Communication Studies Program Assessment Report
2021-2022

Table of Contents

I.   Communication Studies Program Mission and Educational Objectives

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.

B.   Mission Alignment

The Communication Studies degree typically culminates in an externship, offering students a chance to practice their target career with a current professional. Prior to that hands-on experience, Communication courses offer a variety of open-ended projects and opportunities to engage with professional or public communities as objects of study for research (e.g. COM 326: Communication Research) or practice (e.g. COM 425/426: Mediation and Mediation Practicum).

As every student's 36-credit focused sequence (see below) creates a unique degree program, innovation is a regular feature of the curriculum – students' programs of study vary as much as the students themselves. Communication Studies students work with their advisors to identify and take classes from other programs that support their individual career goals.

The Focused Sequence and many of our program's core courses emphasize the university mission's focus on innovation, hands-on experience, scholarship and leadership development.

- Innovation: Students actively craft their own program of study in response to their career goals. Many students come to OIT to craft an expertise that cannot be gained through traditional undergraduate programs (e.g. e-Sports/Live-Streaming Broadcast Expert).
- Hands-On Experience: Students in Communication Studies courses regularly apply their academic knowledge to real-life situations, both as a means to complete homework and as a part of their professional lives outside of school.
- Scholarship: Students in Communication Studies engage with communication and rhetorical theories, both as a means of understanding the discipline and as a product for broader consumption. In COM 326: Communication Research, students submit abstracts of their course projects to a regional conference for presentation in the Spring. OIT regularly sends half a dozen students to this conference each year.
- Leadership: Communication Studies is a field that studies and works to improve group dynamics and leadership strategies. All of our students graduate with a thorough understanding of a variety of effective strategies for managing teams and group projects.

C.   Additional Information

The Communication Studies program fills a niche in the Human and Professional Communication world by offering students the opportunity to design a major particular to their career goals. All students are required to complete 36 credit hours in courses of their choosing, forming a Focused Sequence tailored to their individual professional goals. These courses may come from within the Communication department, but many students enroll in courses from Business, CSET, and Psychology to gain specific technical expertises in addition to the interpersonal communication knowledge and skill they gain in a Communication Studies program.

The diversity of our students' career goals results in a graduate body that does not conform to a single mold. Graduates have pursued careers in law enforcement, education, management and marketing, while others have moved on to Communication-focused graduate programs. Each student is guided by their advisor to craft their focused sequence. The student to full-time faculty ratio in our program (39:11 in Fall 2020) allows students to work closely with their advisor in

planning this Sequence. Moreover, the breadth of experience in the Communication Studies program allows students to find advisors who have knowledge of fields like management, UX, content writing, mediation and journalism.

II.   Program Description and History

The Communication Studies program fills a niche in Communication programs nationally. Rather than focus on content production within a specific medium (e.g. television or radio broadcast) or on the dynamics of interpersonal communication, the Communication Studies B. S. gives students the flexibility to craft their own program of study. Students do gain experience in content production through courses like COM 248: Digital Media Production and COM 309: Communication Technology in Use, and they do gain experience in interpersonal communication through OIT's general education requirements and courses like COM 205: Intercultural Communication and COM 347: Negotiation and Conflict Resolution. However, these experiences are the foundations for students to develop their specific professional interests.

III.   Program History: AY 2014 to Present

The Communication Studies program was revised and approved by the CPC in Winter 2014. All new courses within the major have been rolled out, but many courses in the major are offered once per year or once per two years. As a result, limited PSLO data has been collected in many of these courses. Within the same department, the Professional Writing program was approved in Winter of 2017 and its first courses launched in Winter 2018. Because the programs have quite significant curricular overlap, our assessment this year was conducted jointly.

      A.   Program Locations

All Communication Studies students are located on the Klamath Falls campus, but the department is developing hybrid and online offerings to make the major more appealing to students in other locations. Communication faculty are present on the Klamath Falls campus (9 full-time, 1 single-year contract), the Portland-Metro campus (2) and online (1).

The program serves primarily Communication Studies majors, but also serves students in other fields interested in communication-related course work to complement their chosen major.

      B.   Enrollment and Retention Trends

The Communication Studies program has historically averaged 40 enrolled students each Fall, though along with many other programs, we have about a 1.25% drop in 2021. Many of our students transfer to OIT from other schools or change to a Communication Studies major from another program at OIT (and the general drop in transfer students has affected us). The latter is an attractive option for students who decide not to persist in a program for any reason but want to retain their technical knowledge (and course credits) towards graduation.

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Communication Studies	40	31	44	41	39	34
Full-Time	32	25	32	33	34	27
Part-Time	8	6	11	8	5	7

Table 1: Communication Studies B. S. Enrollment and Retention

      C.   Program Graduates

In AY 2021, 17 students were awarded a B.S. in Communication Studies. Additionally, two students earned the Dispute resolution Certificate. This is a dramatic increase in degree completions after a large drop in graduations/increase in students taking a longer time to graduate during Covid-19 (for reference, only 3 students completed their Communication Studies degree in 2019-2020).

D. Industry Relationships
The Communication department maintains an industry advisory board. The program director communicated informally with this board in 2020-2021 but no meeting was held.

E. Learning Experiences
In April of 2021, two students presented papers at the Northwest Communication Association's annual conference, along with many of their faculty. Their work was presented at the same level as graduate students and faculty from universities across the Pacific Northwest.

F. Program Changes
The Communication Studies major revised the curriculum in response to student input and faculty experience. The courses in the focus sequence—a group of courses designed by the student and their advisor for their career goal—were revised from in-major and out-of-major categories to a single non-specified category to better enable transferability and meet the needs of specific student occupational goals.

The Communication Studies major revised the curriculum to include a writing course as part of the focused sequence in response to feedback from the Communication Studies Advisory Board and a change in university general education writing requirements.

The Communication Department has hired a new faculty member with expertise in interpersonal and relational communication in response to the departure of faculty with that expertise and are currently searching for a faculty member that can contribute in the mass/social media field to address a perceived deficit in that area.

IV. Program Education Objectives and Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)

A. Program Education Objectives
Upon completion of the Communication Studies program, students should be able to:
1. Apply appropriate communication skills across settings, purposes, and audiences.
2. Demonstrate knowledge of communication theory and application.
3. Practice critical thinking to develop innovative and well-founded perspectives related to the students' emphases.
4. Build and maintain healthy and effective relationships.
5. Use technology to communicate effectively in various settings and contexts.
6. Demonstrate appropriate and professional ethical behavior.

