

COMMUNICATION STUDIES Update September 7, 2011

Identifying Information

Academic Year: 2012-2013			
College:	College of Arts and Sciences	Author/Contact:	Dr. John Baldwin
Department:	School of Communication	Email:	Jrbaldw@ilstu.edu
Program:	Communication Studies	Phone:	(309)438-7110
Date:	September 2012	Mail Code:	Campus Box 4480

Program Mission/Purpose

Our Communication Studies mission is to promote competent, ethical, and responsible production and consumption of messages in professional, social, interpersonal, and intercultural contexts. We accomplish this by providing an environment that cultivates the lifelong teaching and learning of expressive and receptive abilities that individuals employ when they organize, make decisions, manage conflict, exert influence, create aesthetic experience, coordinate actions, and relate personally.

Program Goal:

Program will provide students with knowledge of the general ideas of communication theory and discipline

Outcome Measures	Data Needed	Data Already Available	What group(s) will be assessed?	Assessment Methods	Who will conduct assessment?	Timeline
Assessment of objectives by COM 111 instructors and/or coordinator	Pre- and post test scores ⁱ	No*	COM 111 students (entry com theory course, required of all majors)	Pre- and post-test score comparison of all students	COM 111 instructor	Every other Spring (even-numbered years)
Assessment of objectives via theory-based artifacts in upper-level courses.	Rubric scores for theory artifact	No	Students in upper-level courses that include theory component (e.g., 223, 229, 272, 372)	A rubric to be developed	Instructors will randomly select appropriate papers for assessment team	Every other fall (even-numbered)
Assessment of objectives by capstone instructors, based on rubric criteria applied to student portfolios	Rubric scores with summary assessment	No**	Student capstone summary paper or report	A rubric tapping students' use of theory	Capstone instructor	Every other Spring (odd-years)

Program Goal: Program will provide students with ability to conduct and evaluate communication research ⁱⁱ						
Outcome Measures	Data Needed	Data Already Available	What group(s) will be assessed?	Assessment Methods	Who will conduct assessment?	Timeline
Assessment by course instructors of students' ability to meet course objectives (recognizing portions of scholarly journal article; ability to conduct [social scientific] research), based on rubric assessment of student abilities in key class assignments	Rubric scores with summary assessment	Yes	Faculty performance, based on student outcomes	Summary report of met objectives, based on rubric evaluating final research project	COM 297 instructor	Papers collected each semester, with assessment per rubrics in Fall of each year

Program Goal: Program will provide students with competence in oral and written communication						
Outcome Measures	Data Needed	Data Already Available	What group(s) will be assessed?	Assessment Methods	Who will conduct assessment?	Timeline
Evaluative assessment of various aspects of student writing, based on standard criteria of solid writing (punctuation, grammar, organization, style), based on summary of randomly selected senior-level student papers from upper-level electives*	Scores on writing rubric; copies of specific student papers	Yes	Student performance outcomes	Evaluation rubric—aspects on ability to write effectively	Communication Studies unit director (based on "random" papers received from instructors.**	Spring of every other year (even-numbered)
Evaluative assessment of public presentation ability, based on standard criteria of public speaking (delivery, organization, argumentation, etc.), based on summary of randomly selected senior-level presentations from electives.	Scores on writing rubric; copies of specific student papers	No	Student performance outcomes	Evaluation rubric—aspects on ability to write effectively	Communication Studies unit director (based on "random" papers received from instructors.*	Spring of every other year (odd-numbered)

*Communication Studies Unit Director reserves the right to assign evaluation of set of papers and speeches to committees of the Comm Studies faculty.ⁱⁱⁱ

Program Goal:						
Program will provide students with the ability to link their degree knowledge to profession or career						
Outcome Measures	Data Needed	Data Already Available	What group(s) will be assessed?	Assessment Methods	Who will conduct assessment?	Timeline
Percentage of alumni who indicate that they are employed in a "Comm Studies" related field (agree or strongly agree)	Alumni data	Yes	Alumni	Alumni survey scores	Alumni office;	Spring of each year
Percentage of alumni who indicate that they are using skills and knowledge learned in their degree frequently or often.	Alumni data	Yes	Alumni	Alumni survey scores	Alumni office;	Spring of each year

