2016-17 Program Assessment Report

Communication Studies B.S.

Mission, Objectives & Learning Outcomes

Oregon Tech Mission
Oregon Institute of Technology, an Oregon public university, offers innovative and rigorous applied degree programs in the areas of engineering, engineering technologies, health technologies, management, and the arts and sciences. To foster student and graduate success, the university provides an intimate, hands-on learning environment, focusing on application of theory to practice. Oregon Tech offers statewide educational opportunities for the emerging needs of Oregonians and provides information and technical expertise to state, national and international constituents.

Core Theme 1: Applied Degree Programs
Oregon Tech offers innovative and rigorous applied degree programs. The teaching and learning model at Oregon Tech prepares students to apply the knowledge gained in the classroom to the workplace.

Core Theme 2: Student and Graduate Success
Oregon Tech fosters student and graduate success by providing an intimate, hands-on learning environment, which focuses on application of theory to practice. The teaching and support services facilitate students' personal and academic development.

Core Theme 3: Statewide Educational Opportunities
Oregon Tech offers statewide educational opportunities for the emerging needs of Oregon's citizens. To accomplish this, Oregon Tech provides innovative and rigorous applied degree programs to students across the state of Oregon, including high-school programs, online degree programs, and partnership agreements with community colleges and universities.

Core Theme 4: Public Service
Oregon Tech will share information and technical expertise to state, national, and international constituents.

Program Alignment to Oregon Tech Mission and Core Themes
N/A

Program Mission
The Communication Studies Program prepares students for the challenges of a society that is shaped by communication. As participants in the program, students develop and integrate knowledge, creativity, ethical practice, and skills. Students also examine and produce work in oral, written, and visual communication and practice skills in group and intercultural communication.

Program Educational Objectives

- Apply appropriate communication skills across settings, purposes, and audiences.
- Demonstrate knowledge of communication theory and application.
- Practice critical thinking to develop innovative and well-founded perspectives related to the students' emphases.
- Build and maintain healthy and effective relationships.
- Use technology to communicate effectively in various settings and contexts.
- Demonstrate appropriate and professional ethical behavior.

Program Faculty Review

Program Student Learning Outcomes and Objectives were reviewed by program faculty during Fall Convocation Program Assessment Meeting.

Communication faculty reviewed the current program objectives and learning outcomes to provide feedback for change to the program. All of the most recent modifications to the program mission, educational objectives, and learning outcomes are included in the sections below. Although the student learning detailed in this report was assessed in a classroom setting, students had other opportunities to demonstrate their learning in Communication student clubs, honor societies, externships, and regional academic conferences. In April 2017, six COM majors presented original research at the Northwest Communication Association annual convention, and several students studied abroad for COM207, the media seminar in Paris.

Showcase Learning Opportunities

The Media Seminar in Paris (COM 207--new course number coming in Fall 2018) is a great opportunity for students to learn more about intercultural communication and the media-making process. Every year, 5-10 students take part in this international trip.

Every spring, select COM students and most COM faculty attend the Northwest Communication Association annual convention. Every year, at least 3 COM students (often more) share their original research at the conference. In 2017, six students presented their own original research.

Program History & Vision

Program History

Located exclusively at the Klamath Falls campus, the Communication Studies program offers courses in a variety of communication contexts, including technical, rhetorical, interpersonal, group, and organizational communication. The program serves primarily Communication Studies majors, but also serves a group of students in other fields interested in communication-related course work to complement their chosen major.

The program revision was approved by the CPC in Winter 2014. All new courses have been rolled out, and many will be assessed in the coming years. As the new courses were designed to more completely meet the PSLOs, more and more data points will be available in the coming years. The new school-wide Communication rubric was used to assess the PSLO of Competence in Communication, allowing our program courses to provide benchmark data for program-integrated courses. For this year, due to the revisions and rather low course enrollment in the courses that best align with this year's outcomes, the

data sets, particularly the Communication Theory set, are small, but they should increase in coming years due to our department's enthusiastic focus on recruitment (more students=more data).

Meeting with Advisory Board
Program faculty held a meeting with their Advisory Board during the academic year.

Advisory Board Review
The Advisory Board reviewed the Program Mission and Objectives during the academic year.

The program objectives are reviewed annually, most recently throughout CSAC meetings in the 2016-2017 academic year. The department meets with their advisory board twice per year, and the advisory board last reviewed the program objectives in June 2017.

Program Enrollment
For Fall 2016, there were 40 students. Retention data were not provided, but, given that retention numbers often focus on first-time freshmen, retention data may not be as useful for the Communication major, where many of the students transfer in from junior/community colleges; there are very few true freshmen in the program.

Attachment 1_Enrollment_5_Year_History_by_Major

Program Graduates

Attachment 2_Graduates_10_Year_History_by_Major

Employment Rates and Salaries

Attachment 3_Grad_Data_First_Destination_3_Year_History_by_Major

Pass Rates on Board and Licensure Exam
N/A

Results of Board or Licensure Exam
N/A

Other Program Assessment Data
The program revision was approved by the CPC in Winter 2014. All new courses have been rolled out, and many will be assessed in the coming years. As the new courses were designed to more completely meet the PSLOs, more and more data points will be available in the coming years. The new school-wide Communication rubric was used to assess the PSLO of Competence in Communication, allowing our program courses to provide benchmark data for program-integrated courses. For this year, due to the revisions and rather low course enrollment in the courses that best align with this year's outcomes, the data sets, particularly the Communication Theory set, are small, but they should increase in coming years due to our department's enthusiastic focus on recruitment (more students=more data).

Attachment 4_Curriculum_Map_PSLO_2

Attachment 5_Curriculum_Map_PSLO_3.pdf

Closing the Loop

Describe any actions taken and re-assessment done during this academic year in response to assessment findings from prior academic years.

Program Faculty implemented actions during the academic year based on assessment findings from previous assessment cycles.

Changes Implemented

Last year, the assessment data set was quite small. This year, while still not as large as the department would like, the data sets were bigger, particularly with the Competence in Communication outcome, where two courses were used, one to assess competence in oral communication and another to assess competence in written communication. The department is focusing on recruitment, which should result in larger data sets in coming years.

Much like last year's assessment allowed for creating a benchmark for a program-integrated ESLO (Diverse Perspectives), this year the Communication department's assessment of Competence in Communication, which was assessed with the new Communication ESLO rubric, allowed for a benchmark assessment on program-integrated Communication.