B. Program Student Learning Outcomes
Students with a bachelor's degree in Communication Studies should be able to:
1. Demonstrate critical and innovative thinking

2. Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication
3. Apply communication theories
4. Understand opportunities in the field of communication
5. Use current technology related to the communication field
6. Respond effectively to cultural communication differences
7. Communicate ethically
8. Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges
   C. *Origin and External Validation*

The program objectives are reviewed annually by the department and at each advisory board meeting. They are implicitly discussed at each CSAC (Communication Studies Advisory Committee) meeting, occurring twice per academic term, as individual students' programs of study and focused sequences are reviewed.

The Communication department has not yet begun external validation of these outcomes nor assessment of student proficiency after graduation.

V.   Curriculum Map

As the Communication Studies program recruits many non-traditional students, transfer students and students not persisting in other majors at OIT, and because every student's program of study includes 36 credits not necessarily taken within the Communication Studies program (in addition to general education credits and elective credits), a traditional curriculum map is not appropriate for the program.

Beginning in AY 2018, program faculty have been polled occasionally regarding the PSLOs *necessary* to successfully complete a course within the program. For instance, COM PSLO 7: Communicate Ethically is considered necessary in many courses, but that looks different in each context. In COM 326: Communication Research, ethical communication practices often look like an informed consent form for survey-based research and accurate citation practices in the formal report produced from that research. In COM 255: Communication Ethics, ethical communication practices are more likely to involve justification of communicative practices using established ethical theories.

The PSLO map included below is intended as an aid to understand which courses are most likely to demonstrate particular PSLOs. Due to staffing constraints, not all courses are offered every year.

In 2022, the university's ISLOs were mapped to the program ESLOs and can be seen in the top row of the chart as follows. The only ISLO not already covered by Communication ESLOs is Quantitative Literacy.

	ISLO 2: Inquiry and Analysis	ISLO 1: Communication				ISLO 6: Diverse Perspectives	ISLO 3: Ethical Reasoning	ISLO 4: Teamwork	ISLO 5: Quantitative Literacy
Course	COM 1 Demonstrate critical and innovative thinking	COM 2 Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication	COM 3 Apply communication theories	COM 4 Understand opportunities in the field of communication	COM 5 Use current technology related to the communication field	COM 6 Respond effectively to cultural communication differences	COM 7 Communicate ethically	COM 8 Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges	
COM 104: Introduction to Communication		✓		✓					
COM 105: Introduction to Communication Theory						✓			
COM 106: Introduction to Communication Research		✓			✓				✓
COM 109: Introduction to Communication Technology	✓				✓				✓
COM 115: Introduction to Mass	✓	✓					✓	✓	

Course									
Communication									
COM 135: Office Software		✓			✓				✓
COM 205: Intercultural Communication						✓	✓		
COM 216: Essentials of Grammar and Punctuation		✓							
COM 225: Interpersonal Communication		✓	✓			✓	✓		
COM 237: Introduction to Visual Communication	✓	✓							
COM 248: Digital Media Production		✓			✓			✓	
COM 255: Communication Ethics							✓		
COM 276: Democracy and Media	✓	✓	✓			✓			
COM 301: Rhetorical Theory and	✓	✓	✓			✓			

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Application									
COM 305: Contemporary Rhetorical Theory	✓	✓	✓			✓			
COM 309: Communication Technology in Use	✓		✓	✓	✓				
COM 325: Gender and Communication	✓					✓			
COM 326: Communication Research	✓		✓				✓		✓
COM 345: Organizational Communication I			✓			✓	✓		
COM 347: Negotiation and Conflict Resolution			✓	✓		✓			
COM 358: Communication and the Law			✓			✓			
COM 424: Capstone	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
JOUR 211: Publication / Student Newspaper		✓		✓				✓	

SPE 314: Argument ation	✓	✓	✓			✓			

Table 2: PSLOs mapped by course

VI.   Assessment Cycle of Student Learning Outcomes

The Communication department collects artifacts and faculty statements across several courses offered. While the method loses some power in the amount of data collected, it does allow for wide-spread data collection and comparison within an individual program.

This method is especially appropriate for the Communication Studies program, as many of our students progress through core program courses in a different sequence from that listed in the OIT Catalog—whether that is due to transferring in with several upper- and lower-level courses satisfied, changing majors mid-career at OIT *after* taking some core courses as general education requirements or simply taking courses out of the listed sequence due to scheduling needs. As a result, what may be a "foundational" course in a PSLO (e.g. COM 109: Introduction to Communication Technology, offered each Spring) might be taken after an "intermediate" or "reinforcing" course in that same PSLO (e.g. COM 248: Digital Media Production, offered each Winter).

Formal assessment is limited to a small number of courses. Informal assessment (through department meeting discussions, curricular group discussions, and regular exchanges on the department's MS Teams site) is less limited and frequently results in changes on a shorter timeline.

	2020-2021	*2021-2022*	*2022-2023*	*2023-2024*
COM 1: Demonstrate critical and innovative thinking	✓			✓
COM 2: Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication		✓		
COM 3: Apply communication theories	✓			✓
COM 4: Understand opportunities in the field of communication			✓	
COM 5: Use current technology related to the communication field			✓	
COM 6: Respond effectively to cultural communication differences				
COM 7: Communicate ethically	✓			✓
COM 8: Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges		✓		

Table 3: Assessment Cycle for PSLOs

Table 1: PSLO Assessment Cycle

VII.   Summary of 2021-2022 Assessment Activities

Due to the resignation of all faculty who had previously conducted program assessments, no assessment data was collected during the 2021-2022 school year. After the installation of a new department chair, a retrospective analysis of several programmatic courses was conducted during Fall 2022, made possible by the retention of student materials on Canvas.

Fortunately, a clear assessment plan was left by the departed assessment coordinator that allowed us to assess Communication Studies outcomes, Professional Writing Outcomes, and ISLO outcomes at the same time through appropriate outcomes alignment. For this reason, where one course was assessed for both Professional Writing and Communication Studies, that analysis will be repeated between both reports.

All retrospective reports have been included in their entirety as attachments to this report (see appendices A through I) though some were lightly redacted to remove individual student names.

