MA in Communication 2022-2023 Assessment Report

Prepared by Dr. Kelly Young, Director of Graduate Studies

May 2023

Contents

M	A in Communication 2022-2023 Assessment Report	1
	Communication: MA in Communication Mission Statement	3
	Learning Outcomes:	3
	Communication: MA in Communication Assessment #1	4
	Assessment Method:	4
	Data:	4
	Results:	4
	Program Action Plan:	4
	Timeline for Action Plan Implementation:	5
	Reporting to Stakeholders:	5
	Communication: MA in Communication Assessment # 2	6
	Assessment Method:	6
	Data:	6
	Results:	6
	Program Action Plan:	6
	Timeline for Action Plan Implementation:	7
	Reporting to Stakeholders:	7
	Communication: MA in Communication Assessment # 3	8
	Assessment Method:	8
	Data:	8
	Results:	8
	Program Action Plan:	8
	Reporting to Stakeholders:	8
	Communication: MA in Communication Assessment # 4	. 10

Assessment Method:	0
Data:1	0
Results:	0
Program Action Plan:	0
Timeline for Action Plan Implementation:1	0
Reporting to Stakeholders:1	1
Communication: MA in Communication Assessment # 51	2
Assessment Method:	2
Data:1	2
Results:	2
Program Action Plan:1	2
Timeline for Action Plan Implementation:1	2
Reporting to Stakeholders:	2
Appendix - MA IN COM LO1 & LO2 DATA 22-231	3
Appendix - 22_23 MA LO 3_4_5 data1	5

Communication: MA in Communication Mission Statement

Mission Statement:

The MA Communication program prepares students for a) communication-related professions in the concentrations of Communication Studies; Journalism; Media Arts; Media Studies; and Public Relations & Organizational Communication and b) pursuing a doctoral degree in communication through a broad array of competencies across the different concentrations. These competencies include the development of hands-on skills to exploration of theory, a focus on practice and application to analysis of state-of-art research, and a general survey of broad areas to narrow study of specialized topics.

Learning Outcomes:

- 1. Evaluate communication theory and research in the chosen concentration.
- 2. Apply communication theory and research to analyze communication practices relevant to the chosen concentration.
- 3. Produce scholarly or creative work as relevant to the chosen concentration.
- 4. Present one's own and other's scholarly or creative work in a public setting.
- 5. Adhere to professional guidelines for work in the profession.

Assessment Method:

Evaluation of major assignment from theory-relevant courses using a rubric that assesses both the evaluation and the application of theory.

The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) asked instructors from Fall 2023 theory courses (COM 6250 (Organizational Communication), COM 7250 (Rhetorical Criticism), and COM 72520 (Theories of Media Effects) and Winter 2024 theory courses (COM 6270: New Media Theory, COM 7040: Language and Power, and COM 7410: Communication Theory) to submit sample MA student final papers for assessment. Out of that sample, 24 papers (3-4 from each course per term) were randomly selected for assessment. The instructors were asked to assess the quality of the student's work independent of any grade/score the paper received.

The assessment rubric consists of four evaluation categories: Introduction: problem, significance, and purpose; literature review; style guidelines; and writing mechanics. Each category had four evaluation levels: Excellent, good, weak, and unacceptable, with a detailed description of each level for each of the categories. Based on the evaluation level of the individual categories, an overall summary evaluation level was also assessed. An overall average of 3.0 met our expectations for student learning.

Data: Appendix Spreadsheet MA IN COM LO1 & LO2 DATA 22-23

Results:

Combined student results for the two semesters ranged from 2.0-3.75, with an average student total of 2.96. This is a decline from last year (average total was 3.49), but like AY2020-2021 average of 2.83. Based on the assessment data, 17 of the 24 students met or exceeded expectations. The only category in LO1 assessment that had a score below 3.0 was Literature Review, which had an average score of 2.83 in Fall 2022. In both Fall and Winter, Writing Mechanics was 3.0 and Style Guide was 3.08.

Program Action Plan:

Generally, our MA students are meeting expectations in every category except in Literature Review. Style Guidelines and Writing Mechanic were at or very close to expectation.

We continue to have regular dialogues as graduate faculty and on the graduate committee about improving students' ability to access literature, weave it into conversation, and evaluate it. Additionally, we continue to regularly discuss how to improve student writing and use of style

guides. This is material that we can focus on in our Introduction to MA Studies course (COM 7000) and our individual theory courses.

