Arapahoe Community College

2013-2014 Communication Assessment Plan Data

Discipline Outcome
Use three credible sources in paper with inclusion of citations and correct Works Cited page.

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Rubric-graded report

Measure 1 Description:
Students will show proficiency in communicating, organizing and synthesizing information from sources to fully achieve a specific purpose, with clarity and depth.

(This Outcome is Discipline Specific as CCCNS outcomes for COM 125 Interpersonal Communication require students to demonstrate an understanding of purpose as a factor of writing an Academic Perception research paper.)
1. The Assessment Method was an evaluation of the Perception Research Essay submitted by all students who completed the assignment. Faculty members discussed the assignment with their classes, providing examples of movies and television programs and a former student sample essay for further explanation of the process involved in writing the assignment. COM faculty members were supplied with a scoring rubric which explained the criteria for scoring this Outcome. Faculty then evaluated each paper submitted to see if students demonstrated an ability to thoroughly analyze, communicate, organize, and synthesize these concepts from the text and at least two other sources. Each student received a numeric grade for each of the outcomes, calculated on up to three separate citations. Outcome grades were then averaged for results.

2. The benchmark was designed to give us an idea if students are using information effectively to support their assertions in perception papers.

3. The outcome was measured in 2013-2014, then annually thereafter.

4. The sample size was 205 students in the classes of seven professors (ft/pt) teaching Interpersonal Communication in a 15-week format and represented 14 separate class sections.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
205
Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

80% of students will score a 3 (Proficient: “Communicates and organizes information from sources. The information is not yet synthesized, so the intended purpose is not fully achieved.” In other words, the student did part of the assignment correctly.), 4 (Very Good) or 5 (Excellent: See Outcome Description, above)

1. The Assessment Method was an evaluation of the Perception Research Essay submitted by all students who completed the assignment. Faculty members discussed the assignment with their classes, providing examples of movies and television programs and a former student sample essay for further explanation of the process involved in writing the assignment. COM faculty members were supplied with a scoring rubric which explained the criteria for scoring this Outcome. Faculty then evaluated each paper submitted to see if students demonstrated an ability to thoroughly analyze, communicate, organize, and synthesize these concepts from the text and at least two other sources. Each student received a numeric grade for each of the outcomes, calculated on up to three separate citations. Outcome grades were then averaged for results.

2. The benchmark was designed to give us an idea if students are using information effectively to support their assertions in perception papers.

3. The outcome was measured in 2013-2014, then annually thereafter.

4. The sample size was 205 students in the classes of seven professors (ft/pt) teaching Interpersonal Communication in a 15-week format and represented 14 separate class sections.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

We chose this measure since this class is very writing intensive and these skills are necessary in the COM discipline and other college courses. As long as the criterion is measurable, specific and stated in terms of achievement it is reliable information.

Measure 2 Type:

Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
Outcomes Met/not met

Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:
178 students out of 205 scored a 3 or higher on this measure, which is 86.8% (The average score on this outcome was 3.96, but could be stronger. Each student received a numeric grade for this outcome, calculated on up to three separate citations.

Measure 2 Results:

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?
1. The results were a little higher than the benchmark. If these results are accurate, that would indicate that our students are doing an adequate job of using information to support their assertions in the perception papers; however, this assessor believes we can get a 4.0 or higher on this outcome in the next assessment period by bringing a Writing Center representative to class to explain the Works Cited page and bringing in a reference librarian to conduct a short informational training session earlier in the semester.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
2. As we are only at the beginning of the narrative for the assessment, we estimate that in most of the five quantifiable evaluative criterions will be in excess of 80%.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
3. Multiple measures of assessment were not used.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?
Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

1. The Department rates student performance on this outcome as Strong and exceeds benchmark.
2. We are doing a very good job of teaching students how to cite their sources and use those sources effectively to accomplish their written goals; however, some students did not meet the proficient rating and need more support.
3. This assessor believes we can get a 4.0 or higher on this outcome in the next assessment period by bringing a Writing Center representative to class to explain the Works Cited page and bringing in a reference librarian to conduct a short informational training session earlier in the semester.

Further Action:
Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action

Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

Discipline Outcome
Paper must be in MLA format with a separate Works Cited page.

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Rubric-graded report

Measure 1 Description:
Students will show proficiency in communicating, organizing and synthesizing information in formatting in the MLA style.