VIII.   Assessment Data Summary

Performance Criteria	Assessment Methods	Performance Target	Results	Met?
COM PSLO 2, (Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication) /ISLO1- Communication	JOUR 211 Instructor Reflection	>80% on assessed assignments	Averages of 80% or higher on all assessed assignments	Yes
COM PSLO 2, (Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication) /ISLO1- Communication	JOUR 211 final grades	>3.0	3.17	Yes
COM PSLO 2, (Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication) /ISLO1- Communication	COM 115 Instructor Questionnaire	70% of students should score above 80% on Discussion Prompt assignments (DP) and Career Research Project (Summative)	Formative – 78.5% (11/14) of students scored above 80%, while 100% of students scored above 70%, for their DP cumulative grade. For participation, 71.4% (10/14) of students scored above 80%, while 92.9% (13/14) of	Yes

			students scored above 70%.	
			Summative – 64.3% (9/14) of students scored above 80%, while 92.9% (13/14) of students scored above 70%, for their career research project.	
COM PSLO 2, (Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication) /ISLO1- Communication	COM 115 final grades	>3.0	3.21	Yes
COM PSLO 2, (Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication) /ISLO1- Communication	SPE 321 Instructor Questionnaire	Majority of students should report positive interactions during 6 required reflections on group work	Majority did report positive interactions	Yes
COM PSLO 2, (Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication) /ISLO1- Communication	SPE 321 final grades	>3.0	3.51	Yes

COM PSLO 2, (Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication) /ISLO1- Communication	WRI 410 Instructor Questionnaire Students completed 7 major course assignments that required competence in oral, written, and visual communication: (1) Audience Analysis, (2) Project Proposal, (3 & 4) RFP Analysis & peer-review draft exchange, (5 &6) Grant Package & peer-review draft exchange, and (7) Oral Presentation. All 7 assignments required intensive writing. The Oral Presentation assignment required oral communication and visual communication. The Grant Package required visual communication in the form of tables and graphics.	Majority of students earn 80% final grade in class	Students performed exceedingly well on the term-long project and the smaller assignments that built to the final grant package. 90% completed the course with an A. 10% completed the course with a B. No one earned below a B in the course.	Yes
COM PSLO 2, (Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication)	WRI 410 Final Grades	>3.0	3.19	Yes

/ISLO1-Communication				
PWR PSLO 4 (Demonstrate professionally-appropriate ethical reasoning, including awareness intellectual property in the creation and management of documents)/ISLO2 – Ethical Reasoning	JOUR 211 Instructor Questionnaire	Qualitative instructor judgement of average performance	Students were able to ethically cite their sources, but not enough data was gathered to assess use of intellectual property	Mixed
PWR PSLO 4 (Demonstrate professionally-appropriate ethical reasoning, including awareness intellectual property in the creation and management of documents)/ISLO2 – Ethical Reasoning	JOUR 211 Final grades	>3.0	3.17	Yes
PWR PSLO 4 (Demonstrate professionally-appropriate ethical reasoning, including awareness intellectual property in the creation and management of documents)/ISLO2 – Ethical Reasoning	WRI 410 Instructor Questionnaire Students completed research using secondary/library sources and primary/client-based resources; they were required to obtain and use information ethically about the audience, severity	Majority of students earn 80% final grade in class	Students performed exceedingly well on the term-long project and the smaller assignments that built to the final grant package. 90% completed the course with an A. 10% completed the course with a B. No one earned	Yes

	of problem/issues in the organization, possible solutions, and populations served by solutions.		below a B in the course.	
PWR PSLO 4 (Demonstrate professionally-appropriate ethical reasoning, including awareness intellectual property in the creation and management of documents)/ISLO2 – Ethical Reasoning	WRI 410 final grades	>3.0	3.19	Yes
PWR PSLO 4 (Demonstrate professionally-appropriate ethical reasoning, including awareness intellectual property in the creation and management of documents)/ISLO2 – Ethical Reasoning	WRI 328 Instructor Questionnaire PWR 4 was assessed through HW 5, "Ethics" in which students did exercises about stylistic choices can have ethical implications (e.g., hiding who pays when there is a price increase or who is at fault when there is a malfunction).	Majority of students passing assignment/instructor discretion.	All students who completed this homework received full credit for it. Students performed better than expected.	Yes

PWR PSLO 4 (Demonstrate professionally-appropriate ethical reasoning, including awareness intellectual property in the creation and management of documents)/ISLO2 – Ethical Reasoning	WRI 328 final grades	>3.0	2.5	No
COM PSLO 8 (Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges)/PWR PSLO 3 (Demonstrate professionally-appropriate practice in working with clients/stakeholders and teammates)/ISLO 5 - Teamwork	WRI 328 PWR 3 was assessed in Analysis & Revision 2, in which students analyzed and revised post-op instructions from Bend surgeon Dr. Andy Higgins. As part of this assignment, they had to write a cover letter to Dr. Higgins as their client, analyze for stakeholder needs (especially patients and families), and revise the document according to those needs.	Majority of students receive 80% or above.	PWR 3: Overall, students performed quite well on the assignment assessing PWR 3. The average grade for this assignment was an 83%. Students performed better than expected.	Yes

COM PSLO 8 (Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges)/PWR PSLO 3 (Demonstrate professionally-appropriate practice in working with clients/stakeholders and teammates)/ISLO 5 - Teamwork	WRI 328 final grades	>3.0	2.5	No
COM PSLO 8 (Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges)/PWR PSLO 3 (Demonstrate professionally-appropriate practice in working with clients/stakeholders and teammates)/ISLO 5 - Teamwork	JOUR 211 Instructor Questionnaire	Qualitative instructor judgement of average performance	Students performed worse than expected on Q&A for beat reports, but as expected on group discussions and interviewing	Mixed
COM PSLO 8 (Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges)/PWR PSLO 3 (Demonstrate professionally-appropriate practice in working	JOUR 211 final grades	>3.0	3.17	Yes

with clients/stakeholders and teammates)/ISLO 5 - Teamwork				
COM PSLO 8 (Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges)/PWR PSLO 3 (Demonstrate professionally-appropriate practice in working with clients/stakeholders and teammates)/ISLO 5 - Teamwork	COM 115 Instructor Questionnaire	70% of students should score above 80% on Discussion Prompt assignments (DP) and Career Research Project (Summative)	Formative – 78.5% (11/14) of students scored above 80%, while 100% of students scored above 70%, for their DP cumulative grade. For participation, 71.4% (10/14) of students scored above 80%, while 92.9% (13/14) of students scored above 70%. Summative – 64.3% (9/14) of students scored above 80%, while 92.9% (13/14) of students scored above 70%, for their career research project.	Yes
COM PSLO 8 (Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges)/PWR PSLO 3	COM 115 final grades	>3.0	3.21	Yes

(Demonstrate professionally-appropriate practice in working with clients/stakeholders and teammates)/ISLO 5 - Teamwork				
COM PSLO 8 (Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges)/PWR PSLO 3 (Demonstrate professionally-appropriate practice in working with clients/stakeholders and teammates)/ISLO 5 - Teamwork	SPE 321 instructor questionnaire	SPE 321 Instructor Questionnaire	Majority of students should report positive interactions during 6 required reflections on group work	Majority did report positive interactions
COM PSLO 8 (Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges)/PWR PSLO 3 (Demonstrate professionally-appropriate practice in working with clients/stakeholders and teammates	SPE 321 final grades	>3.0	3.51	Yes