The new ESLO model does not significantly alter the COM curriculum, so the department could serve as a benchmark as the ELSOs continue to be rolled out across campus. The assessments in COM 446 and SPE 314 were among the first and only program-integrated courses to be assessed using the new COM ESLO rubric.

Note: Communication rubric, it is difficult to compare this year's findings with previous years' findings as Competence in Communication was assessed with completely different rubrics. That said, it is nice to have benchmark data to show how the Communication ESLO rubric was used to effectively assess communication in a program (program-integrated communication courses).

We have gathered assessment data following changes that indicates improvement in student learning.

Assessment Findings

Students have improved dramatically in considering theory and its components and in applying the theory, and there is noticeable improvement in connections and integration and use of theoretical language.

However, these improvements could be the result of the course that was assessed. In 2016-2017, the assessment was in Communication Theory, which is a whole course dedicated to theory. Conversely, in 2008-2009, the assessment was in Rhetorical Theory, which, while a theory course, has other components as well. In many ways, the distinction between the two is similar to the foundational and practicing discussion that is going on across campus. COM 105 is a foundational course, complete with students being led through and regularly applying theories in the communication discipline. The class, as a whole, asks students to consider various communication theories and the components of those theories; similarly, class work as well as the final project ask students to first explain and then apply the

theories. Basically, there is a lot of "hand-holding" in the foundational level course. On the other hand, Rhetorical Theory is a 300-level practicing class, so students are left to do more of the work on their own.

Having a second data set at the practicing level would help to see if the results from the foundational assessment in COM 105 hold as students' progress through the COM program.

On the whole, though, this assessment coupled with the last one shows that the COM department theory rubric (developed in 2008) is adequate and valid for assessing students' knowledge of theory.

Attachment 6_2008_09_Theory_Application_and_Analysis

Attachment 7_2016_17_COM_105_Theory_Application_and_Analysis

Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle

PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES **3-Year Cycle** **Communication Studies B.S.**	**2016-17**	**2017-18**	**2018-19**
OIT-BCOM 2016-17.1 Demonstrate critical and innovative thinking.		X	
OIT-BCOM 2016-17.2 Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication.	COM 446 SPE 314 Student Exit Survey		
OIT-BCOM 2016-17.3 Apply communication theories.	COM 105 Student Exit Survey		
OIT-BCOM 2016-17.4 Show an understanding of opportunities in the field of communication.		X	
OIT-BCOM 2016-17.5 Use current technology related to the communication field.			
OIT-BCOM 2016-17.6 Respond effectively to cultural communication differences.			X
OIT-BCOM 2016-17.7 Communicate ethically.			X
OIT-BCOM 2016-17.8 Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges.			X

Assessment Map & Measure

F – Foundation – introduction of the learning outcome, typically at the lower-division level,
P – Practicing – reinforcement and elaboration of the learning outcome, or
C – Capstone – demonstration of the learning outcome at the target level for the degree

For each outcome, programs should identify at least 2 direct measures (student work that provides evidence of their knowledge and skills), and 1 indirect measure (student self-assessment of their knowledge and skills) for each outcome.

For every program, data from the Student Exit Survey will be an indirect measure at the capstone level.

OIT-BCOM 2016-17.2 Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication.	
Course/Event	COM 446
Legend	P – Practice
Assessment Measure	Direct – Final Paper
Criterion	The students' final paper will be assessed using the new Oregon Tech Communication rubric, a rubric that was designed to assess both oral and written communication. The target is that 80% of students score 3 or 4 in each performance criteria of the rubric.
Attachment 8_2016_17_ESLO_1_Communication_Rubric	
Course/Event	SPE 314
Legend	P – Practice
Assessment Measure	Direct – Final Presentation
Criterion	The students' final presentation will be assessed using the new Oregon Tech Communication rubric, a rubric that was designed to assess both written and oral communication. The target is that 80% of students score 3 or 4 in each performance criteria of the rubric.
Attachment 8_2016_17_ESLO_1_Communication_Rubric	
Course/Event	Student Exit Survey
Legend	C – Capstone
Assessment Measure	Indirect – Student Exit Survey
Criterion	80% of students score 3 or 4

OIT-BCOM 2016-17.3 Apply communication theories.	
Course/Event	COM 105
Legend	F – Foundation
Assessment Measure	Direct – Final Paper
Criterion	The final paper will be assessed for all 9 students in the class. The Communication department's theory rubric will be used to assess the students' ability to understand and apply communication theories. The target is that 80% of students score 3 or 4 in each performance criteria of the rubric.
Course/Event	Student Exit Survey

Legend	C – Capstone
Assessment Measure	Indirect – Student Exit Survey
Criterion	80% of students score 3 or 4

Analysis of Results

OIT-BCOM 2016-17.2 Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication.	
Criterion	Not Met
Summary	Having 80% of students rated at 3 or 4 shows proficiency. Thus, based on the above table, when it comes to oral communication competency, Communication students are good at linking purpose and audience, have good focus and organization in their presentation, and are good at finding credible sources and appropriately citing those sources in their presentations. In addition, the students are very good at adhering to style and conventions expected for oral presentations. The students use visuals, but on this particular measure, only 73.3% of students scored at a 3 or 4. Ideas for helping to improve students' visual use are discussed later in this document. Having 80% of students rated at 3 or 4 shows proficiency. Thus, when it comes to recognizing the purpose and the audience for their written work, the students do quite well; likewise, 100% of the students were proficient with regards to style and conventions, meaning that they know what style and tone are appropriate for the situation. The students had the option of using visuals, and 10 of 11 did, and all 10 were rated as proficient. The students focus and organization and justification were also rated as proficient (though at less than 100%). However, students' support and documentation needs work when it comes to written communication. This is an ongoing issue both in the Communication department and across campus, and Communication faculty are working on ways to reinforce the importance of documentation. Some faculty, for instance, have started having more of the paper grade focused on documentation to encourage students to take more time to cite sources correctly. Taken together, the results reveal students' overall communication competency, which is important to consider both departmentally and school-wide as the new Communication ELSO bundles the results of oral and written communication together. Overall, Communication students are proficient in purpose and audience, focus and organization, style and conventions, and visual communication. In many ways, this makes sense as these are core ideas that are reinforced in most COM/SPE courses. They are introduced in school-wide foundational courses (WRI 121, WRI 122, SPE 111) and reinforced in nearly every COM major course. Students who are taking upper division communication major courses should be competent in these areas. The faculty are encouraged to retain their focus on these areas. Similar to the written communication discussion above, students in the Communication major and in other programs across campus struggle with properly documenting sources. It may help

