**Annual Assessment Report for 2018-2019 AY**

Reports completed on assessment activities carried out during the 2018-2019 AY will be due September 30th 2019 and must be e-mailed to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Melissa Jordine (mjordine@mail.fresnostate.edu).

Provide detailed responses for each of the following questions within this word document. Please do NOT insert an index or add formatting. Furthermore, only report on two or three student learning outcomes even if your external accreditor requires you to evaluate four or more outcomes each year. Also be sure to explain or omit specialized or discipline-specific terms.

Department/Program: **Communication** Degree: **BA**

Assessment Coordinator: **Dr. Douglas Fraleigh**

1. Please list the learning outcomes you assessed this year.

Learning Outcome 3.4: Students will be able to use theoretical perspectives to analyze and produce effective public discourse.

1. What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment? **Please describe the assignment and the criteria or rubric used to evaluate the assignment in detail and, if possible, include copies of the assignment and criteria/rubric at the end of this report.**

We used student papers in two sections of Communication 140 (Rhetorical Theory) and one section of Communication 144 (Rhetoric of Terrorism) for this assessment. A total of sixty-five student papers were analyzed, using a rubric that is attached in an appendix at the end of this report.

The Communication 140 assignment required students to “explore the claims of a rhetorical theory covered in the course by applying them to an outside rhetorical situation, event, or text of your choice. Specifically, you will advance an argument that examines the ways in which a specific rhetorical theory can be applied to a concerte event/situation/text found in an external article or rhetorical artifact of your choice.”

The Communication 144 assignment required students to “explore the claims of one of more of the course readings in relation to a terrorist event/situation of your choice. Specifically in this paper you will advance an argument that *examines the ways in which the claims found in one (or more) of the readings can be applied to a real (not fictional) terrorist event or situation discussed in a rhetorical artifact* (speech or newspaper/ magazine/television news story, etc.) of your choice.” Furthermore, “the paper must advance and support an *argument* about the extension of one or more of the readings to the real world.”

**It was expected that 80% of the students or more would achieve a passing score of seven or higher (competent) on a ten-point scale on both the Application of Theory and the Analysis of Artifacts elements of the rubric (see appendix).**

1. What did you learn from your analysis of the data? Please include sample size (how many students were evaluated) and indicate how many students (number or percentage instead of a median or mean) were designated as proficient.

A total of sixty-five students were evaluated. On the category of Application of Theory, the results were as follows:

Excellent (9-10) 43

Competent (7-8) 13

Developing (4-6) 8

Beginning (1-3) 1

**The goal of 80% or more students earning a score of competent or higher was met. 56 out of 65 (86%) students earned a score of seven or higher.**

On the category of Analysis of Artifacts, the results were as follows:

Excellent (9-10) 36

Competent (7-8) 22

Developing (4-6) 7

Beginning (1-3) 0

**The goal of 80% or more students earning a score of competent or higher was met. 58 out of 65 (89.2%) students earned a score of seven or higher.**

The data indicate that the overwhelming majority of students earned a score of competent or higher on both categories, with a majority of students earning scores of excellent. There were somewhat more students excelling on the Application of Theory category than in the Analysis of Artifacts category. It is also noteworthy that all but one of the students whose work did not meet the benchmark earned a score of developing, rather than beginning.

1. What changes, if any, do you recommend based on the assessment data?

No significant changes are warranted, the above data indicate that the students performed very well on both categories of assessment. The results will be shared with the faculty and considered as we work on curricular revisions following our program review.

1. If you recommended any changes in your response to Question 4 in last year’s assessment report, what progress have you made in implementing these changes? If you did not recommend making any changes in last year’s report please write N/A as your answer to this question.

No changes were recommended in our response to Question 4 on last year’s assessment report. 80.7% of the students were evaluated as accomplished or proficient on the learning outcomes assessed. Because many of the students met the 75% benchmark in 2017-18, we increased the goal to 80% in 2018-19.

6. What assessment activities will you be conducting during the next academic year?

The department completed a program review and received final recommendations in Spring 2018. The review team noted the department as “doing excellent work designing and carrying out assessments of existing Learning Outcomes,” and recommended that the department work on the learning outcomes themselves, and coordinate them with the department mission statement and any curriculum revisions that are implemented.

Our department and graduate faculty have been meeting regularly to discuss changes in our curriculum and corresponding learning outcomes in response to our program review. These discussions will culminate in new learning outcomes and a new SOAP plan. The department will conduct the assessment activities that are stipulated in this new plan.

7. What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?

The department held an all-day retreat in Spring 2019 to work on action plan items and has continued to hold regular monthly meetings to continue action plan work. With respect to specific items in the action plan, (1)The department has revised the departmental mission and vision statement. (2)The department has consistently met and worked on curriculum revisions. A new service learning course, Communication 117S, has been approved at the department level and is pending approval at the college level. (3)The department has revised a number of policies of high interest to the faculty, including coordinator appointments, and continues to work on other policy revisions. (4)Diversity. The department has reached a consensus on offering a new upper division major course focusing on diversity and inclusion as part of our curricular revisions. (5)The faculty approved two searches in areas of high need, a tenure-track professor in Communication and Instruction in 2018-19 and a tenure-track Director of Forensics in 2019-20. Both searches were approved by the administration. As curricular revisions are completed, the department will develop a strategic plan for new faculty hires in areas of greatest curricular need. (6)Support for research. The department is establishing a forum where faculty and graduate students can present their research. (7)Revised SOAP. The faculty will revise their SOAP to cohere with the final changes in our undergraduate curriculum. (8)Technology, Facilities, and Space. The department is waiting for the funding and resources needed to make improvements in these areas. (9)The department held a plagiarism workshop with Dr. Ida Jones, and changed the department academic integrity policy. (10)The department is searching for a tenure-track director of forensics. (11)The department held an on campus forensics tournament, bringing community college students and faculty to the university. (12)The department continues to work with the college development committee and development officers to pursue funding opportunities. (13)The faculty met with Matthew Zivot to discuss undergraduate retention rates and has taken student success into account when planning curricular revisions.

**APPENDIX**

***Rubric Used to Evaluate Student Papers***

**Application of Theory**

**9-10 Excellent**

Applies theory correctly to corresponding aspects of rhetorical artifact. Applies theory to artifact with attention to detail and nuance.

**7-8 Competent**

Applies theory correctly to corresponding aspects of rhetorical artifact.

**4-6 Developing**

Applies theory correctly to some aspects of rhetorical artifact, but incorrectly applies some aspects of theory.

**1-3 Beginning**

Fails to apply theory correctly to artifact.

**Analysis of Artifact**

**9-10 Excellent**

Relevant/penetrating questions clarify facts, concepts, and relationships. Questions are insightful and go beyond the obvious. Identifies inconsistency in language, data, images, or symbols and discusses the possible intent and/or consequences in terms of how the information will be interpreted.

**7-8 Competent**

Asks relevant/penetrating questions to clarify concepts and relationships. Recognizes contradictions or inconsistencies in language, data, images, or symbols.

**4-6 Developing**

Questions raised about facts, concepts, or relationships are not thoughtful or are unlikely to provide significant information. Recognizes some contradictions/inconsistencies in language, data, images, or symbols but misses others or fails to recognize inconsistencies within a particular category.

**1-3 Beginning**

Questions are not used to clarify facts, concepts, or generalizations. Fails to detect contradictions and inconsistencies in language, data, images, or symbols.