)/ISLO 5 - Teamwork				
All Communication Studies PSLOs	Exit Survey	All students rate themselves as at least a the level of "proficiency" in all outcomes	Majority of students rate themselves as "High Proficiency" in all outcomes; minority selected "Proficiency"; no one selected "Some" or "limited"	Yes
Student Satisfaction	Exit Survey	100% positive student comments	Students were constructive but some pointed comments were made about the quantity/challenge of the writing required in the degree, as well as the lack of faculty and the need to hire more faculty	No
Graduation Rate	University Dashboard	6-year rate >50%	50%	Yes
Retention	University Dashboard	1-year rate >75%	75%	Yes
COM (all) DFWI rate	University Dashboard	All program <12%	8%	Yes
COM DFWI (major only)	University Dashboard	All program <12%	8%	Yes
COM DFWI (gen ed only)	University Dashboard	All program <12%	7.7%	Yes

SPE DFWI (all)	University Dashboard	All program <12%	5.4%	Yes
COM and SPE DFWI	University Dashboard	All program <12%	6.3%	Yes
COM and SPE DFWI equity gaps	University Dashboard	No equity gaps	International students: 18.4 % DFWI rate, compared to 6.6% DFWI rate for White domestic students. Men: 8.0% DFWI rate, compared to 4.8% DFWI rate for Women.	No

IX. DFWI Tables for COM and SPE prefixes including gen ed:

FIRST_GENERATION	DFWI	TOTAL	% DFWI
First Generation	26	417	6.3%
Not First Generation	47	792	6.1%
Unknown	37	605	6.7%
Total	**110**	**1,814**	**6.3%**

GENDER	DFWI	TOTAL	% DFWI
Female	44	952	4.8%
Male	66	862	8.0%
Total	**110**	**1,814**	**6.3%**

RACE	DFWI	TOTAL	% DFWI
African American	3	33	9.1%
American Indian	1	22	4.8%
Asian	4	107	3.9%
Hawaii/Pacific Islander	0	15	0.0%
Hispanic	7	247	3.0%
International	7	38	18.4%
Two or More Races	9	93	9.8%
Unknown	1	24	4.3%
White	78	1,235	6.6%
Total	**110**	**1,814**	**6.3%**

PELL	DFWI	TOTAL	% DFWI
No Pell Awarded	72	1,319	5.8%
Pell Awarded	38	495	7.7%
Total	**110**	**1,814**	**6.3%**

X.   Action Plan

The chair recommends the following action plan for the Communication Studies program.

1. Address data gathered from student exit survey
   a. Action: hire more faculty to provide consistent staffing for classes and consistent advising
   b. Action: hire new faculty to develop a writing center to provide outside-of-class tutoring and supplemental instruction in writing, to ensure the successful transition of Communication Studies graduates to the expectations of college writing
   c. Implement TILT transparent assignment design in Communication Studies courses

2. Address equity gaps detected through DFWI dashboard.

   A cursory analysis suggests a big gap our program is not addressing is success for international students in speech and communication classes. A smaller but notable gap is that the DFWI rate for men is approximately twice that of women.

   a. Action: hire new faculty to develop a speech center to provide outside-of-class tutoring and supplemental instruction in speech and communication.

b. Action: work with Advising and Retention to assess current availability of supplemental instruction and barriers to students using it.
c. Action: continue to invest in Open Academic Resources to reduce the cost of attendance for our writing classes, to increase equity for all groups.
d. Action: conduct equity assessment of COM classes with specific focus on international students, as well as analyze how gender stereotypes or other factors may affect the performance of men in communication courses

XI.   Closing the Loop

The main action item from the 2020-2021 assessment report was to hire more faculty, because Communication Studies faculty were so overloaded as to be barely able to complete that report. While we hired three non-tenure track department faculty in Summer 2022, including one Communication Studies faculty member, this has only let us maintain our current level of courses. We are currently searching for a tenure-track Communication Studies faculty member this fall. But closing the data-driven feedback loop that suggests we need more people to be able to do the work of the department can only happen if we are granted the resources to accomplish that goal.

Appendix A

COM 115 – Fall 2021
- COM 2: Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication
- COM 8: Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges

1.   What assignment or activity in your course was used to assess any of the PSLOs listed for the course?

For COM 115 (Introduction to Mass Communication) two assignments, two formative and one summative, were used to assess COM 2 (display competence in oral, written, and visual communication) and COM 8 (demonstrate positive group communication exchanges).

Formative Assessment – Every other class period, students completed the discussion prompt (DP) assignment before attending class. The DP asks students to form in writing a brief prompt (usually one paragraph) for their peers to respond to. The prompt needed to tie in information focused on that class period's content; however, students were encouraged and often pulled in ideas from previous class periods, information from other classes (inside and outside of the communication studies curriculum), and current events. After forming their DP before attending class, during class they would verbally paraphrase the question to their peers. The student prompting their peers would answer question(s), if necessary, to clarify what their peers are being asked to do/respond to. At times, DP's would include a visual component (although not required for the assignment) which the student would then need to explain (the instructor would display the visual). Finally, student-to-student and student-to-instructor discussions would develop from the initial DP given to the group. Depending on the DP, either a think-pair-share, small group, or whole class discussions were conducted (COM 8). Finally, students completed self-assessment participation evaluations and were evaluated by the instructor during the mid-point and end of the term their participation. This assessment focused on their communication interactions during the class discussion day.

Summative Assessment – The final project for the class included a career research project. This project included the student researching a career in the mass communication industry. The students then prepared a brief written report and classroom presentation (which was required to use a technology visual aid such as PowerPoint; COM 2). After each block of similar presentations, the class would conduct a panel question and answer session. Finally, students workshopped together to identify a potential career path in the mass communication industry they have inside knowledge about through their project along with learning more about a career they did not know about it before.

2.   How did students perform on it? You can gather specific numbers out of Canvas, or you can provide a detailed, text description here.

Formative – 78.5% (11/14) of students scored above 80%, while 100% of students scored above 70%, for their DP cumulative grade. For participation, 71.4% (10/14) of students scored above 80%, while 92.9% (13/14) of students scored above 70%.

Summative – 64.3% (9/14) of students scored above 80%, while 92.9% (13/14) of students scored above 70%, for their career research project.

3.   Overall, did the class perform better than, worse than or as expected on this assignment or activity?

Overall, students performed as expected for these assignments. Notably, this was my first term teaching at Oregon Tech and my expectations changed throughout the term and has since then.

4.   Based on this experience, will you change anything about the assignment or activity the next time you teach the course? (or that you have potentially already changed for this year's class…)

Students did perform as expected; however, some notable changes have been made since the Fall 2021.