	to have faculty in the Communication department put additional grade or class emphasis on documentation. To address the campus-wide issues, Communication faculty and/or the Communication ESLO committee could hold workshops for faculty, for if faculty do not understand APA, then they are going to have a hard time reinforcing it in their program-integrated courses. The exit survey was administered to the seniors graduating from the Communication program in 2017; nine students completed the survey. This survey included two questions asking students to assess their competence in communication (the first question assessed their ability to use communication theory, and the second focuses specifically on how the Oregon Tech communication program helped them learn to apply theories). Taken together, the two serve to show how students assess their own communication competency. On the first measure, which asked to students to assess their ability to communicate competently verbally, orally, and visually, 8 rated themselves as highly proficient, and 1 rated him/herself as proficient. On the second measure, which asked students to specifically address how much Oregon Tech and the Communication program contributed to students' ability to communicate competently verbally, orally, and visually, 4 students said "very much" and 5 said "quite a bit." Thus, on both measures, 100% of students rated themselves as proficient or highly proficient and all 9 believed that Oregon Tech and the Communication program contributed to their communication competence. Areas of Competence: The results show that Communication students are proficient in purpose and audience, focus and organization, style and conventions, and (in written documents) visual communication. In many ways, this makes sense as these are core ideas that are reinforced in most COM/SPE/WRI courses. They are introduced in school-wide foundational courses (WRI 121, WRI 122, SPE 111) and reinforced in nearly every COM major course. Students who are taking upper division communication major courses should be competent in these areas. The faculty are encouraged to retain their focus on these areas.
Improvement Narrative	*Other:* When it comes to written communication, students in the Communication major and in other programs across campus struggle with finding credible sources and with properly documenting those sources. With oral communication, students' visual use needs some work. To address the issue of finding credible sources, faculty are encouraged to make use of the library offer to come to courses and walk students through how to find credible sources. With regards to the documentation issue, it may help to have faculty in the Communication department put additional grade or class emphasis on documentation, particularly in Communication department courses (at both the foundational and the practicing levels). To address the campus-wide issues, Communication faculty and/or the Communication ESLO committee could hold workshops for faculty, for if faculty do not understand APA, then they are going to have a hard time reinforcing it in their program-integrated courses. In the Argumentation class, which assessed communication competency based on an oral presentation, students' visual use could use some

	improvement. Many COM courses, particularly COM major courses, have a presentation component. One way to build and reinforce effective visual use could come from having a visual requirement for the presentations, and having that requirement be a substantial portion of the grade (i.e., at least 10%). This would show students how important effective visual use is and get them in the habit of considering the efficacy of their visual aids. Effective visual use is a skill that is taught in the foundational SPE 111 course, but it needs to be more reinforced at the programmatic level. : There are a few things that should be considered when interpreting the results of the Competency in Communication assessment: 1. The fact that COM students are better with style and documentation when speaking compared to writing is not surprising and, in fact, shows that some of the issues identified at the foundational level persist into the practicing level. In a presentation, citing a source is as simple as orally providing enough information that members of the audience could look up the information if they were so inclined (e.g., "On the front page of yesterday's New York Times, John Smith explained the Mueller investigation in detail"). On the other hand, when it comes to documenting sources through writing, students are required to use APA, which is much more detailed. Having taught foundational courses that rely mainly on speaking (like SPE 111) and courses that rely mainly on writing (e.g., COM 225), students' oral citation/documentation skills are much stronger when citing orally. 2. Due to rubric revisions, it is difficult to compare the results of this assessment with the 2010-2011, but key commonalities exist and will be discussed later in this document. It is worth noting that, while only 76.9% of students are proficient with documentation, this is a substantial over the 40% who were rated as proficient in this skill in 2010-2011. 3. This assessment was important on an institutional level, for it shows how program-integrated communication can be assessed using the new COM ESLO rubric. The rubric was effective for measuring the program-integrated practice of oral and written communication in the COM program.
Attachment 9_2016_17_COM_446_Competency_in_Communication *Attachment 10_2016_17_SPE_314_Competency_in_Communication* *Attachment 11_2016_17_Overall_Competency_in_Communication*	

OIT-BCOM 2016-17.3 Apply communication theories.	
Criterion	Not Met
Summary	Having 80% of students rated at level 3 or 4 shows proficiency. Thus, from the above table, it appears that COM students are doing well with considering communication theories and the components associated with those theories and with applying communication theories. In Introduction to Communication Theory, the major paper asks students to explain and

	apply a communication theory, which honed in on these very skills. However, their use of theoretical language, in particular, needs some work (though, as will be explained later in this document, the 66.6% is an improvement from the last time PSLO 3 was assessed). Coming back to the written communication assessment, particularly the support and documentation findings, ideally, students in COM105 should be finding academic articles about their theory of choice, but this requires finding academic articles, a source of support, which is already identified as a possible weakness. Perhaps across COM courses, faculty could emphasize the importance of finding relevant, academic sources, which would help students to a) find credible support for their ideas (helps with PSLO2) and b) would expose them to how theoretical language is used in academic literature, possibly helping them in their own use of theoretical language (PSLO 3). The exit survey was administered to the seniors graduating from the Communication program in 2017; nine students completed the survey. This survey included two questions asking students to assess their ability to apply communication theories (the first question assessed their ability to use communication theory, and the second focuses specifically on how the Oregon Tech communication program helped them learn to apply theories). Taken together, the two serve to show how students assess their own competency when it comes to applying communication theories. On the first measure, which asked students to assess their ability to apply communication theory, 7 reported that they were proficient, and 2 rated themselves as highly proficient. On the second measure, which asked students to specifically address how much Oregon Tech and the Communication program contributed to students' ability to apply communication theory, 6 students said the program contributed "very much," 1 said the program contributed "quite a bit," and 2 said the program contributed "some." This means that 100% of the students rated themselves as proficient or highly proficient, but only 77.77% believed that Oregon Tech and the Communication program contributed to this ability. While 77.7% is close to the 80%, it does fall short of the 80% mark. Given that only one course has focused specifically on theory application, working through the curriculum and allowing instructors to highlight the role of theory in a variety of courses could both provide more courses in which to assess this outcome and allow students to see how they are applying theories throughout their time at Oregon Tech.
Improvement Narrative	*Other:* Areas of Competence: COM students are doing well with considering communication theories and the components associated with those theories and with applying communication theories. In Introduction to Communication Theory, the major paper asks students to explain and apply a communication theory, which honed in on these very skills. Areas for Improvement: COM students' use of theoretical language, in particular, needs some work (though, as will be explained later in this document, the 66.6% is an improvement from the last time PSLO3 was assessed). Plans for Improvement: Coming back to the written communication assessment, particularly the support and documentation findings, ideally, students in COM 105 should be finding academic articles