(This Outcome is Discipline Specific as CCCNS outcomes for COM 125 Interpersonal Communication require students to demonstrate an understanding of purposes as a factor of writing an Academic Perception research paper and the formatting requirements that are included.)
The Assessment Method was an evaluation of the use of MLA formatting in an academic research paper submitted by all students who completed the assignment. Faculty members discussed MLA formatting with their classes, providing examples and web sites for further explanation of the process involved in writing a formatted paper effectively. Evaluations were completed by full-time and part-time COM facultymembers. Each student received a numeric grade for each of the outcomes, calculated on up to three separate citations. Outcome grades
were then averaged for results. 
We are doing a very good job of teaching students how to cite their sources and use MLA formatting effectively to accomplish their written goals; however, some students did not meet the proficient rating and need more support.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
205

Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
80% of students will score a 3 (Proficient: “Students show some correct use of MLA format (double spaced, 12-point font, one-inch margins, etc.) with a separate Works Cited page.”), 4 (Very Good) or 5 (Excellent: See Outcome Description, above)
1. The Assessment Method was an evaluation of the use of MLA formatting in an academic research paper submitted by all students who completed the assignment. Faculty members discussed MLA formatting with their classes, providing examples and web sites for further explanation of the process involved in writing a formatted paper effectively. Evaluations were completed by full-time and part-time COM faculty members. Each student received a numeric grade for each of the outcomes, calculated on up to three separate citations. Outcome grades were then averaged for results.
2. We are doing a very good job of teaching students how to cite their sources and use those sources effectively to accomplish their written goals; however, some students did not meet the proficient rating and need more support.
3. The sample size was 205 students in the classes of seven professors. (ft/pt) Interpersonal Communication in a 15-week format and represented 14 separate class sections.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
We chose this measure since this class is very writing intensive and these skills are necessary in the COM discipline and other college courses. As long as the criterion is measurable, specific and stated in terms of achievement it is reliable information.

Measure 2 Type:

Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark
1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met
Met benchmark

Measure 1 Results:
164 students out of 205 scored a 3 or higher on this measure, which is 80.0% (The average score on this outcome was 3.77 out of 5.0 on the Likert scale.)

Measure 2 Results:

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?
1. The Department rates student performance on this outcome as Neutral and meets benchmark. We are doing a very good job of teaching students how to use the MLA format with a separate Works Cited page effectively to accomplish their written goals; however, some students did not meet the proficient rating and need more support.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
2. The outcome was measured in 2013-2014, then annually thereafter.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
3. Multiple measures of assessment were not used

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?
Met benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?
This assessor believes we can get a 4.0 or higher on this outcome in the next assessment period by bringing a Writing Center representative to class to explain the Works Cited page and bringing in a reference librarian to conduct a short informational training session earlier in the semester.

Further Action:
Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action

Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

Discipline Outcome
Information Management: Access the information from a movie or television program and demonstrate the understanding of an Introduction at

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Rubric-graded report

Measure 1 Description:
Access the information from a movie or television program and demonstrate the understanding of an Introduction at

(This Outcome is Discipline Specific as CCCNS outcomes for COM 125 Interpersonal Communication require students also a Student Learning Outcomes it falls within Information Management.)

1. The Assessment Method was an evaluation of the concepts and theories used to demonstrate the understanding Students who completed the writing assignment. Faculty members discussed Chapter 3 or the Perception Chapter with further explanation of the theories.

2. COM faculty members were supplied with a scoring rubric which explained the criteria for scoring this Outcome demonstrated an ability to analyze, apply, and communicate their findings. Each student received a numeric grade for Outcome grades were then averaged for results by Interpersonal COM sections.

3. As this is the first year of this assessment, we anticipate the average results would be higher next year. Th eben
sources they use for the perception research paper. We set the benchmark high, as the assignment is done fairly early in 2013 as a pilot with only full-time faculty participating, and in Spring of 2014 with both full-time and part-time faculty.

4. The sample size was 205 students in the classes of seven different professors (ft/pt) or 14 sections of the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1 Sample Size:</th>
<th>205</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1 Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

Our benchmark is at 80% and we predict that 80% or better of our students will score 3 or Proficient in accessing the Introduction and Thesis statement as it applies to the concept of Perception. A4 score is (Very Good) and 5 is (Excellent) paper collected, 201 students received 3-5 points for this outcome or 98.0% are proficient or better.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

We chose this measure since this class is very writing intensive and these skills are necessary in the COM discipline and achievement it is reliable information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 2 Type:</th>
<th>Please select</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 2 Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 2 Sample Size:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 2 Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met

Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:

The results are as follows: 201 students scored a 3 or higher on this outcome, which is 98.0%. (The average score for this
Measure 2 Results:
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1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?
1. The results were much higher than the benchmark. If these results are accurate, that would indicate that our skills are correctly for their Perception Research Essay paper.
**Discipline Outcome**

Measure college-level writing skills in a 2-4 page paper.

**Measure 1 Type:**

Direct

Rubric-graded report

**Measure 1 Description:**

Outcome Description: Students apply college-level grammar, spelling, and punctuation, as they show proficiency in communicating, organizing and synthesizing the academic information.

(This Outcome is Discipline Specific as CCCNS outcomes for COM 125 Interpersonal Communication require students to demonstrate an understanding of purpose as a factor of writing an Academic Perception research paper and the formatting requirements that are included.)