Formative (DP) – I believe students had a different connotative meaning to the term "prompt" in the discussion prompt than I intended. At the beginning of Fall 2021, the student's DPs were framed as statements or examples of concepts. When the DP was expressed to the rest of the class, the receivers were left wondering "what should I do with this?" or "how do I respond to this?" (abbreviated quotes from participation self-evaluations, informal office hours conversations, and formal end of term teaching evaluations). I have since changed change the assignment to 'discussion question' (DQ). This simple change has clarified my expectations for the students, improved the quality of written work, and orally delivered prompting stimulating classroom discussion. Finally, I have addressed their ability to write about the content (content knowledge) and pre-load their peers with information to better understand and respond/engage with their ideas (stimulate discussion) in the below rubric for assessing the written portion of the assignment.

Discussion Question Rubric

	Very Good (A; 95%)	Good (B; 85%)	Satisfactory (C; 75%)	Unsatisfactory (D; 65%)
Content Knowledge	Questions display an excellent understanding of the required reading(s) and underlying concepts including correct use of terminology.	Questions display a good understanding of the required reading(s) and underlying concepts including correct use of terminology.	Questions display a limited understanding of the required reading(s) and underlying concepts including correct use of terminology.	Questions display little or no understanding of the required reading(s) and underlying concepts.
Stimulate Discussion	Questions empower discussion; questions	Questions actively encourage discussion;	Questions passively create discussion; questions	Questions provide little or no discussion; questions

	educate and orient the receiver to aid in their response.	questions include enough information to educate and orient the receiver to aid in their response.	include limited information to educate and orient the receiver to aid in their response.	include little to no information that will educate or orient the receiver to aid in their response.

Formative (participation) – Like the DP, I quickly learned students and I had different meanings for terms. During the mid-term participation self-evaluation mass majority (more than 75%) of students cited attending class as justification for earning an A (+90%) for participation. By definition, participation is "the action of taking part in something." The students conceptualized their passive engagement of 'butt in seat' time to be the same as participation, which did not match my own. Thus, I have since clearly explained and defined participation for the students. Additionally, I have broken the rubric into three sections (level of engagement, quality of contributions, and listening) to more strategically measure the types of participation I am looking for.

Participation Rubric

	Very Good (A; 95%)	Good (B; 85%)	Satisfactory (C; 75%)	Unsatisfactory (D; 65%)
Level of Engagement	The student proactively contributes to class by offering ideas and/or asking questions more than once per class.	The student proactively contributes to class by offering ideas and/or asking questions once per class.	The student makes a few contributions to class discussion by offering ideas and/or asking questions in every other class.	The student does not contribute on their own and requires direct contact to solicit a response.
Quality of Contributions	Contributions are always insightful/constructive and use appropriate terminology. Comments are balanced between general impressions/opinions and specific/thoughtful criticism or contributions.	Contributions are mostly insightful/constructive and use appropriate terminology. Occasionally contributions are too general or not relevant to the discussion.	Contributions are sometimes constructive, with occasional signs of insight. Appropriate terminology is rarely used and/or contributions are not	Contributions are uninformative and lack appropriate terminology. Contributions rely heavily on opinion and/or are not relevant.

			always relevant.	
Listening	The student listens attentively when others are talking and provides contributions that build on others' remarks	The student is mostly attentive when others are talking and/or mostly provides contributions that build on others' remarks.	The student is often inattentive. Occasionally makes disruptive while others are speaking and/or provides contributions that are not relevant to others' remarks.	The student does not listen to others/does not pay attention while others are speaking, detracts or distracts from discussion (e.g., sleeps, on electronic devices)

Summative (Career Research Project) – COM 115 is offered every Fall; I am teaching it for the second time as of forming this report. I am not making significant changes to the overall project or how it is assessed (as I have done in the other two assignments). Looking back on the student's grades, the summative project being the lowest assignment of students earning less than 80%, procrastination I believe to be the culprit. I believe that because looking at the references in students who scored below 80% benchmark reports and presentations were all published or retrieved a few days (one student the day before) before the deadline. Thus, this term I have implemented the students generating a list of three (3) mass media professions they are interested in learning more about and then meeting with me one-on-one to discuss. From this minor change, I believe I can identify the procrastinator students early on and motivate them before it is too late. One idea I am still wrestling with is, at least for the Fall term, how to handle two weeks back-to-back being away from the students. The National Communication Association annual conference is always the week before Thanksgiving break; thus, I am physically away from the students for two weeks and then we come back for a week or two before finals week.

Appendix B

COM 2: Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication.
JOUR 211, Winter 2022

Overview
Journalism 211 is an introductory class. The students write 5 articles of differing genres, which are provided initial feedback before being evaluated in the Final Portfolio. For the Final Portfolio, students choose their best and second-best writings, revise them according to feedback, and reflect in writing on their choices for revision. The students also present 2 short speeches, called "beat reports," to share topics they are investigating for class discussion. They also provide written feedback to another student for each of the 5 articles and the rough draft of the portfolio reflection.

There were 16 students enrolled in the class in Winter 2022, **11 Communication Studies (BCOM)** majors and 5 (BPWR) Professional Writing majors.

1. What assignment or activity in your course was used to assess any of the PSLOs listed for the course?
   a. The 5 articles demonstrated written and visual communication. The grading criteria were lede, newsworthiness, content, and style, and they mostly concern written communication. Visual communication is part of content and is graded largely on participation rather than ability. I focus on the article in the Final Portfolio that the students chose as their best work.
   b. The Final Portfolio Reflection demonstrated written and visual communication on a mostly metacognitive level. The grading criteria were focus, examples, explanation, and style, and I focus on example and explanation where the metacognition is most evident.
   c. The 2 beat reports demonstrated oral communication. The grading criteria were newsworthiness, style, and Q&A (question and answer session).
2. How did students perform on it? You can gather specific numbers out of Canvas, or you can provide a detailed text description here.
   a. Students performed quite well on the article they chose as their best for the Final Portfolio. The 11 BCOM students averaged above 80% for all four criteria, above 90% for lede and newsworthiness.
   b. Students performed quite well on the reflection on their best article for the Final Portfolio. The 11 BCOM averaged 90% for examples and 89% for explanation.
   c. Students performed quite well on the beat reports, fulfilling nearly 100% for all criteria. However, the assignment was worth few points and so was graded largely on participation, which means it does not indicate much for oral communication.
3. Overall, did the class perform better than, worse than, or as expected on this assignment or activity?
   a. Students performed as expected on the best article in the Final Portfolio. With the opportunity for revision based on feedback from both other students and the instructor, it should be expected for them to score quite high. However, that they scored lowest on content, an 85% average is

worth noting, especially since content is the only score that even partially evaluates visual communication.
   b. Students performed better than expected on the reflection for the Final Portfolio.
   c. Students performed as expected on beat reports.
4. Based on this experience, will you change anything about the assignment or activity the next time you teach the course?
   a. The portfolio-evaluated best article assignment, in conjunction with the variety of articles the students write during the term, demonstrates effective development for students in written and visual communication. However, visual communication deserves more attention in the future, including **a criterion dedicated purely to visual communication.**
   b. The reflection assignment in the Final Portfolio demonstrates effective development for students in metacognitive aspects of written and visual communication, except that it should **dedicate more attention to visual communication as in 4a.**
   c. The beat reports serve their purpose as an informal opportunity to share story ideas. However, JOUR 211 needs a more demanding assignment for oral communication. Similar to how articles build to the Final Portfolio, it would be useful to have a beat-report-related speech. In the future, I will **assign a longer, formal speech for the end of the term.**