	about their theory of choice, but this requires finding academic articles, a source of support, which is already identified as a possible weakness. Perhaps across COM courses, faculty could emphasize the importance of finding relevant, academic sources, which would help students to a) find credible support for their ideas (helps with PSLO 2) and b) would expose them to how theoretical language is used in academic literature, possibly helping them in their own use of theoretical language (PSLO 3). As an additional area for improvement, finding a second course for a second direct assessment of this outcome would help to validate the results shown here, as would having a larger sample set (9 is a small number of students to assess and smaller still to try to generalize in any way). Other Areas for Consideration: There are a few things that should be considered when interpreting the results of the Competency in Communication assessment: 1. 9 students is a very small sample size, and the direct assessment was only taken in one course. This small sample size could have affected the results. As noted in footnote 4, it is possible that a second data set will be provided, which will help to validate the results. Right now, the data set is so small that it is difficult to make any generalization of findings. 2. Two criteria, theory development and connections and integration, were very close to the 80%, close enough that it is hard to really assess proficiency on these two criteria, given the small sample size. Thus, most recommendations for improvement focus mainly on the use of theoretical language criterion. 3. This was the same rubric that was used for part of the 2008-2009 theory assessment (for some reason, two different rubrics were used), so, focusing on the prior assessment using this rubric can allow for some comparisons on how students' learning of theory has progressed (or not) over time. These comparisons appear later in this document.
Attachment 7_2016_17_COM_105_Theory_Application_and_Analysis	

References

Program Assessment Coordinator: Veronica Koehn, Assistant Professor, Communication

Office of Academic Excellence

Oregon TECH

Majors History, Fall 4th Week
November 30, 2016

The following data represents majors declared by student as of Fall 4th week. Students with multiple/dual majors have been reported under each major in which they enrolled; therefore the student headcount will be duplicated. A small number of students that declared a third major have now been included in this report. Data reported is combined for all levels and all locations.
Some programs may have had name changes such as CLS and have been reported as they were (historically).

Description	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	5 Year Difference	5 Year % Change
ABA Course Series	0	0	3	0	0	0	-
Accounting Certificate	0	0	0	0	1	1	-
Allied Health	0	0	0	0	3	3	-
Allied Health Management	11	5	3	2	1	-10	-90.9%
Applied Behavior Analysis	0	0	0	10	17	17	-
Applied Mathematics	41	38	47	42	33	-8	-19.5%
Applied Psychology	146	149	122	96	110	-36	-24.7%
Automat, Robot, & Cntrl Engr	0	0	0	0	1	1	-
Biology	15	8	1	1	0	-15	-100.0%
Biology-Health Sciences	136	150	150	138	151	15	11.0%
Civil Engineering	127	121	110	120	118	-9	-7.1%
Clinical Lab Science-Earlyadm	6	10	35	22	0	-6	-100.0%
Clinical Laboratory Science	62	85	94	95	2	-60	-96.8%
Communication Studies	55	42	39	47	40	-15	-27.3%
Computer Engineering Tech	82	82	81	86	63	-19	-23.2%
Dental Hygiene	226	240	211	221	202	-24	-10.6%
Diagnostic Medical Sonography	86	104	95	102	112	26	30.2%
Dispute Resolution Certificate	1	1	2	4	2	1	100.0%
Echocardiography	121	119	123	122	128	7	5.8%
Electrical Engineering	76	120	146	164	197	121	159.2%
Electronics Engineering Tech	67	58	51	37	32	-35	-52.2%
Embedded Systems Eng Tech	24	25	32	35	57	33	137.5%
Emergency Medical Services Mgt	0	0	17	20	34	34	-
EMT - Paramedic	29	30	29	28	28	-1	-3.4%
Environmental Sciences	49	49	51	48	42	-7	-14.3%
General Studies	495	736	632	1,031	1,414	919	185.7%
Geomatics	1	0	0	0	0	-1	-100.0%
Geomatics-option in GIS	13	14	10	10	7	-6	-46.2%
Geomatics-option in Surveying	49	39	26	31	30	-19	-38.8%
Health Care Mgmt-Admin Mgmt	0	10	14	19	18	18	-
Health Care Mgmt-Clinical Mgmt	0	4	10	11	25	25	-
Health Care Mgmt-Rad Science	0	3	6	12	12	12	-
Health Informatics	0	0	0	20	38	38	-
Health Sciences	1	1	0	1	2	1	100.0%
Information Technology	0	0	0	56	114	114	-
IT Accounting Option	8	4	2	1	1	-7	-87.5%
IT Applications Dev Opt	91	75	71	48	20	-71	-78.0%
IT Bus/Systems Analysis Opt	58	59	69	51	28	-30	-51.7%
IT Health Informatics Opt	54	68	59	32	17	-37	-68.5%
Magnetic Resonance Imagng Spec	0	0	0	0	4	4	-
Manufacturing Engineering Tech	129	99	109	107	101	-28	-21.7%
Marriage and Family Therapy	0	0	0	0	10	10	-
Mechanical Engineering	208	303	331	323	354	146	70.2%
Mechanical Engineering Tech	145	112	121	121	104	-41	-28.3%
Medical Lab Science-Earlyadm	0	0	0	0	17	17	-
Medical Laboratory Science	0	0	0	0	86	86	-
Mgmt Info Sys/Mgmt Acc Option	1	0	0	0	0	-1	-100.0%
Mgmt/Accounting Option	32	38	35	32	19	-13	-40.6%
Mgmt/Marketing Option	34	34	36	34	37	3	8.8%
Mgmt/Small Bus Mgmt Option	54	43	38	37	33	-21	-38.9%
MIT Applicant	0	0	1	2	0	0	-
Nuclear Medicine Technology	47	51	48	48	49	2	4.3%
Nursing	50	49	52	61	69	19	38.0%
Operations Management	61	66	65	69	70	9	14.8%
Optical Engineering	0	0	3	3	3	3	-
Picture Archive/Comm Sys Spec	0	0	1	2	3	3	-
Polysomnographic Technology	19	13	6	12	5	-14	-73.7%
Population Health Management	0	0	3	24	31	31	-
Pre-Clinical Lab Science	0	8	1	20	2	2	-
Pre-Dental Hygiene	62	65	35	37	48	-14	-22.6%
Pre-Medical Imaging Tech	273	287	253	237	226	-47	-17.2%
Pre-Medical Lab Science	0	0	0	0	27	27	-
Pre-Nursing	56	60	53	69	78	22	39.3%
Pre-Paramedic Education	0	3	3	7	0	0	-
Pre-Renewable Energy Eng	111	0	0	0	0	-111	-100.0%
Pre-Respiratory Care	11	12	8	11	9	-2	-18.2%
Radiologic Science	164	163	154	160	152	-12	-7.3%
Renewable Energy Engineering	110	206	203	180	166	56	50.9%
Respiratory Care	85	84	88	103	117	32	37.6%
Sleep Health-Polysom Tech Opt	0	0	4	6	17	17	-
Software Engineering Tech	260	268	289	309	285	25	9.6%
Spec in Entrepreneur/Small Bus	0	0	0	1	2	2	-
Specialization in Accounting	0	0	0	2	2	2	-
Specialization in Marketing	0	0	1	1	1	1	-
Specialization Travel/Tourism	0	1	0	0	0	0	-
System Engr & Technical Mgmt	0	0	2	3	0	0	-
Technology and Management	16	30	43	46	46	30	187.5%
Vascular Technology	88	95	80	93	98	10	11.4%
Total (Duplicated)	**4,146**	**4,539**	**4,407**	**4,923**	**5,371**	**1,225**	**29.5%**
Total (Unduplicated)	**4,001**	**4,414**	**4,273**	**4,786**	**5,232**	**1,231**	**30.8%**