Timeline for Action Plan Implementation:

Beginning with the coming academic year, the graduate committee will discuss ways emphasize accessing literature, weave it into a dialogue, and evaluate it and improving writing and style guide use more in the Introduction to MA studies and other MA-level (5000-7000 level) courses.

Reporting to Stakeholders:

Assessment Method:

Evaluation of major assignment from theory-relevant courses using a rubric that assesses both the evaluation and the application of theory.

The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) asked instructors from Fall 2023 theory courses (COM 6250 (Organizational Communication), COM 7250 (Rhetorical Criticism), and COM 72520 (Theories of Media Effects) and Winter 2024 theory courses (COM 6270: New Media Theory, COM 7040: Language and Power, and COM 7410: Communication Theory) to submit sample MA student final papers for assessment. Out of that sample, 24 papers (3-4 from each course each term) were randomly selected for assessment. The instructors were asked to assess the quality of the student's work independent of any grade/score the paper received.

The assessment rubric consists of two evaluation categories: theoretical understanding and analysis. Each category had four evaluation levels: Excellent, good, weak, and unacceptable, with a detailed description of each level for each of the categories. Based on the evaluation level of the individual categories, an overall summary evaluation level was also assessed. An overall average of 3.0 met our expectations for student learning.

Data:

See Appendix MA IN COM LO1 & LO2 DATA 22-23

Results:

Average scores ranged from 2.00-4.00, with an overall student average of 3.10, which at our level of expectation. This is a light decline in average from last year (3.20). Based on the assessment data, 17 of the 24 students met or exceeded expectations. In the Fall semester, LO2 category Theoretical Understanding had the lowest average score of 2.75. In Winter semester, the same category had an average score of 2.83. In the category of Analysis, students in the Fall term averaged a 3.00, while students in Winter averaged 3.08.

Program Action Plan:

The results suggest that our MA students are most at or slightly below expectation level in terms of application of communication theory. This is like last year's average score of 2.88 in theoretical understanding. Analysis scores are stronger than theoretical understanding.

The results suggest that while students have improved in their data analysis, like the results of assessment of LO 1, they somewhat struggle with theoretical concepts and fundamental theoretic foundations. As with the Action Plan for LO 1, we will discuss how to improve students' understanding of theoretical foundations and concepts.

Timeline for Action Plan Implementation:

The graduate committee will discuss next year in September 2023 how to improve students' theoretical understanding in our theory course offerings.

Reporting to Stakeholders:

Assessment Method:

Evaluation of the portfolio project from the capstone course for Public Relations and Organizational Communication concentration using a rubric that assesses students' ability to produce scholarship relevant to their MA concentration. In other years, we assessed MA internship portfolios, but we did not have any MA internships this year. A total of 3 students were assessed.

The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) asked the instructor of COM 7200 Professional Issues in Applied Communication to use a rubric to assess the quality of students' work in producing scholarship relevant to the PR/Org Communication concentration.

The assessment rubric consists of three evaluation categories: reflection narrative, work examples/resumes, and explanation/analysis. Each category had four evaluation levels: Excellent, good, weak, and unacceptable, with a detailed description of each level for each of the categories. Based on the evaluation level of the individual categories, an overall summary evaluation level was also assessed. An overall average of 3.0 met our expectations for student learning.

Data: See Appendix 22_23 MA LO 3_4_5 data

Results:

Average scores in each category ranged from 3.0 to 3.33, which is at or above our expectations. All three students met or exceeded expectations for LO 3.

Program Action Plan:

The results are limited because I was expecting to have more data from the internship program, but both our MA internship and MA program as a whole have low enrollment right now.

The DGS plans to revise the MA in COM program's LOs and assessment plans for next year.

Timeline for Action Plan Implementation:

By the start of the Fall 2023 semester, the DGS will have new LOs and assessment methods for the department's graduate committee to review.

Reporting to Stakeholders:

Assessment Method:

Evaluation of the portfolio project from the capstone course for Public Relations and Organizational Communication concentration using a rubric that assesses students' ability to present their scholarship. In past years, we have not assessed this LO.

The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) asked the instructor of COM 7200 Professional Issues in Applied Communication to use a rubric to assess the quality of students' presentation of their work, as this class features a presentation of final projects.

The assessment rubric consists of two evaluation categories: content and presentational skills. Each category had four evaluation levels: Excellent, good, weak, and unacceptable, with a detailed description of each level for each of the categories. Based on the evaluation level of the individual categories, an overall summary evaluation level was also assessed. An overall average of 3.0 met our expectations for student learning.