Overall Notes: [There is no clear place on the grid to address item #5 on the Academic Assessment Feedback form, so director of unit (Communication Studies) will address that here with notes beyond the above grid:

1) **DATA:** Unit coordinator will assign instructors of appropriate classes to collect data from approximately 10% of all majors in the pertinent courses at the timeline indicated. Specifically, the unit director will provide numbers from a random table of numbers, based on the number of instructors teaching a given course; instructors will provide copies of papers corresponding to those numbers on their role book to the unit director. For example, if for writing, there are 5 upper-level courses in the fall and 5 in the spring, with a total of 100 students in each semester, the unit director will determine which courses have final papers that have a strong writing component and will locate random numbers to equal 10 papers each semester across the courses with such a component. While papers will be collected from both fall and spring semesters (to ensure assessment in those courses that tend to be offered only once a year), assessment will occur only in the semester indicated in the grid.

Data collection is offset by year and semester so that both those instructors who are providing data and those who are evaluating it according to the rubric are not overworked in any given semester.

2) **ASSESSMENT:** Committees of faculty will evaluate the data following rubrics, which will be developed by the Department in Spring of 2009. Dr. Cheri Simonds, a specialist in communication pedagogy, has agreed to work through the various rubrics with one of her graduate classes on communication education. The Communication Studies Unit will assign a qualified committee to look at each criterion during the year and semester indicated, comparing papers and videos of speeches to the rubric, providing a summary report (both quantitative and qualitative) to the Unit coordinator.

3) **IMPROVEMENT:** Unit director will take final reports from assessment teams and will create a summary memo for the assessment file at the end of each summer. She or he will enter numeric assessment scores in each area on a spreadsheet to track degree to which instruction meets the program goals, as well as summarize open-ended assessments. In the fall of each year, the Unit director will present the memo with summary suggestions for improvement to the Communication Studies faculty. The director will conduct a final evaluation of 5-year progress towards goals as part of the next program review.

-
- ⁱ Currently, COM 111 is taught in a large-lecture class, with no writing assignment. Until the School has more personnel to teach the course, or an increased budget to allow for GTAs to evaluate student writing, written theory papers will not be available for evaluation.
 - ⁱⁱ Students in some COM 297 courses conduct research, but in other courses they evaluate existing research. Our goal is that students be able to do both.
 - ⁱⁱⁱ As COM 111 has not undergone the originally planned reversion to smaller classrooms, and as the Capstone is now being offered, most NOTES from previous Assessment Plan are no longer necessary, so have been deleted.

**Appendix 10
Communication Studies Assessment Rubrics**

RESEARCH PROJECT RUBRIC					
	Not Present (0)	Beginning (1)	Developing (2)	Accomplished (3)	Exemplary (4)
Research Problem/ Question	Not present or not clearly identifiable	The research question or hypothesis is present and easily identifiable	The student has chosen properly between using a research question or a hypothesis based on the case made in the literature review	In addition to properly choosing between a research question and a hypothesis, the student(s) posed a thoughtful, creative question that encouraged challenging or provocative research. The question breaks new ground or contributes to knowledge.	The research objective was expressed as a clear and "testable" descriptive difference/relationship RQ or hypothesis. The concepts are clearly defined. Also, heurism is clearly present in the research problem.
Quality of Literature Review	Literature Review not present or no sources were cited	Student(s) gathered information, but it lacked relevance, quality, depth and balance. Analysis of existing scholarly/professional literature on the topic was inadequate.	Student(s) gathered information from a limited range of sources but used some scholarly research The argument as to the necessity of the study was made but lacked strength	Student(s) gathered information from a variety of scholarly sources The review clearly outlined the major points related to the topic; ideas were logically arranged to present a sound scholarly argument. Student(s) did a credible job summarizing related literature.	Student(s) gathered information from a variety of scholarly sources, including appropriate databases. Sources are relevant, balanced and include critical readings relating to the question or problem. Research provides a justification. The review raised important issues or ideas that may not have been represented in the literature.
Quality of Methodology	Methodology section not present.	Appropriate methods of analysis were not evident in the work.	The project methodology was inadequately presented, incompletely executed, or inappropriate to the purpose of the project.	The project methodology was appropriate. However, little detail was given and not all elements/procedures (described in the next column) were include in the description.	Student(s) used appropriate methodology to link evidence developed to the research question. This includes a participant description, and procedures for measuring all concepts, identifying and creating comparison groups, and gathering data.