Attachment 2_Graduates_10_Year_History_by_Major

Oregon TECH

10 Year History By Major and Degree Type
As of September 5, 2016

Specializations

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Picture Archive/Comm Sys Spec	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	4	3	-
Specialization in Accounting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Specialization in Marketing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**7**	**3**	**0**

Certificates

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Accounting Certificate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dispute Resolution Certificate	1	2	1	2	4	1	6	11	1	2
Marketing Certificate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Polysomnographic Technology	-	-	4	14	13	11	8	6	3	9
Total	**1**	**2**	**5**	**16**	**17**	**12**	**14**	**17**	**4**	**11**

Associates

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Associate of Arts	13	8	2	5	-	1	-	-	1	1
Computer Engineering Tech	7	5	3	2	3	-	5	7	6	6
Dental Hygiene	25	26	22	25	18	27	18	23	21	9
Electronics Engineering Tech	3	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
EMT - Paramedic	19	21	22	25	27	17	28	26	26	29
Office Systems Technology	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Polysomnographic Technology	-	-	1	2	3	5	6	2	4	-
Respiratory Care	23	16	15	17	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sleep Health-Polysom Tech Opt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Software Engineering Tech	7	2	3	2	2	-	-	2	9	2
Total	**97**	**81**	**72**	**79**	**53**	**50**	**57**	**60**	**67**	**50**

Bachelors

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Allied Health Management	-	-	-	1	2	4	3	2	1	-
Applied Environmental Science	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Applied Mathematics	-	-	7	1	5	4	7	4	4	5
Applied Psychology	46	42	37	30	36	38	30	40	37	31
Biology	10	6	16	14	11	11	3	4	1	2
Biology-Health Sciences	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	14	20	18
Civil Engineering	23	23	29	28	20	14	23	17	15	25
Clinical Laboratory Science	23	24	24	22	22	35	27	34	49	46
Communication Studies	13	13	9	10	13	8	19	13	4	8
Computer Engineering Tech	15	7	14	8	13	3	4	3	3	3
Dental Hygiene	35	38	45	55	49	54	51	76	62	65
Diagnostic Medical Sonography	21	24	21	27	29	24	19	31	25	24
Echocardiography	6	4	16	9	21	32	31	32	29	35
Electrical Engineering	-	-	-	6	11	9	11	17	17	26
Electronics Engineering Tech	18	17	13	10	18	16	11	10	10	13

Bachelors

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Embedded Systems Eng Tech	-	-	-	1	2	2	4	1	5	3
Emergency Medical Services Mgt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Environmental Sciences	1	1	3	1	5	5	4	5	11	14
Geomatics	10	8	5	5	1	-	-	-	-	-
Geomatics-option in GIS	-	-	2	1	1	3	3	5	1	2
Geomatics-option in Surveying	-	-	1	11	13	14	10	13	1	12
Health Care Mgmt-Admin Mgmt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2
Health Care Mgmt-Clinical Mgmt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Health Sciences	1	3	2	2	2	6	1	1	-	-
Industrial Management	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Information Technology	4	4	1	2	-	1	-	-	-	-
IT Accounting Option	-	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	-	-
IT Applications Dev Opt	8	5	13	5	6	8	21	12	8	11
IT Bus/Systems Analysis Opt	1	1	4	10	12	6	12	14	13	8
IT Health Informatics Opt	-	-	-	-	2	4	9	6	14	7
Management Information System	12	2	8	3	-	2	-	-	-	-
Manufacturing Engineering Tech	30	15	16	18	18	9	13	5	11	12
Mechanical Engineering	3	3	17	12	11	19	14	27	23	45
Mechanical Engineering Tech	31	19	31	23	24	19	24	18	17	21
Mgmt Info Sys/Mgmt Acc Option	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mgmt/Accounting Option	8	4	3	8	4	9	9	12	5	8
Mgmt/Marketing Option	9	7	5	5	7	8	7	4	7	7
Mgmt/Small Bus Mgmt Option	9	11	11	18	8	6	8	12	4	7
Nuclear Medicine Technology	18	18	16	15	16	16	15	14	14	15
Operations Management	8	6	3	15	7	14	16	13	19	18
Optical Engineering	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Population Health Management	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
Radiologic Science	47	51	50	53	51	50	48	55	45	56
Renewable Energy Engineering	-	-	6	9	29	35	60	35	29	29
Renewable Energy Systems	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Respiratory Care	5	8	6	7	10	21	21	21	27	22
Software Engineering Tech	44	36	27	27	31	29	41	31	35	47
System Engr & Technical Mgmt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Technology and Management	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	11	8
Ultrasound/Diag Med Sono Opt	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ultrasound/Vascular Option	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vascular Technology	30	30	26	23	23	25	21	28	19	24
Total	**492**	**434**	**490**	**497**	**534**	**565**	**612**	**632**	**599**	**689**