Data: See Appendix 22 23 MA LO 3 4 5 data

Results:

Average scores in each category ranged from 3.67 to 4.0, which is at or above our expectations. All three students exceeded expectations for LO 3.

Program Action Plan:

The results are limited because I was expecting to have more data from the internship program, but both our MA internship and MA program as a whole have low enrollment right now. Compared to other LOs, students seem to be excellent in making presentations.

The DGS plans to revise the MA in COM program's LOs and assessment plans for next year.

Timeline for Action Plan Implementation:

By the start of the Fall 2023 semester, the DGS will have new LOs and assessment methods for the department's graduate committee to review.

Reporting to Stakeholders:

Assessment Method:

Evaluation of the portfolio project from the capstone course for Public Relations and Organizational Communication concentration using a rubric that assesses students' ability to adhere to professional guidelines for work in their profession. In past years, we have not assessed this LO.

The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) asked the instructor of COM 7200 Professional Issues in Applied Communication to use a rubric to assess the quality of students' adherence to professional expectations of their work, as the course's final project requires presentation of information through a web-based portfolio.

The assessment rubric consists of three evaluation categories: portfolio contents, style, and writing. Each category had four evaluation levels: Excellent, good, weak, and unacceptable, with a detailed description of each level for each of the categories. Based on the evaluation level of the individual categories, an overall summary evaluation level was also assessed. An overall average of 3.0 met our expectations for student learning.

Data: See Appendix 22_23 MA LO 3_4_5 data

Results:

Average scores in each category ranged from 3.0 to 3.67, which is at or above our expectations. All three students exceeded expectations for LO 3.

Program Action Plan:

The results are limited because I was expecting to have more data from the internship program, but both our MA internship and MA program as a whole have low enrollment right now.

The DGS plans to revise the MA in COM program's LOs and assessment plans for next year.

Timeline for Action Plan Implementation:

By the start of the Fall 2023 semester, the DGS will have new LOs and assessment methods for the department's graduate committee to review.

Reporting to Stakeholders:

Appendix - MA IN COM LO1 & LO2 DATA 22-23

MA in Communication LO 1 & LO 2 Fall 2022-Winter 2023

Fall 2022

	Learning Outcom	e 1						Learning Outcom	ne 2	1	
	_							Theoretical			
COM 7520	Problem/Sign	Lit Review	Style Guidelines	Writing Mechanics	Student Total	Average per stude	ent	Understanding	Analysis	s	Student Tc Student
Student A		3	3	4	3	13 3	3.25		4	3	7 3
Student B		2	2	3	3	10	2.5		2	2	4
Student C		4	3	4	3	14	3.5		3	4	7 3
COM 7250											
Student A		2	3	3	3	11 2	2.75		3	4	7 3
Student B		4	3	4	4	15 3	8.75		4	4	8
Student C		4	3	2	3	12	3		2	4	6
Student D		3	3	4	4	14	3.5		2	2	4
COM 6250							_				
Student A		3	2	2	1	8	2		2	2	4
Student B		3	3	3	4	13 3	3.25		3	4	7 3
Student C		3	2	2	1	8	2		2	2	4
Student D		4	4	3	4	15 3	3.75		3	3	6
Student E		3	3	3	3	12	3		3	2	5 2
	3	8	34	37 3	6	36	5.25		33	36	
	3.1	7	.83 3.0	18	3			2	.75	3.00	34
Ninter 2023	Learning Outcom]			Learning Outcom Theoretical	ne 2		
COM 7200			Style Guidelines	Writing Mechanics	Student Total	Average per stude		Learning Outcom	ne 2 Analysis	s	Student to Student
COM 7200 Student A	Learning Outcom Problem/Sign	e 1 Lit Review 4	Style Guidelines	Writing Mechanics	 	14	3.5	Learning Outcom Theoretical	Analysis 4	4	8
COM 7200 Student A Student B	Learning Outcom Problem/Sign	e 1 Lit Review	Style Guidelines	Writing Mechanics	Student Total	14		Learning Outcom Theoretical	Analysis		
COM 7200 Student A	Learning Outcom Problem/Sign	e 1 Lit Review 4	Style Guidelines	Writing Mechanics	Student Total	14	3.5	Learning Outcom Theoretical	Analysis 4	4	8
COM 7200 Student A Student B Student C	Learning Outcom Problem/Sign	e 1 Lit Review 4	Style Guidelines	Writing Mechanics	Student Total	14	3.5	Learning Outcom Theoretical	Analysis 4	4	8
COM 7200 Student A Student B Student C	Learning Outcom Problem/Sign	e 1 Lit Review 4 3	Style Guidelines 3 2	Writing Mechanics	Student Total	14 11 2	3.5	Learning Outcom Theoretical	Analysis 4 2	4 3	8 2
COM 7200 Student A Student B Student C COM 7410 Student A	Learning Outcom Problem/Sign	e 1 Lit Review 4 3 	Style Guidelines 3 2 	Writing Mechanics	Student Total	14 11 2 11 2 11 2	3.5 2.75	Learning Outcom Theoretical	Analysis 4	4	8 5 2 6
COM 7200 Student A Student B Student C COM 7410 Student A Student B	Learning Outcom	e 1 Lit Review 4 3 3 3 3 2	Style Guidelines 3 2 3 3 3 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 2 3 2 3 3 2 3	Writing Mechanics 4 3 3 3 3 3 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	Student Total	14 11 2 11 11 11 11 10	3.5 2.75 2.75 2.5	Learning Outcom Theoretical	Analysis 4 2 3	4 3 3 3 2	8 5 2 6 5 2
COM 7200 Student A Student B Student C COM 7410 Student A Student B Student C	Learning Outcom Problem/Sign	e 1 Lit Review 4 3 	Style Guidelines 3 2 3 3 3 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 2 3 2 3 3 2 3	Writing Mechanics	Student Total	14 11 2 11 2 11 2 11 2 11 2 10 3	3.5 2.75 2.75 2.5 3.75	Learning Outcom Theoretical	Analysis 4 2 3 3	4 3 3 3 3	8 5 2 6
COM 7200 Student A Student B Student C COM 7410 Student A Student B Student C	Learning Outcom Problem/Sign	e 1 Lit Review 4 3 3 3 3 2 2 4	Style Guidelines 3 2 3 3 3 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 2 3 2 3 3 2 3	Writing Mechanics 4 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	Student Total	14 11 2 11 2 11 2 11 2 11 2 10 3	3.5 2.75 2.75 2.5	Learning Outcom Theoretical	Analysis 4 2 3 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	4 3 	8 5 2 6 5 2 7
COM 7200 Student A Student B Student C COM 7410 Student A Student B Student C Student D	Learning Outcom	e 1 Lit Review 4 3 3 2 4 3 e 1	Style Guidelines 3 2 3 3 4 3 4 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Writing Mechanics 4 3 3 3 3 4 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Student Total	14 11 2 11 2 11 2 11 2 11 2 10 3	3.5 2.75 2.75 2.5 3.75	Learning Outcom Theoretical	Analysis 4 2 3 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	4 3 	8 5 2 6 5 2 7
COM 7200 Student A Student B Student C COM 7410 Student A Student B Student C Student D Student D	Learning Outcom	e 1 Lit Review 4 3 3 3 3 2 4 3 3	Style Guidelines	Writing Mechanics 4 3 3 3 3 4 4 Writing Mechanics	Student Total	14 11 2 11 2 11 2 10 1 15 3 13 3 14 1 15 3 13 3 14 1 15 3 16 3 17 1 17 1 18 1 19	3.5 2.75 2.75 2.5 3.25 3.25	Learning Outcom Theoretical	Analysis 4 2 3 3 3 4 3 4 3 4 4 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	4 3 3 2 3 3 3	8 5 2 6 5 2 7 6 6