Appendix C

<u>COM 8: Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges.</u>
JOUR 211, Winter 2022

Overview
Journalism 211 is an introductory class. The students write 5 articles of differing genres, which are provided initial feedback before being evaluated in the Final Portfolio. For the Final Portfolio, students choose their best and second-best writings, revise them according to feedback, and reflect in writing on their choices for revision. The students also present 2 short speeches, called "beat reports," to share topics they are investigating for class discussion. They also provide written feedback to another student for each of the 5 articles and the rough draft of the portfolio reflection.

There were 16 students enrolled in the class in Winter 2022, **11 Communication Studies (BCOM) majors** and 5 (BPWR) Professional Writing majors.

1. What assignment or activity in your course was used to assess any of the PSLOs listed for the course?
    a. The 2 beat reports demonstrated group communication exchanges with question and answer sessions which were graded with their own criterion (in addition to criteria of newsworthiness and style).
    b. There were a variety of small group activities in class, but they we not graded and so will be assessed only anecdotally.
2. How did students perform on it? You can gather specific numbers out of Canvas, or you can provide a detailed text description here.
    a. Students received 100% on the Q&A criterion for their beat reports. It was a small assignment for few points, so it was graded largely on participation. Anecdotally, I had to coax them to ask questions a great deal, so generally they performed poorly.
    b. Anecdotally, students performed well in small group discussions, reporting out useful observations and insights to the class.
3. Overall, did the class perform better than, worse than, or as expected on this assignment or activity?
    a. Anecdotally, students performed worse than expected on Q&A for beat reports. However, from a participation perspective they did what was required of them.
    b. Anecdotally, students performed as expected in small group discussions.
4. Based on this experience, will you change anything about the assignment or activity the next time you teach the course?
    a. For the beat report assignment I will **provide more structure for the Q&A sessions**, including points for assigned respondents.
    b. There is **no need to change the format of small group discussions.**
    c. In the future, it may be useful to assess group communicative exchanges in SPE 314: Argumentation where the student are assigned a collaborative panel presentation. However, it would also be useful to determine a 100- or 200-level course for group communication to get more of a baseline.

PWR 3: Demonstrate professionally-appropriate practice in working with clients/stakeholders and teammates.
JOUR 211, Winter 2022

Overview
Journalism 211 is an introductory class. The students write 5 articles of differing genres, which are provided initial feedback before being evaluated in the Final Portfolio. For the Final Portfolio, students choose their best and second-best writings, revise them according to feedback, and reflect in writing on their choices for revision. The students also present 2 short speeches, called "beat reports," to share topics they are investigating for class discussion. They also provide written feedback to another student for each of the 5 articles and the rough draft of the portfolio reflection.

There were 16 students enrolled in the class in Winter 2022, 11 Communication Studies (BCOM) majors and **5 (BPWR) Professional Writing majors.**

1. What assignment or activity in your course was used to assess any of the PSLOs listed for the course?
   a. For all of the 5 assigned articles students need to conduct at least short interviews, which would provide the closest approximation for client/stakeholders.
   b. There were a variety of small group activities in class, but they we not graded and so will be assessed only anecdotally.
2. How did students perform on it? You can gather specific numbers out of Canvas, or you can provide a detailed, text description here.
   a. There is not specific criterion for professionally-appropriate practice in interviewing. Anecdotally, on the textual level, I can see that students were conscientious in how they presented those that they interviewed. In some instances, where interviewees wished to remain anonymous, their wishes were followed.
   b. Anecdotally, students performed well in small group discussions, reporting out useful observations and insights to the class.
3. Overall, did the class perform better than, worse than, or as expected on this assignment or activity?
   a. Anecdotally, students performed as expected with interviewing.
   b. Anecdotally, students performed as expected in small group discussions.
4. Based on this experience, will you change anything about the assignment or activity the next time you teach the course?
   a. Generally, the interviewing skills are one of the real benefits students report unsolicited on JOUR 211 course evaluations. I do wonder if there might be a way to evaluate those skills beyond the articles themselves. It may be worthwhile to have the students reflect on their process for one or more of the interviews and evaluate their awareness of that process.
   b. There is **no need to change the format of small group discussions.**
   c. In the future, it may be useful to assess group communicative exchanges in SPE 314: Argumentation where the student are assigned a collaborative

panel presentation. However, it would also be useful to determine a 100-or 200-level course for group communication to get more of a baseline.

Appendix E

<u>PWR 4: Demonstrate professionally-appropriate ethical reasoning, including awareness of intellectual property in the creation and management of documents.</u>
JOUR 211, Winter 2022

Overview
Journalism 211 is an introductory class. The students write 5 articles of differing genres, which are provided initial feedback before being evaluated in the Final Portfolio. For the Final Portfolio, students choose their best and second-best writings, revise them according to feedback, and reflect in writing on their choices for revision. The students also present 2 short speeches, called "beat reports," to share topics they are investigating for class discussion. They also provide written feedback to another student for each of the 5 articles and the rough draft of the portfolio reflection.