Masters

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Civil Engineering	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	6
Manufacturing Engineering Tech	3	4	7	2	6	8	12	4	8	9
Renewable Energy Engineering	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	11	9
Total	**3**	**4**	**7**	**2**	**6**	**8**	**12**	**5**	**21**	**24**

Grand Total

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Grand Total	**593**	**521**	**574**	**594**	**610**	**635**	**699**	**721**	**694**	**774**

Attachment 3_Grad_Data_First_Destination_3_Year_History_by_Major

Oregon Tech Graduate Outcome Data

a=2013/2014/2015 combined b=2014/2015/2016 combined	% Employed		% Continuing Ed		% Looking for Work		% Not Looking		Success Rate		Median Salary	
	a	**b**	a	**b**	a	**b**	a	**b**	a	**b**	a	**b**
% among those reporting outcomes	83.3	**87.6**	6.1	**6.7**	9.4	**4.9**	1.2	**0.8**	90.6	**95.1**	$ 54,000	**$ 56,000**
Biology-Health Sciences	36	38	60	62	4	0	0	0	96	100	$ 20,750	$ 33,000
Civil Engineering	83	92	11	8	6	0	0	0	94	100	$ 50,000	$ 51,540
Communication Studies	60	67	13	11	27	22	0	0	73	78	$ 27,000	$ 28,500
Computer Engineering Technology	89	93	0	0	0	0	11	7	100	100	$ 63,000	$ 64,000
Dental Hygiene	86	96	4	1	9	2	1	1	91	98	$ 53,000	$ 57,500
Diagnostic Medical Sonography	97	98	3	2	0	0	0	0	100	100	$ 60,000	$ 60,868
Echocardiography	95	93	0	3	5	3	0	0	95	97	$ 60,500	$ 64,000
Electrical Engineering	87	83	0	10	13	7	0	0	87	93	$ 60,000	$ 60,000
Electronics Engineering Technology	73	82	7	5	20	14	0	0	80	86	$ 54,250	$ 66,750
Embedded Systems Engineering Tech	80	83	0	17	20	0	0	0	80	100	$ 58,250	$ 60,000
EMT/Paramedic	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100	$ 48,000	$ 52,000
Environmental Sciences	67	76	11	18	22	6	0	0	78	94	$ 39,800	$ 40,000
Geomatics: GIS	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100	$ 42,000	$ 42,000
Geomatics: Surveying	69	64	0	9	31	27	0	0	69	77	$ 40,500	$ 43,000
Health Care Management	75	80	25	20	0	0	0	0	100	100	$ 52,000	na
Health Informatics	75	79	10	11	15	11	0	0	85	89	$ 53,000	$ 52,000
Information Technology	84	88	0	2	16	10	0	0	84	90	$ 55,000	$ 55,000
Management: Accounting	78	83	6	6	17	11	0	0	83	89	$ 32,000	$ 32,250
Management: SmBus/Entrepreneursh	77	87	15	13	8	0	0	0	92	100	$ 33,000	$ 40,900
Management: Marketing	82	93	0	0	18	7	0	0	82	93	$ 39,250	$ 48,500
Manufacturing Engineering Technolo	77	85	5	4	13	11	0	0	87	89	$ 62,500	$ 60,000
Mathematics, Applied	60	71	20	29	0	0	20	0	100	100	na	na
Mechanical Engineering	71	82	12	9	10	5	7	4	90	95	$ 60,000	$ 60,000
Mechanical Engineering Technology	86	100	7	0	7	0	0	0	93	100	$ 60,000	$ 62,500
Medical Laboratory Science	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100	$ 53,750	$ 55,000
Nuclear Medicine Technology	87	86	0	3	13	11	0	0	87	89	$ 57,000	$ 57,846
Nursing												
Operations Management	83	83	11	14	6	3	0	0	94	97	$ 63,000	$ 63,000
Polysomnographic Technology	83	100	0	0	17	0	0	0	83	100	$ 50,000	$ 40,500
Population Health Management	na	75	na	25	na	0	na	0	na	100	na	$ 42,000
Psychology, Applied	54	66	24	26	15	5	6	3	85	95	$ 30,000	$ 30,000
Radiologic Science	92	97	1	0	6	3	1	1	94	97	$ 47,000	$ 50,000
Renewable Energy Engineering	76	83	6	8	18	9	0	0	82	91	$ 57,000	$ 56,500
Respiratory Care	97	98	0	0	3	2	0	0	97	98	$ 56,000	$ 56,000
Software Engineering Technology	93	91	0	0	3	7	3	3	97	93	$ 62,250	$ 66,750
Technology and Management	100	88	0	0	0	12	0	0	100	88	na	na
Vascular Technology	92	91	0	0	8	9	0	0	92	91	$ 64,602	$ 62,000

Additional Notes:

Numbers may not add to 100 due to rounding

na=not reported, or not available due to small sample size

METHODOLOGY

Sample Frame 2016: 781 degrees awarded per FAST

Survey Response Rate: 49% Total Knowledge Rate 2016: 75%

Sources: Data collected from a variety of sources. Below, for 2016, in chronological order:

- Grad Fair paper survey
- Faculty senior exit survey
- Career Services survey
- Career Services followup with non-respondents
- Faculty information from their contact with students
- LinkedIn Profiles

Salaries of $2,500 and below and $250,000 and above were deleted.

Students with dual majors are included under each major

Known Outcomes 2016: 587

Known Outcomes 2013/2014/2015 combined N=1008

Known Outcomes 2014/2015/2016 combined N=1244

CURRICULUM MAP

Outcome (PSLO 2): Students with a Bachelor's degree in Communication Studies should be able to display competence in oral, written, and visual communication.