COM 7200 Student A Student B Student C COM 7410 Student A Student B Student C Student D Student D Student A	Learning Outcom	e 1 Lit Review 4 3 3 2 4 3 e 1	Style Guidelines	Writing Mechanics	Student Total	14 11 2 11 2 11 2 11 2 13 3	3.5 2.75 2.75 2.5 3.75 3.25	Learning Outcom Theoretical	Analysis 4 2 3 3 3 4 3 4 2 2 2 2 2 2	4 3 	8 5 2 6 5 2 7 6 6 6 6
COM 7200 Student A Student C COM 7410 Student A Student B Student D COM 6270 Student A Student A Student A	Learning Outcom	e 1 Lit Review 4 3 3 2 4 3 e 1	Style Guidelines 3 2 3 3 3 4 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Writing Mechanics	Student Total	14 11 2 11 2 13 13 13 13 14	3.5 2.75 2.5 3.75 3.25 3.5	Learning Outcom Theoretical	Analysis 4 2	4 3 3 2 3 3 3	8 5 2 6 5 2 7 6 6 6 6 8
COM 7200 Student A Student B Student C COM 7410 Student A Student A Student D COM 6270 Student A Student B Student C	Learning Outcom	e 1 Lit Review 4 3 3 2 4 3 e 1	Style Guidelines 3 2 3 3 3 4 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Writing Mechanics 4 3	Student Total	14 11 2 11 2 11 2 13 13 13 13 13 13	3.5 2.75 2.5 3.75 3.25 3.25 3.25 3.25	Learning Outcom Theoretical	Analysis 4 2	4 3 3 2 3 3 3	8 5 2 6 5 2 7 6 6 6 6
COM 7200 Student A Student B Student C COM 7410 Student A Student B Student C Student A Student A Student A Student A Student C Student C Student C Student C	Learning Outcom	e 1 Lit Review 4 3 3 2 4 4 4 5 5 6 6 1 Lit Review 5 6 1 Lit Review 5 4 4 4 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Style Guidelines 3 2 3 3 2 4 3 Style Guidelines 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4	Writing Mechanics 4 3 3 3 3 4 Vriting Mechanics 3 4 Vriting Mechanics 3 3 4 2	Student Total Student Total Student Total S S S S S S S S S S S S S	14 11 2 11 2 11 2 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13	3.5 2.75 2.75 2.5 3.25 3.25 3.25 3.25 3.25	Learning Outcom Theoretical	Analysis Analys	4 3 3 3 3 3 3 4 4 4 4 4 4	8 5 2 6 5 2 7 6 6 6 8 8 8 8 7
COM 7200 Student A Student B Student C COM 7410 Student A Student B Student C Student A Student A Student A Student A Student C Student C Student C Student C	Learning Outcom	e 1 Lit Review 4 3 3 2 4 4 3 2 4 4 3 4 4 4 4 4 3 3	Style Guidelines 3 2 3 3 3 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 4 4	Writing Mechanics 4 3 3 3 3 4 Vriting Mechanics 3 4 Vriting Mechanics 3 3 2 3 3 4 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	Student Total 3 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 3 4 3 3 4 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	14 11 2 11 2 11 2 13	3.5 2.75 2.75 2.5 3.25 3.25 3.25 3.25 3.25	Learning Outcorr Theoretical Understanding	Analysis 4 4 2 3 3 4 3 4 4 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 3 2 4 4 4 4	4 3 3 3 3 3 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 3	8 5 2 6 5 2 7 6 6 6 6 8 8 7 5
COM 7200 Student A Student B	Learning Outcom	e 1 Lit Review 4 3 3 2 4 4 3 2 4 4 3 4 4 4 4 4 3 3	Style Guidelines 3 2 3 3 3 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 4 4	Writing Mechanics 4 3 3 3 3 3 4 Writing Mechanics 3 4 Writing Mechanics 3 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Student Total 3 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 3 4 3 3 4 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	14 11 2 11 2 11 2 13	3.5 2.75 2.75 2.5 3.25 3.25 3.25 3.25 3.25	Learning Outcorr Theoretical Understanding	Analysis Analys	4 3 3 3 3 3 3 4 4 4 4 4 4	8 5 2 6 5 2 7 6 6 6 8 8 8 8 7

74.5 3.1

Appendix - 22_23 MA LO 3_4_5 data

Data from COM 7220: Professional Issues in Applied Communication

N = 3

LO 3: Produce scholarly or creative work as relevant to the chosen concentration. Student 1:

Reflective Narrative: 4

Work examples/resume: 4

Explanation/analysis: 3

Student 2:

Reflective Narrative: 3

Work examples/resume: 3

Explanation/analysis: 3

Student 3:

Reflective Narrative: 2 Work examples/resume: 3 Explanation/analysis: 3

LO 4: Present one's own and other's scholarly or creative work in a public setting. Student 1:

Content: 4

Presentational Skills: 4

Student 2:

Content: 4

Presentational Skills: 4

Student 3:

Content: 3

Presentational Skills: 4

LO 5: Adhere to professional guidelines for work in the profession. Student 1:

Portfolio components: 3

Style: 4

Writing: 4

Student 2:

Portfolio components: 3

Style: 3

Writing: 3

Student 3:

Portfolio components: 3

Style: 3

Writing: 4