



Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2019-2020

Program: Communication & Rhetoric

(Due: June 1, 2020)

Date report completed: May 22, 2020

Completed by: Kevin Van Winkle

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved): _____

Please describe the 2019-2020 assessment activities and follow-up for your program below. Please complete this form for each undergraduate major, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., B.A.S, M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, save and submit it to both the Dean of your college/school and to the Executive Director for Assessment as an email attachment by June 1, 2020. You'll also find this form on the assessment website at <https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/resources.html>. Thank you.

Brief statement of Program mission and goals:

The Communication & Rhetoric minor at CSU-Pueblo is designed for students interested in developing effective written and verbal communication skills. It provides a course of study that emphasizes both a theoretical understanding and practical application of communication that prepares students technically, professionally, and personally to successfully navigate a variety of challenges.

I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in this cycle. Including processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2019-2020 based on the assessment process.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO <u>last</u> reported on prior to this cycle? (semester and year)	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved (N).	E. What is the expected proficiency level and how many or what proportion of students should be at that level?	F. What were the results of the assessment? (Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.)	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
Produce and deliver content and messaging	AY 2018-2019 assessment.	Objective was assessed by comparing	Three COMR minor-seeking students took	Per the assessment plan, all COMR	Two of three student papers assessed meet	That the majority of the COMR minor	Since last year's assessment there have been

<p>appropriate in a variety of contexts.</p>		<p>COMR-minor seeking students' final papers for 493 Seminar course against rubric (attached).</p>	<p>the COMR 493 Seminar course in the spring of 2020 were assessed. They represent all of the COMR minor students in the class. Their final papers were the artifacts used for this assessment.</p>	<p>students taking this seminar course were expected to display a "Expert" level of producing and delivering content in writing.</p>	<p>the expected criteria of "Expert"; the other paper displayed "Proficiency."</p>	<p>students in the course were able to write cohesive, grammatically correct papers that demonstrated their knowledge of rhetoric and ability to write in the academic genre substantiate the program's success.</p> <p>The unorthodox semester circumvented many of the workshops and review sessions. Had they semester gone has normal, it is likely the third "Proficient" paper assessed would've also met the criteria for "Expert."</p>	<p>a number of programmatic changes implemented and several more that are upcoming. We have changed its focus and core curricula, changes that are reflected in its new name Communication & Information Design (COMID).</p> <p>While we are still awaiting final approval of these changes, it seems likely that they will get approved. Thus, this will probably be the last year we assess the COMR program.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it is likely that the new assessment plan will be similar to the one used this</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	---

							<p>cycle in outcomes and scope; however, nothing is finalized yet. The current program coordinator for COMR and eventually COMID will be creating new assessment procedures and requirements, as well as identifying the best course artifacts to use for this assessment, once final CAP Board approval is obtained. This process is ongoing.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Comments on part I:

II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during the 2019-2020 cycle. These are those that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) or other issues did you address in this cycle? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed to generate the data which informed the change? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment column H and/or feedback?	D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
Produce and deliver content and messaging appropriate in a variety of contexts.	AY 2018-2019 assessment.	<p>From last cycle’s Assessment Report:</p> <p>Based on our assessment, we feel that we are missing a critical component of producing rhetorical artifacts and we would like to add an additional core course to our curriculum.</p> <p>We will be submitting that course for CAP Board approval in fall, 2019. Additionally, based on feedback from an external reviewer, we will be cutting the number of electives we offer so we can eliminate overlap in courses, offer a more regular rotation of electives, and make sure that every course we offer maps to our overall program outcomes. Finally, we would like to update our curriculum map and rubrics based on the new objectives and artifacts to be assessed.</p>	Aligned with our findings from the last assessment cycle, we have changed core curricula, cut available electives, and adjusted the focus and scope of the program.	The changes are ongoing. We continue to await final CAP Board approval for some of these changes, but it seems likely that they will be approved soon. Once approved, the program coordinator will be devising a new assessment plan, with associated outcomes, rubrics, and artifacts for analysis.

Comments on part II:

COMR Assessment: Rubric to Evaluate COMR 493 Papers

	Expert	Proficient	Apprentice	Novice
Integration of Knowledge	The paper demonstrates that the author fully understands and has applied concepts learned in the course. Concepts are integrated into the writer's own insights. The writer provides concluding remarks that show analysis and synthesis of ideas.	The paper demonstrates that the author, for the most part, understands and has applied concepts learned in the course. Some of the conclusions, however, are not supported in the body of the paper.	The paper demonstrates that the author, to a certain extent, understands and has applied concepts learned in the course.	The paper does not demonstrate that the author fully understood and applied concepts learned in the course.
Topic	In-depth discussion & elaboration in all sections of the paper.	The topic is focused but lacks direction. The paper is about a specific topic but the writer has not established a position.	The topic is too broad for the scope of this assignment.	The topic is not clearly defined.
Depth of Discussion	In-depth discussion & elaboration in all sections of the paper.	In-depth discussion & elaboration in most sections of the paper.	The writer has omitted pertinent content or content runs-on excessively. Quotations from others outweigh the writer's own ideas excessively.	Cursory discussion in all the sections of the paper or brief discussion in only a few sections.
Cohesiveness	Ties together information from all sources. Paper flows from one issue to the next without the need for headings. Author's writing demonstrates an understanding of the relationship among material obtained from all sources.	For the most part, ties together information from all sources. Paper flows with only some disjointedness. Author's writing demonstrates an understanding of the relationship among material obtained from all sources.	Sometimes ties together information from all sources. Paper does not flow - disjointedness is apparent. Author's writing does not demonstrate an understanding of the relationship among material obtained from all sources.	Does not tie together information. Paper does not flow and appears to be created from disparate issues. Headings are necessary to link concepts. Writing does not demonstrate understanding any relationships
Sources	More than 5 current sources, of which at least 3 are peer-review journal articles or scholarly books.	5 current sources, of which at least 2 are peer-review journal articles or scholarly books. All web sites used are authoritative.	Fewer than 5 current sources, or fewer than 2 of 5 are peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books. All web sites used are credible.	Fewer than 5 current sources, or fewer than 2 of 5 are peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books. Not all web sites used are credible, and/or sources are not current.
Citations	Cites all data obtained from other sources. APA citation style is used in both text and bibliography.	Cites most data obtained from other sources. APA citation style is used in both text and bibliography.	Cites some data obtained from other sources. Citation style is either inconsistent or incorrect.	Does not cite sources.