### Arapahoe Community College

**2014-2015**

#### COMMUNICATION

**USE THREE CREDIBLE SOURCES IN PAPER WITH INCLUSION OF CITATIONS AND CORRECT WORKS CITED PAGE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Author(s)</th>
<th>Terri Scrima</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Type:</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Description:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome Title:** Assess all information used in paper with inclusion of citations and correct Works Cited page for three scholarly sources.

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.)

**Measure 1 Sample Size:** 395

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)
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) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

We know that students in a freshman-sophomore based class are learning these concepts and we provide assignments that practice these principles. The benchmark was designed to give us an idea if students are using information effectively to support their assertions in perception papers. The outcome was measured in 2013-2014, then annually thereafter. The sample size was 395 students in the classes of 13 professors (ft/pt) teaching Interpersonal Communication in a 15-week format.

Please select

This Discipline Outcome was: Missed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:

Only 309 students out of 395 scored a 3 or higher on this measure, which is 78.2%, slightly below the benchmark of 80%.

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

Since the benchmark is 80%, the results (78.2%) were slightly below the benchmark. The results were a little lower than the benchmark. If these results are accurate, that would indicate that students are slightly under-achieving the use of information to support their assertions in the perception papers. 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%.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

This year’s results were slightly below the benchmark and slightly down from last year’s results at 86.8%.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do

Each student received a numeric grade for this outcome, calculated on up to three separate citations of three scholarly sources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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)?</th>
<th>Missed benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>The COM Department will continue the Writing Center Workshops and support by Writing Center representatives to explain the Works Cited page and bringing in a reference librarian to conduct a short informational training session earlier in the semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Further Action:**

**Describe the action plan:**

This is an area where we need to help students learn how to cite their sources and use those sources effectively to accomplish their written goals. This assessor believes we can increase 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. The COM Department will be polled to determine which professors are
incorporating a Writing Center workshop in his or her classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person/ Group responsible for action</th>
<th>COM staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Date for implementation of the action</td>
<td>08/17/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAPER MUST BE IN MLA OR APA FORMAT WITH A SEPARATE WORKS CITED OR REFERENCES PAGE.

**Assessment Author(s)**

Terri Scrima

**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 or APA writing style.

(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.)

**Measure 1 Sample Size:**

395

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

80% of students will score a 3 (Proficient: “Students show some correct use of MLA format (typed, 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).

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

The Assessment Method was an evaluation of the use of MLA or APA formatting in an academic research paper submitted by all students who completed the assignment. Faculty members discussed MLA and APA 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.

The sample size was 395 students in the classes of 13 professors. (ft/pt) Interpersonal Communication in a 15-week format.

Please select
This Discipline Outcome was: Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1 Results: 370 students out of 395 scored a 3 or higher on this measure, which is 93.7 % or an increase from 80.0% last year.

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?
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 (only 6.3%) did not meet the proficient rating and need more support.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
This is an increase from last years, therefore the COM Department is successful in disseminating the APA and MLA information and tools like: owl.english.purdue.edu in the classroom. The outcome was measured in 2013-2014, then annually thereafter.

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

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?
The COM Department will continue to utilize the Writing Center and Library Workshops during class time.
3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

This assessor believes that this outcome has increased from 80% last year to 93.70% this year 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 Planned

Describe the action plan:

This assessor believes that this outcome has increased 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. A poll will be taken in the next few weeks to determine this assumption.

Person/Group responsible for action

COM staff

Target Date for implementation of the action

08/17/2015

Priority

Medium

MEASURE COLLEGE-LEVEL WRITING SKILLS IN A 2-4 PAGE PAPER.

Assessment Author(s)

Terri Scrima

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.) A score of five (5) 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 at least two pages in paper length.”), 4 (Very Good) or 5 (Excellent: See Outcome Description, above).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>395</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Size:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This Discipline Outcome was:</strong></td>
<td>Surpassed benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure 1 Results:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?</strong></td>
<td>The COM Department is 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. The sample size was 395 students in the classes of 13 professors. (ft/pt) Interpersonal Communication in a 15-week format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?</strong></td>
<td>368 students out of 395 scored a 3 or higher on this measure, which is 93.2% and well over the benchmark of 80%. However, this year's results are a slight reduction of last year's results of 96.58% .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?</strong></td>
<td>Not used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department</strong></td>
<td><strong>Surpassed benchmark</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?

The COM Department will continue to utilize the Writing Center for student success.