1. The Assessment Method was an evaluation of college-level writing in an academic research paper submitted by all students who completed the assignment. Faculty members discuss college-level writing with their classes, while providing an example paper for further explanation of the process involved in writing a formatted paper effectively. Evaluations were completed by full-time and part-time COM faculty members. Each student received a numeric grade for each of the outcomes, calculated on up to three separate citations. Outcome grades were then averaged for results.

2. We are doing a very good job of teaching students how to write a college-level academic research paper so as to effectively accomplish their written goals; however, some students did not meet the proficient rating and need more support.

3. The sample size was 205 students in the classes of seven professors. (ft/pt) Interpersonal Communication in a 15-week format and represented 14 separate class sections.

**Measure 1 Sample Size:**

205

**Measure 1 Benchmark**

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

A score of five (S) or Excellent is defined as: “No errors regarding college-level writing, meets paper length.” 80% of students will score a 3 (Proficient: “Students will have two or less errors regarding college-level writing, and is close to two pages in paper length.”), 4 (Very Good) or 5 (Excellent: See Outcome Description, above)

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

We chose this measure since this class is very writing intensive and these skills are necessary in the COM discipline and other college courses. As long as the criterion is measurable, specific and stated in terms of achievement it is reliable information.
Measure 2 Type:

Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met
Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:
198 students out of 205 scored a 3 or higher on this measure, which is 96.58% (The average score on this outcome was 4.278 out of 5.0 on the Likert scale.)

Measure 2 Results:

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?
The Department rates student performance on this outcome as Strong and exceeds the benchmark.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
The outcome was measured in 2013-2014, then annually thereafter.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
not used

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets
benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?

Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

This assessor believes that this is a strong outcome, yet several students did not get a 3.0 or higher on this outcome. Faculty could identify students that need help and suggest that they visit the Writing Center for help in the beginning of the semester after the first writing assignment to assess their writing skills. In most cases, faculty do stress enhancing these skills to their students.

Further Action:

Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action

Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

Discipline Outcome

Quantitative Reasoning: Evaluate Conceptual Information and Its Sources Critically

Measure 1 Type:

Direct

Rubric-graded report

Measure 1 Description:
1. The Assessment Method was an evaluation of the concepts and theories used to demonstrate the understanding and application of the term perception by the Students who completed the writing assignment. Faculty members discussed Chapter 3 or the Perception Chapter with their classes, providing examples and using visual aids, mass media and other web sites for further explanation of the theories.

2. COM faculty members were supplied with a scoring rubric which explained the criteria for scoring this Outcome, faculty then evaluated each Perception paper of 2-4 pages in length to determine if students demonstrated an ability to analyze, apply, and communicate their findings. Each student received a numeric grade for this outcome, calculated on the following items or criteria listed in the Addendum section and the Outcome grades were then averaged for results by Interpersonal COM sections.

3. As this is the first year of this assessment, we anticipate the average results would be higher next year. The benchmark was designed to give us an idea if students are evaluating the information and critiquing the sources they use for the perception research paper. We set the benchmark high, as the assignment is done fairly early in the semester, to accommodate the assessment timeframe. The outcome was measured in Fall 2013 as a pilot with only full-time faculty participating, and in Spring of 2014 with both full-time and part-time faculty. The Assessment will be will be measured annually thereafter.

4. The sample size was 205 students in the classes of seven different professors (ft/pt) or 14 sections of the course.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
205

Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
80% of students will score a 3 (Proficient: “Demonstrates adequate analysis of sources; shows basic understanding of relevance and context”), 4 (Very Good) or 5 (Excellent: See Outcome Description, above)

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
We chose this measure since this class is very writing intensive and these skills are necessary in the COM discipline and other college courses. As long as the criterion is measurable, specific and stated in terms of achievement it is reliable information.

Measure 2 Type:

Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark
1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met

Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:
The results are as follows: 201 students scored a 3 or higher on this outcome, which is 98.0%. (The average score for this outcome was 4.60 out of 5.0 on the Likert scale.)

Measure 2 Results:
1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?
The results were much higher than the benchmark. If these results are accurate, that would indicate that our students are doing an excellent job of evaluating information and information sources, as well as analyzing what constitutes perception while utilizing the perception-checking process. Since many professors scored the assignments, there is a possibility of some bias. We may need to apply more stringent measures to this outcome.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
2. As we are only at the beginning of the narrative for the assessment, we estimate that in most of the five quantifiable evaluative criterions will be in excess of 80%.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
3. Multiple measures of assessment were not used.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?
Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

1. The Department rates student performance on this outcome as extremely strong.
2. We are doing a very good job of teaching students how to evaluate research information critically. Our faculty emphasizes the importance of evaluating source material. The faculty uses several different resources (handouts) on evaluating sources in the D2L shell under Content and the Library Tour gives an added awareness to the students.

Further Action:
Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action

Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)