There were 16 students enrolled in the class in Winter 2022, 16 Communication Studies (BCOM) majors and **5 (BPWR) Professional Writing majors.**

1. What assignment or activity in your course was used to assess any of the PSLOs listed for the course?
   a. Article 3: Hard News required students to gather information from a professional news article in addition to the 3 short interviews they conducted. Doing so required them to effectively cite a professional journalist. The articles were graded on lede, newsworthiness, content, and style, with content being the criterion that included—as a part—the use of sources.
   b. All the articles had a visual component, but that component was typically satisfied by photos the students took themselves. However, sometimes they would use images they found on the internet.
2. How did students perform on it? You can gather specific numbers out of Canvas, or you can provide a detailed, text description here.
   a. For the initial hand-in draft of Article 3, 2 students received "check+" (exceptional) for content, and 3 students received "check" (satisfactory). One student chose Article 3 as her best article in the Final Portfolio, and she received a 100% for content. Two students chose Article 3 as their second-best article, and they each received 80% for content. Once again, the content criterion is not solely the citation of a professional journalist, but it may provide some indication.
   b. The amount of images taken from the internet were negligible, offering little indication of performance.
3. Overall, did the class perform better than, worse than, or as expected on this assignment or activity?
   a. Students performed as expected on citing professional sources. All the content scores on Article 3 were satisfactory or higher (in the case of initial drafts), and 80% or higher (in the case of final drafts). Anecdotally, I find that students are quite successful at citing their professional sources.
   b. Not enough internet images were used to indicate performance.

4. Based on this experience, will you change anything about the assignment or activity the next time you teach the course?
    a. Student ability with citing professional sources is quite good. However, it would be useful to require citation of a professional source on an additional article to further reinforce the skill.
    b. The next time that I teach the course I will have at least one assignment that requires all students to use an image from the internet to further develop their awareness of intellectual property.

Appendix F

SPE 321 Assessment

1.   What assignment or activity in your course was used to assess any of the PSLOs listed for the course?

Students are expected to reflect and report on group interactions during group meetings 6 times during the course. They also complete an end of term evaluation of their fellow team members.

2.   How did students perform on it? You can gather specific numbers out of Canvas, or you can provide a detailed, text description here.

Overwhelmingly, students report positive interactions within their groups. In the rare instance when there is conflict or clashing styles, students are encouraged to follow a course of action that will address and mitigate the problem. The syllabus includes this: *"Any problems/friction should be dealt with early. Please contact me, sooner rather than later, if you are having any issues with your group or partners"*

3.   Overall, did the class perform better than, worse than or as expected on this assignment or activity?

I expect positive interactions, students are often surprised. It is not uncommon to have students say their experience working with their small group, was much better and more satisfying than they anticipated.

4.   Based on this experience, will you change anything about the assignment or activity the next time you teach the course? (or what have you potentially already changed for this year's class…)

I am pretty happy with the course design but every term I make small changes to improve the student experience.

Below are some comments from the final evaluations.

#1) XXX was always so supportive and kept all of us on track.
#2) XXX brought a lot of really good ideas to the group and always followed through.
#3) XXX also brought a lot of good ideas to the group but she would arrive late the meetings. But she did let us know when she was running late.

1 XXX provided lots of stress relief and worked hard when he was needed to.

#2 XXX was always willing to go the extra mile to get the assignments done and took it upon herself multiple times to do the tedious paperwork for the group
#3 XXX was very caring and always wanted us to do more and didn't let his personal ideals conflict with what the group wanted to accomplish

#4 XXX really wanted us to do magnet fishing and let us know every meeting. This is an ongoing joke from our meetings. On a real note, when XXX was needed to put in valuable input, he never failed us and always contributed what and how he felt about an issue.
#5 XXX was very helpful with always providing his insights and opinions. I really appreciated his laid back manner to approaching how to work in a group.

1 XXX was involved in the meetings but was a source of distraction at times. Helped make decisions and had good ideas. Enjoyable company. Provided resources during project day.
#2 XXX was late to several meetings and didn't have too many ideas of his own, but contributed to group discussions thoroughly. Was tech savvy and helped provide some unique solutions and ideas. Enjoyable company.
#3 XXX was a very effective leader during meetings especially her own. Sparked a lot of discussions and took on the role of writing things down for the group on her own. Was not motivated on project day itself, but not a hindrance. Enjoyable Company
#4 XXX was not at many of the classes so some time was spent relaying important info. During meetings he wasn't the most talkative but did contribute to discussions effectively. Was one of the most focused during meetings. Contributed well to project day.

#5 XXX spent the most amount of time and effort outside of meetings making our project work as well as it did through communications on facebook. Had a lot of knowledge and spent the most time scouting sites for our project. Felt the most committed to the project and helped motivate and be a leader when it was necessary.

#1 XXX was the main one who wrote out our responses to group things. She would write down our thoughts and then later type them out to submit them.

#2 XXX was the main one who gave the group their first big push towards the project. He found all the possible sites for where we could do our project and had us each go out and investigate a site ourselves.

#3 XXX always brought great ideas to the group. He seemed to be the most determined on the project day and wanted to keep on going for more and more. He was a great motivator to all of us.

#4 XXX was always willing to help anyone with anything they needed. He was occasionally late to meetings but always caught up quick and brought some smart ideas to the group.

#5 XXX was always the funny one of the group. He kept everyone's spirits lifted when we were having struggles, and still was a very useful in adding his thoughts and ideas to help better the

project.

#1 XXX was very willing to help any way he could. He offered to contact the school for permission we needed. He was quick to respond in the group chat and was always flexible and willing to meet when was convenient for the group.
#2 XXX brought many ideas to the group and was always trying to do more for the group. He was able to help out in many ways. He got amazing pictures for the group and was a great motivator helping us push forward.
#3 XXX compiled the facts we used in our map. He was a positive group member.

1 XXX was an excellent member and always showed up to everything with a positive attitude and energy. He did however miss one meeting but he was also sick which was understandable. Upon return, XXXS made sure to catch up on all he missed
#2 XXX went above and beyond for our group. She scheduled a meeting with Erin Foley to discuss if our project was possible and through XXX's meeting, we gained permission to take our project forward. She was overall a great group member that was always positive.

#3 XXX was a solid group member and would always bring a positive mindset when present.

I feel like I contributed a lot to the group and how we actually went about completing our goals. I provided a majority of the logistics and information about the sites and what it would take to make our goal a reality. I don't feel like I should be rated better than any of my other members though because we all contributed our part to make something awesome happen.

XXX went completely above and beyond in collecting networking information, ensuring that our project was on track and keeping us all together. She was so helpful and I think we owe her the success that the project had.

The one person that stood out to me was XXX. She was always the one pushing to keep things moving. She was so dedicated to this project and never missed a meeting or ignored someone over messages. She was the one making sure everything was getting worked on and that the project would get done. She checked in with everyone to make sure everyone had an opportunity to speak during group meetings. She wanted everyone to feel like they were involved and contributing something. She made sure everyone knew what they were doing. She asked lots of questions and really wanted to project to turn out right.
I can't speak highly enough about XXX. If you are giving extra credit based on these comments, I think she deserves it.

1 XXX was always willing to go one step above on every single task. She never worried about the amount of work she put on herself and she was always the one offering the take the burden of anything that needed to get done. She sold all of our birdhouses, by herself, at her place of work.