Communication Studies Course	Foundational	Practice	Capstone
COM 104 Intro to Comm			
COM 105 Intro to Comm Theory	F		
COM 106 Intro to Comm Research	F		
COM109 Technology and Comm	F		
COM 115 Intro to Mass Comm			
COM 205 Intercultural Comm			
COM 216 Grammar and Punct	F	P	
COM 225 Interpersonal Comm	F		
COM 226 Nonverbal Comm	F		
COM 237 Intro to Visual Comm	F	P	
COM 248 Digital Media Production	F	P	
COM 255 Communication Ethics			
COM 256 Public Relations	F		
COM 276 Democracy and Media	F		
COM 301 Rhet Theory and Apps.	F	P	
COM 309 Applied Technology		P	
COM 325 Gender and Comm	F		
COM 326 Comm Research		P	C
COM 345 Organizational Comm I		P	
COM 346 Health Comm	F	P	
COM 347 Negotiation and Con Res		P	
COM 348 Facilitation		P	
COM 358 Comm and the Law	F		
COM 365 Elect Comm and Soc	F		
COM 407 SPECIAL TOPICS			
COM 415 Multimedia Presentation		P	C
COM 420 Externship			C
COM 424 Capstone			C
COM 425 Mediation		P	
COM 426 Mediation Practicum		P	
COM 437 Training and Dev		P	
COM 445 Organizational Comm II		P	
COM 446 Leadership and Comm		P	
JOUR 211 Publications: Newspaper		P	
JOUR 311 Advanced Newspaper			C
SPE 314 Argumentation		P	
WRI 328 Technical Journalism		P	
WRI 350 Document Editing		P	
WRI 415 Technical Editing		P	
WRI 420 Document Design		P	C

CURRICULUM MAP

Outcome (PSLO 3): Students with a Bachelor's degree in Communication Studies should be able to apply communication theories.

Communication Studies Course	Foundation	Practice	Capstone
COM 104 Intro to Comm	F		
COM 105 Intro to Comm Theory	F	P	
COM 106 Intro to Comm Research		P	
COM109 Technology and Comm	F		
COM 115 Intro to Mass Comm	F		
COM 205 Intercultural Comm	F		
COM 216 Grammar and Punct			
COM 225 Interpersonal Comm	F		
COM 226 Nonverbal Comm			
COM 237 Intro to Visual Comm	F	P	
COM 248 Digital Media Production	F		
COM 255 Communication Ethics			
COM 256 Public Relations	F		
COM 276 Democracy and Media			
COM 301 Rhet Theory and Apps.	F	P	
COM 309 Applied Technology			
COM 325 Gender and Comm	F		
COM 326 Comm Research		P	
COM 345 Organizational Comm I	F		
COM 346 Health Comm	F		
COM 347 Negotiation and Con Res			
COM 348 Facilitation			
COM 358 Comm and the Law	F		
COM 365 Elect Comm and Soc			
COM 407 SPECIAL TOPICS			
COM 415 Multimedia Presentation			
COM 420 Externship			C
COM 424 Capstone			C
COM 425 Mediation			
COM 426 Mediation Practicum			
COM 437 Training and Dev			
COM 445 Organizational Comm II		P	
COM 446 Leadership and Comm	F		
JOUR 211 Publications: Newspaper			
JOUR 311 Advanced Newspaper			
SPE 314 Argumentation	F		
WRI 328 Technical Journalism			
WRI 350 Document Editing			
WRI 415 Technical Editing			
WRI 420 Document Design			

Theory Application and Analysis
2008-09 Results of Communication Theory Assessment

Performance Criteria	Assessment Method	Measurement Scale	Minimum Acceptable	Results
Consideration of theory and its components	Paper, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	76%
Theory development	Paper, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	N/A
Application of theory	Paper, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	66%
Connections and integration	Paper, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	43%
Use of theoretical language	Paper, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	71%

Theory Application and Analysis
COM 105 – Introduction to Communication Theory
Apply Communication Theories

Performance Criteria	Assessment Method	Measurement Scale	Minimum Acceptable	Results
Consideration of theory and its components	Paper, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	100% (9 of 9)
Theory development	Paper, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	77.7% (7 of 9)
Application of theory	Paper, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	88.8% (8 of 9)
Connections and integration	Paper, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	77.7% (7 of 9)
Use of theoretical language	Paper, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	66.6% (6 of 9)

Oregon TECH

Essential Student Learning Outcome Rubric – Communication

ESLO 1 Communication:
Oregon Tech students will communicate effectively orally and in writing.

Definition
Communication is the creation, development, and expression of ideas. The Communication ESLO differentiates between oral and written communication. The two forms of communication operate much the same but differ in the criterion Style and Delivery because of their differing forms of expression. Both forms of communication involve purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.

Performance Criteria	High Proficiency (4) The work *meets listed requirements* for this criterion; little to no development needed.	Proficiency (3) The work *meets most requirements*; minor development would improve the work.	Some Proficiency (2) The work needs moderate development in *multiple requirements.*	Limited Proficiency (1) The work does not meet this criterion: it needs substantial development in *most requirements.*
Purpose and Audience	• Content serves a specific, identifiable purpose (e.g., inform, persuade, analyze). • Purpose and content are appropriate to the needs of a specific, identifiable, and appropriate audience. • Content is tailored to the level of expertise, authority, and values of the audience. • Communication medium (essay, memo, report, speech, etc.) matches purpose and audience.	Examples: • Purpose may be inferred, but is not clearly stated • Minor changes in approach or medium would make the work more meaningful or useful to the intended audience. • Some content is too advanced/basic for the intended audience.		Examples: • Purpose is unclear, or requires substantial inference from the audience. • Intended audience is unclear or overly broad. • The work would not be meaningful or useful to the intended audience. • The work omits or dismisses key audience concerns.
Focus and Organization	• Content is focused on a specific and appropriate organizing element: a thesis statement, purpose statement, or theme. • Content is organized so that ideas relate clearly to each other and to the organizing element. • Distinctions between major and minor claims are clear, providing consistent focus in content. • Transition language (and other organizing elements, such as headings or lists) throughout organizes ideas and guides audience understanding.	Examples: • Organizing element is present, but needs development (it is too broad, narrow, or trivial). • Minor gaps in organization detract from the effectiveness of the work. • Minor changes in organization would clarify the hierarchy of claims and information. • Minor changes in transition language would improve the work (transitions between key ideas are choppy or abrupt).		Examples: • Organizing element is underdeveloped, inconsistent, or missing. • Order and structure are unclear. • Digressions compromise or obscure the work's purpose. • Transitional elements are underdeveloped, inconsistent, or missing.