<p>Results</p>	<p>Statistical analyses were not present in the research report.</p>	<p>Statistical analyses were inaccurate or inappropriate to the research question/hypotheses.</p>	<p>The statistical analyses present were appropriate; however, they were incomplete. All tests (as described in the next column) were not run or some data was not reported.</p>	<p>The statistical analyses present were appropriate and completely reported, but there were errors in statistical notation usage.</p>	<p>Appropriate statistical techniques were used to test the hypotheses and/or to answer research questions guiding the study.</p> <p>Descriptive statistics were clearly presented for manipulation check measures and for the dependent variables(s).</p> <p>Results of inferential statistical tests (e.g., t-tests) were clearly and accurately presented.</p> <p>Use of proper statistical notation was nearly flawless</p>
<p>Importance and Appropriateness of Conclusions and Implications</p>	<p>No conclusions or implications were stated</p>	<p>The project did not present appropriate or adequate bases for conclusions of the work.</p> <p>Implications, limitations, and future research were not explored.</p>	<p>The conclusions were inadequately and incompletely presented, or inappropriate to the purpose of the project.</p> <p>Some implications, limitations, or future research were explored but not all three</p>	<p>Student(s) effectively communicated their results to the audience but the work lacked fully articulated connections between the stated problem(s), their evidence, analyses, and conclusions.</p> <p>Recommendations and implications were impartially developed and/or incompletely connected to the conclusions of the project.</p>	<p>Student(s) effectively conveyed conclusions and demonstrated clear/appropriate connections between the stated problem(s), their evidence, and analyses.</p> <p>Recommendations and theoretical/practical implications flowed from the conclusions.</p> <p>Major limitations were discussed.</p> <p>At least one suggestion for future research was provided.</p>
<p>Documentation</p>	<p>No sources were cited or there were clearly plagiarized materials.</p>	<p>Sources are cited but there are consistent APA style errors both in-text and on the reference page.</p>	<p>Sources are cited but there are consistent minor APA style errors either in-text or on the reference page but not both.</p>	<p>Sources are cited but there are sporadic errors in documenting APA style in-text, on the reference page, or both.</p>	<p>Student(s) documented all sources. Sources are properly cited, both in-text/in-product and on reference page. APA style is nearly flawless.</p>
<p>Writing Style and Organization</p>	<p>Student(s) work is not logically or effectively structured or is not written from an empirical standpoint.</p>	<p>An attempt at organization was made but there are abrupt shifts or the sections of the manuscript are not in the appropriate order or are missing.</p> <p>Student(s) need to work on communicating their results more effectively.</p>	<p>The paper either presents all sections in the proper order, or uses an appropriate writing style; but, not both.</p> <p>The work lacked transitions between sections.</p>	<p>Student(s) logically organized the product and made good connections among ideas.</p> <p>Writing style is clear and suitable for an academic audience.</p>	<p>Student(s) developed appropriate structure for communicating product, incorporating variety of quality sources. Information is logically and creatively organized with smooth transitions.</p> <p>Writing style is clear, suitable for an academic audience, and engaging.</p>

THEORY RUBRIC

Name of Student: _____

Title of Paper: _____

Theory for this paper: _____

For grading: (1) = Clearly below standards, major points missing, poor expression. (2) = Insufficient (parts missing, expression below standard). (3) = Meets the requirements for assignment with minimal errors. (4) = Good (better than average). (5) = Excellence (creative, well explained and expressed).