#2 XXX was always coming up with new ideas or creative ways we should go about fixing a problem. He was always available whenever for a group meeting and had good communication throughout every week. He was also the one that came up with the laser idea and did those on the weekend with XXX.

#3 XXX was a great leader role in our group, she was always okay with writing down notes for the group meeting and always wanted to make sure we met up and had good communication with everybody. She was the one that offered to go meet with Home Depot and got the donations we needed to make the birdhouses.

#4 XXX was very valuable in doing whatever tasks needed to be done. She was always very present during our meetings and also had great organization which helped keep everyone on track. XXX worked on the bird pamphlet that went inside the birdhouses and also offered to go and talk to the student involvement before we switched projects with XXX and I.

#5 XXX was a valuable teammate member, as he was very technical and knew exactly what needed to be done in a realistic manner. He was the one that came up with our birdhouse designs and instructed our whole group on how to build them all in one day. If it wasn't for XXX, we would have never been able to pull of making so many birdhouses in a short amount of time.

#6 XXX was always willing to do what needed to be done and didn't wait until the last minute to do something. She always made sure that we were all on the same page, either regarding the presentations, group reports, or shared documents, she made sure everyone was included. XXX was also the one that let us all work at her house to build all the birdhouses and let us use all her tools, without her the project could not have been possible.

Appendix G

WRI 328 Assessment Summary Submitted by Kari Lundgren

What assignment or activity in your course was used to assess any of the PSLOs listed for the course?

PWR 3 was assessed in Analysis & Revision 2, in which students analyzed and revised post-op instructions from Bend surgeon Dr. Andy Higgins. As part of this assignment, they had to write a cover letter to Dr. Higgins as their client, analyze for stakeholder needs (especially patients and families), and revise the document according to those needs.

PWR 4 was assessed through HW 5, "Ethics" in which students did exercises about stylistic choices can have ethical implications (e.g., hiding who pays when there is a price increase or who is at fault when there is a malfunction).

How did students perform on it? You can gather specific numbers out of Canvas, or you can provide a detailed, text description here.

PWR 3: Overall, students performed quite well on the assignment assessing PWR 3. The average grade for this assignment was an 83%.

PWR 4: All students who completed this homework received full credit for it.

Overall, did the class perform better than, worse than or as expected on this assignment or activity?

PWR 3: Overall, the class performed better than expected on this assignment.

PWR 4: Overall, the class performed as expected on this assignment.

4.   Based on this experience, will you change anything about the assignment or activity the next time you teach the course? (or that you have potentially already changed for this year's class...)

PWR 3: I don't think there's anything I'd change.

PWR 4: The selected homework assignment did not go into as much detail on some aspects of this PSLO as would be desirable. In the future, I might design a more tailored assignment to assess this outcome.

Appendix H

WRI 410 Grant and Proposal Writing
Program Assignment Audit 2022 Review

Faculty Member: Susan Rauch

These are the programmatic outcomes assessed:

COM 2: Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication

COM 8: Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges

PWR 3: Demonstrate professionally-appropriate practice in working with clients/stakeholders and teammates

PWR 4: Demonstrate professionally-appropriate ethical reasoning, including awareness intellectual property in the creation and management of documents

I'm looking for an email response addressing the reflection questions below.

What assignment or activity in your course was used to assess any of the PSLOs listed for the course?

I chose the Grant Package because it is meets most of the PSLOs listed above and demonstrates students applied understanding of learning outcomes and course concepts. This assignment is a culmination of several scaffolded mini assignments that build into one grant proposal application. The overview of this assignment, which meets all of the above PSLOs includes:

The final grant package is what you would typically submit to the sponsor as "application" for the grant. The grant package consists of four main parts: (1) letter of transmittal; (2) front matter (abstract, executive summary, acknowledgements, and sometimes other pre-proposal content defined by the sponsor); (3) the full grant proposal; and (4) back matter (appendices – often includes References and any supplemental materials to support the ideas/content in the proposal, and sometimes other post-proposal content defined by the sponsor [such as letters of support from partners/stakeholders, IRB documents if human subject research is involved, etc.]). The grant package assignment brings together all of your materials produced in the course (either as informal application of ideas or as formal components in the grant proposal).

How did students perform on it? You can gather specific numbers out of Canvas, or you can provide a detailed, text description here.

250 total possible points, 12 students . This is how students performed for this assignment:

1	95%	A
2	90%	A
3	97%	A
4	0	F
5	99%	A
6	82%	B

7	89%	B
8	95%	A
9	99%	A
10	97%	A
11	91%	A
12	96%	A

Overall, did the class perform better than, worse than or as expected on this assignment or activity?

As expected

Based on this experience, will you change anything about the assignment or activity the next time you teach the course?

I would add more emphasis, instruction, and examples on how to write an Executive Summary v. writing a formal letter of transmittal.

Appendix I

WRI 410 Assessment Summary submitted by Amber Lancaster

1.   What assignment or activity in your course was used to assess any of the PSLOs listed for the course?

·   COM 2: Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication - Students completed 7 major course assignments that required competence in oral, written, and visual communication: (1) Audience Analysis, (2) Project Proposal, (3 & 4) RFP Analysis & peer-review draft exchange, (5 &6) Grant Package & peer-review draft exchange, and (7) Oral Presentation. All 7 assignments required intensive writing. The Oral Presentation assignment required oral communication and visual communication. The Grant Package required visual communication in the form of tables and graphics.

·   COM 8: Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges - Students completed 8 discussion assignments that required positive group communication and 2 peer-review assignments that required positive group (peer-to-peer) communication.

·   PWR 3: Demonstrate professionally-appropriate practice in working with clients/stakeholders and teammates - Students completed a term-long client project (preparing a grant package for a non-profit organization or another workplace organization); some students engaged with their employer and co-workers to integrate the course assignment at their place of employment.

·   PWR 4: Demonstrate professionally-appropriate ethical reasoning, including awareness intellectual property in the creation and management of documents - Students completed research using secondary/library sources and primary/client-based resources; they were required to obtain and use information ethically about the audience, severity of problem/issues in the organization, possible solutions, and populations served by solutions.

2.   How did students perform on it? You can gather specific numbers out of Canvas, or you can provide a detailed, text description here.

Students performed exceedingly well on the term-long project and the smaller assignments that built to the final grant package. 90% completed the course with an A. 10% completed the course with a B. No one earned below a B in the course.

3.   Overall, did the class perform well than, worse than or as expected on this assignment or activity?

The class performed as expected on all assignments and activities.

4.   Based on this experience, will you change anything about the assignment or activity the next time you teach the course?

I will not change the major assignments, but I have decided to adopt an OER textbook and OER materials. This change will require new discussion activities because this course was previously using textbook practices exercises/activities.