3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

This assessor believes that this is a strong outcome, yet 27 students or 6.8% did not get a 3.0 or higher on this outcome.

COM Faculty should identify students that need help and suggest that they visit the Writing Center for help in the beginning of the semester after a short writing assignment to assess their writing skills.

Further Action: Further Action Unnecessary

FEEDBACK

Please select

Please select

UNDERSTANDING AND APPLYING THE CONCEPTS OF PERSUASION

No Data

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT: ACCESS THE INFORMATION FROM A MOVIE OR TELEVISION PROGRAM AND DEMONSTRATE THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE CONCEPT OF PERCEPTION.

Assessment Author(s) Terri Scrima
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 and Thesis statement regarding the concept of Perception.

(This Outcome is Discipline Specific as CCCNS outcomes for COM 125 Interpersonal Communication require students to research topics to support their assertions in their academic research papers. This Outcome is also a Student Learning Outcome as it falls within Information Management.)

Measure 1 Sample Size: 395

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

Our benchmark is at 80% and we predict that 80% or better of our students will score a 3 or Proficient in accessing the information from a movie or television program and demonstrate the understanding of an Introduction and Thesis statement as it applies to the concept of Perception. A 4 score is (Very Good) and 5 is (Excellent: See Outcome Description, above and the rubric used in the Addendum). Of the 395 student papers collected, 374 students received 3-5 points for this outcome or 95.7% 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 other college courses. As long as the criterion is measurable, specific and stated in terms of achievement it is reliable information.

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 second 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 2014 and in Spring of 2015 with both fulltime and part-time faculty. The Assessment will be will be measured annually thereafter.
4. The sample size was 395 students which is an increase over the 205 students in the classes of 13 different professors (ft/pt) of the course.

Please select

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Learning Outcome was:</th>
<th>Surpassed benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Results:</td>
<td>The results are as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>374 students scored a 3 or higher on this outcome, which is 95.7%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015 Chart in Microsoft Word pts 1, 3, 4, 5 for 2015.xlsx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copy of Rubric for COM 125 Perception paper V4 2.17.15.xlsx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 the students are doing an excellent job of applying appropriate information and using the sources correctly for their Perception Research Essay paper.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

As we are only in the second year of the narrative for the assessment, we estimate that in most of the five quantifiable evaluative criteria will be in excess of 80%. However, last year 98% of the students scored at a "3" or higher compared to this year at 95.7%.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

Multiple measures of assessment were used, as we analyzed five separate categories that were evaluated by 13 different professors in COM 125-Interpersonal Communication.

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

Most faculty use the ACC research librarians and schedule a research instruction day, and this is working well (aka Library Tour). We will continue to emphasize the need for academic research, and also...
this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

Further Action: Further Action Unnecessary

### QUANTITATIVE REASONING: EVALUATE CONCEPTUAL INFORMATION AND ITS SOURCES CRITICALLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Author(s)</th>
<th>Terri Scrima</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Type:</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Description:</td>
<td>Thoroughly analyzes, communicates, organizes, and synthesizes the concept of Perception from the text and at least two other sources (for a total of three sources) to fully achieve a specific purpose for this research topic paper. (This Outcome is Discipline Specific as we expect students to evaluate the quality and suitability of information that they locate through their research to be sure that information provide appropriate support to their assertions. This Outcome is also a Student Learning Outcome as it falls within Quantitative Reasoning.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size:</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

Of the 395 student papers analyzed, 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

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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>choosing this benchmark?</td>
<td>long as the criterion is measurable, specific and stated in terms of achievement it is reliable information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Learning Outcome was:</td>
<td>Surpassed benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Results:</td>
<td>The actual results were that 367 out of 395 students scored a 3 or higher on this measure, which is 92.9 %.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The measure strongly surpassed the benchmark of 80 %.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?</td>
<td>The results were much higher than the benchmark. If these results are accurate, that would indicate that are 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 definitely a possibility of some bias. We may need to apply more stringent measures to this outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?</td>
<td>The actual results were that 367 out of 395 students scored a 3 or higher on this measure, which is 92.9 % and is slightly down from an achievement of 100% last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>Surpassed benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational</td>
<td>There is no affect here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>question</td>
<td>answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional</td>
<td>We are doing a very good job of teaching students how to evaluate and comprehend specific concepts and research information critically. Our faculty emphasizes the importance of activities, reading, lecturing and application of concepts to students through assignments like the Perception Paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stimulate student learning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Action:</td>
<td>Further Action Unnecessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>