<u>Theory Explanation</u>	<u>Poor</u>			<u>Excellent</u>	
Adequate coverage of theory (main/key points covered, balance of breadth & depth)	1	2	3	4	5
Accuracy of theory (explanations, key aspects covered)	1	2	3	4	5
<u>Application</u>					
Concrete and accurate application of theory (research)	1	2	3	4	5
Examples illustrate explicit tie to theory	1	2	3	4	5
Practicalness/Usefulness of application	1	2	3	4	5
Breadth (sufficient coverage of key points across theory)	1	2	3	4	5
Development of application (depth of thought)	1	2	3	4	5
<u>Evaluation/Critique</u>					
Does it accurately use appropriate theory evaluation terms? (scope, heuristic value, strengths, weaknesses, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Development (has <u>enough</u> thought been given to critique?)	1	2	3	4	5
Quality (what is the <u>strength</u> of thought given to critique?)	1	2	3	4	5
Novelty (Does it extend beyond author's limitations?)	1	2	3	4	5

SENIOR LEVEL WRITING RUBRIC

	Style & Effective Word Usage	Sentence Structure	Organization	Supportive Ideas
Satisfactory – Excellent (3)	<p>Writing reflects artful use of language to conceptualize topic</p> <p>Highly developed and consistent use of Standard English practices</p> <p>Little to no spelling, capitalization, punctuation, or writing usage errors</p> <p>Proper use of syntax</p>	<p>High variety of sentence structure</p> <p>Demonstrates evident and appropriate structure pertaining to thesis and preview</p> <p>Structure supports strong topic sentences</p>	<p>Clear logic</p> <p>Conceptual linkage of ideas and concepts</p> <p>All necessary elements are used in the paper (i.e. introduction, body, and conclusion)</p> <p>Thesis and preview are easily identifiable</p> <p>Logical order of presentation within/between points</p>	<p>Effective use, amount, and type of evidence are used</p> <p>Ideas flow logically; arguments are identifiable, reasonable, and well supported</p> <p>Anticipates counterarguments and successfully challenges them</p> <p>All ideas relate easily to central topic or thesis</p>
Meets Requirements – Needs Improvement (2)	<p>Word choice demonstrates little understanding of coordination between concepts and writing style</p> <p>Some arguments are not effective</p> <p>Transitions are difficult to follow</p> <p>Coherency between ideas and concepts is not present</p> <p>No connection is made to audience</p> <p>Words are used appropriately and successfully to demonstrate</p>	<p>Some variety in sentence structure but does not use paragraphs or sentences with a vivid topic</p> <p>Unclear sentence structure but attempts to support main thesis</p> <p>Some variety in sentence structure but is underdeveloped</p>	<p>Transitions are unclear or difficult to follow</p> <p>There is evidence of an introduction but lacks an attention getter and relevancy to audience</p> <p>Reflects a sense of completeness</p> <p>Ideas are present but not in the most effective order</p> <p>Focus is unclear at times and reader must search for meaning in other parts of the paper</p>	<p>All aspects of the paper is an attempt to develop a larger idea</p> <p>Ideas support thesis statement but may not link other concepts together throughout the paper</p> <p>Ideas are supported but details are sketchy</p> <p>Logical order is lacking</p>

	<p>knowledge of topic and concepts</p> <p>Consistent use of Standard English</p> <p>Shows competence in using appropriate language to reflect conceptual understanding</p> <p>Several small errors but does not conflict with meaning</p>			
<p>Does Not Meet Requirements – Needs Improvement (1)</p>	<p>Grammatical expression is severely lacking</p> <p>Proper grammar and word use are not present</p> <p>Unclear expression of ideas</p> <p>Lacks ability to coordinate words with ideas</p> <p>No indication of subordination</p>	<p>Several fragments and run-ons in the paper</p> <p>No variety of sentence structure</p> <p>Does not demonstrate evident and appropriate structure pertaining to thesis and preview</p> <p>Structure does not support strong topic sentences</p> <p>Several fragments and run-ons in the paper</p>	<p>No organizational development is present</p> <p>No linkage between concepts</p> <p>No transitions between paragraphs and ideas</p>	<p>Lack of or very weak examples used</p> <p>Ideas fail to support thesis or is difficult for the reader to follow</p> <p>Improper use of citations and do not support general ideas</p> <p>No logical order of ideas or concepts to tie to narrative structure</p>