, analyze, & reason from evidence to reach an effective conclusion or outcome.	There were 34 individual speeches and 8 groups of 5 speakers assessed (40 speakers). Two trained raters worked in four sessions, using the rubrics established by the department for individual and group presentations. Coder reliability was 98% across all ratings.		
	4.2 Demonstrate the ability to effectively deliver formal presentations before a variety of live audiences.		For the Group Presentations, overall Proficiency was 100% for both courses. Note there is no "advanced" rating in group presentations. Specifically in the first course 75% were rated and Good and 25% as Proficient in Organization and Content,; 50% were rated Good and 50% as Proficient in Content & Delivery. In the second course, 75% were rated and Good and 25% as Proficient in Organization; 100% were Good in Content,; 75% were rated Good and 25% as Proficient in Delivery.	Faculty will discuss these outcomes and share possible actions for improvement with instructors for the CMST 382 course, as well as revisit the rating rubrics and course assignments to better reinforce quality oral communication skills. The overall ratings for 2 semesters of Group presentations was promising, as the majority were Good and less were just Proficient, with no Unacceptable areas.
Fa12-Sp13	Awareness of diverse perspectives	Qualitative analysis with embedded assignments in three classes, one at the	While mastery students recognized difference, its benefits, power, and the	The CMST Faculty discussed the findings in a meeting and identified several possible actions to be taken to

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
		<p>practice level (332) and two at the mastery level (452 &amp; 472). N=105</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CMST 332 (n=44)</li> <li>• CMST 452 (n=38)</li> <li>• CMST 472 (n=24)</li> </ul> <p>Assignments were designed to explore student perceptions of diverse others and appreciation for diverse perspectives</p>	<p>importance of communication skills, in their application of book knowledge in real life, the category of power was significantly under-addressed. Discussion of diversity was de-politicized, and sometimes power was even intentionally de-emphasized.</p> <p>(2) Students' reported experience with someone different was significantly more negative in the 400-level than in the 300-level class. One possible reason, the CMST 332 students had the freedom to report any recent encounter with an "other," the CMST 472 students were given the specific context of work-related experience. The CMST 332 had a clear difference, as more than 2/3 of the positive experience was from personal life, while out of the very small number of negative experience, about half was work-related.</p>	<p>address the findings within program curriculum and classes. First, the findings were disseminated to all the faculty to consider more carefully in relation to the courses they teach. Second, those with courses more related to discussing the concept of diverse perspectives will actively consider highlighting the aspect of power in relation to perspectives and diversity.</p>