Oregon TECH

Essential Student Learning Outcome Rubric – Communication

Performance Criteria	High Proficiency (4) The work *meets listed requirements* for this criterion; little to no development needed.	Proficiency (3) The work *meets most requirements*; minor development would improve the work.	Some Proficiency (2) The work needs moderate development in *multiple requirements.*	Limited Proficiency (1) The work does not meet this criterion: it needs substantial development in *most requirements.*
Support and Documentation	• Claims are consistently supported with appropriate, relevant, and specific evidence, whether drawn from disciplinary knowledge, careful reasoning, or credible research. • Evidence derived from sources supports and develops original content. • Source material is credible; it is introduced and interpreted to provide context. • Source material is documented accurately according to the appropriate conventions (academic citation style or disciplinary approach).	Examples: • The work includes few instances of claims unsupported by appropriate evidence. • Additional or more carefully chosen details would improve the work. • The work includes (but does not rely on) evidence that lacks rigor, based on the audience's or discipline's standards. • Additional context or discussion of credentials for sources of evidence would add value to the work. • The work contains few, minor documentation errors (according to academic citation style or disciplinary approach).		Examples: • The work includes frequent instances of unsupported claims or key missing details. • The work relies on evidence that lacks rigor, based on the audience's or discipline's standards. • The work relies on demonstrably biased evidence (without providing appropriate context or qualification of that evidence). • The work treats sources with bias, or demonstrates incomplete understanding of source material. • The work does not meet academic citation or disciplinary standards.
Style and Conventions	• Students deliver content in spoken, written, or visual forms and media, as appropriate to context. • Use of language (terminology and word choice, sentence structure, etc.) is clear and professional, demonstrating mastery of content and form. • In written form, students demonstrate correct grammar, spelling, syntax, usage, and mechanics. • In oral form, both verbal and nonverbal delivery demonstrate poise, preparation, mastery of material and audience awareness/ engagement.	Examples: • (Where students have a choice in form or medium) a minor change in form or medium would make the work more accessible or engaging to the audience. • Minor changes in terminology, word choice, sentence structure, or tone would improve the work. • Written: the work contains minor, isolated errors in spelling, grammar, syntax, usage, and/or mechanics; an editing pass would improve the work. • Oral: the work contains minor, isolated issues in verbal and/or non-verbal delivery; additional preparation or practice would improve the work.		Examples: • (Where students have a choice in form or medium) the choice or form or medium is inappropriate to audience, purpose, or context. • Terminology, word choice, sentence structure, or tone are not in keeping with professional or academic expectations for the work. • Written: prevalent or distracting spelling, grammar, syntax, usage, and/or mechanics errors compromise the work's impact, credibility, or coherence. • Oral: prevalent or distracting verbal and/or non-verbal delivery issues compromise the work's impact, credibility, or coherence.

Oregon TECH

Essential Student Learning Outcome Rubric – Communication

Performance Criteria	High Proficiency (4) The work *meets listed requirements* for this criterion; little to no development needed.	Proficiency (3) The work *meets most requirements*; minor development would improve the work.	Some Proficiency (2) The work needs moderate development in *multiple requirements.*	Limited Proficiency (1) The work does not meet this criterion: it needs substantial development in *most requirements.*
Visual Communication (where appropriate)	As appropriate to purpose and audience: • High quality visuals are employed to illustrate, contribute to, or develop content, and not for purely aesthetic appeal. • All visuals are appropriately introduced and interpreted. • All visuals are documented according to the appropriate conventions (academic citation style or disciplinary approach).	Examples: • Minor changes in content, organization, or appearance would enhance the visuals in the work. • Additional or more carefully-chosen visuals would improve the work. • Some (but a minority of) visuals in the work serve a purely aesthetic purpose, and relate only tangentially to the work's purpose and content. • Additional context and interpretation of visuals would improve the work. • The work contains few, minor documentation errors of visuals, or the information presented in visual format (according to academic citation style or disciplinary approach).		Examples: • The work includes any visuals that are inappropriate to audience or context. • Necessary visuals are missing from the work. • Most (or all) visuals in the work serve a purely aesthetic purpose, and relate only tangentially to the work's purpose and content. • The work presents most (or all) visuals without context or interpretation. • The work presents most (or all) visuals without documentation (according to academic citation style or disciplinary approach).
Justification (Self-Assessment)	Students: • Articulate a clear rationale for communication choices (purpose and audience, focus and organization, support and documentation, style and conventions, and visual communication). • Self-assess the quality of their work (including process and product). • Elicit and effectively use feedback to improve their work.	Examples: • Student omits evaluation of one ESLO criterion. • Student's self-evaluation would be improved by a more rigorous analysis. • Student's self-evaluation addresses only process, or only product, but does not address both. • A more rigorous approach to eliciting and using feedback would improve the work.		Examples: • Student omits discussion of multiple ESLO criteria. • Student's self-evaluation is cursory, facile, or is compromised by lack of insight (student overlooks obvious deficiencies in the work). • Student demonstrates an inability or unwillingness to elicit or use feedback to improve the work.

Competency in Communication—Written
COM 446 – Communication and Leadership
Used a rubric to assess competence in written communication.

Performance Criteria	Assessment Method	Measurement Scale	Minimum Acceptable	Results
Purpose and Audience	Paper, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	100% (11of 11)
Focus and Organization	Paper, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	81.8% (9 of 11)
Support and Documentation	Paper, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	72.7% (8 of 11)
Style and Conventions	Paper, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	100% (11 of 11)
Visual Communication	Paper, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	100% (10 of 10, 1 N/A)
Justification/Self-Assessment	Paper, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	81.8% (9 of 11)

Competency in Communication—Oral
SPE 314 – Argumentation
Used a Rubric to assess competence in oral communication

Performance Criteria	Assessment Method	Measurement Scale	Minimum Acceptable	Results
Purpose and Audience	Presentation, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	80% (12 of 15)
Focus and Organization	Presentation, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	80% (12 of 15)
Support and Documentation	Presentation, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	80% (12 of 15)
Style and Conventions	Presentation, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	86.6% (13 of 15)
Visual Communication	Presentation, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	73.3% (11 of 15)
Justification/Self-Assessment	Presentation, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	N/A

Competency in Communication—Written and Oral
Students' Overall Communication Competence across the two upper-division courses
Used a rubric to assess competence in written communication

Performance Criteria	Assessment Method	Measurement Scale	Minimum Acceptable	Results
Purpose and Audience	Paper and Presentation, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	88.4% (23 of 26)
Focus and Organization	Paper and Presentation, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	80.7% (21 of 26)
Support and Documentation	Paper and Presentation, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	76.9% (20 of 26)
Style and Conventions	Paper and Presentation, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	92.3% (24 of 26)
Visual Communication	Paper and Presentation, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	84% (21 of 25)
Justification/Self-Assessment	Paper and Presentation, Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	Only required in COM446—discussed previously