**Major Assessment Report Template**

Please either download this document and provide a response to each question in the appropriate section or cut and paste all six questions into a word document and provide a response for each one. E-mail your assessment report(s) to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Melissa Jordine (mjordine@csufresno.edu). Please complete a separate report for each B.A/B.S. and M.A/M.S. program offered by the department.

|  |
| --- |
| **Department and Degree: Communication BA****Assessment Coordinator: Dr. Douglas Fraleigh**1. **What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?** List all program outcomes you assessed (if you assessed an outcome not listed on your department SOAP please indicate explain). Do not describe the measures or benchmarks in this section Also please only describe major assessment activities in this report. No GE assessment was required for the 2016-2017 academic year.

SLO: In 2017-18, Learning Outcome 3.3 (students will be able to explain the role of leadership in group and professional settings) was assessed. |
| 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?** If the assignment (activity, survey, etc.) does not correspond to the activities indicated in the timeline on the SOAP, please indicate why. Please clearly indicate how the assignment/survey is able to measure a specific outcome. If after evaluating the assessment you concluded that the measure was not clearly aligned or did not adequately measure the outcome please discuss this in your report. Please include the benchmark or standard for student performance in your assessment report (if it is stated in your SOAP then this information can just be copied into the report). An example of an expectation or standard would be “On outcome 2.3 we expected at least 80% of students to achieve a score of 3 or above on the rubric.”

 Student papers in Communication 167, Leadership in Groups and Organizations, were assessed. The assignment was a case study of Leadership in Action. Students were required to select a leader of significance, document the leader’s accomplishments as a leader, identify relevant leadership concepts from the textbook and course, and analyze the leader’s leadership style and success as a leader. Twenty-six students submitted papers in this course and all twenty-six were evaluated in this assessment. A rubric (see appendix) was used to measure student proficiency in three categories: explanation of leadership concepts, identification of leadership style, and analysis of the chosen person’s leadership success.  The rubric rated students on the following scale in each category: 4--Accomplished 3--Proficient 2--Developing 1—Beginning It was expected that 75% of the students would achieve an average score of 2.5 or higher (proficient) on the criteria for evaluation.   |
| **3. What did you discover from the data?** Discuss the student performance in relation to your standards or expectations. Be sure to clearly indicate how many students did (or did not) meet the standard for each outcome measured. Where possible, indicate the relative strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the outcome(s). After applying the rubric to the student papers, these were the results:Students scoring accomplished or proficient: 21 (80.7%)Students scoring developing or beginning: 5 (19.3%)Therefore, the goal of 75% of the students achieving a proficient score on the assessment was met.Breaking down the results by each category, these were the scores:Accomplished (3.5-4.0) 4Proficient (2.5-3.49) 17Developing (1.5-2.49) 5Beginning (1.0-1.49) 0 These results show that most students scored in the proficient range (65.3%). Four student papers were exceptionally strong (15.3%), rating accomplished. Five students (19.3%) did not meet the standard for proficiency.With respect to the subcategories, the mean student scores were:Explanation of Leadership Concepts 2.80Identification of Leadership Style 3.30Analysis of Leadership Success 3.02 These data indicate that students were particularly strong at identifying the leadership style of the person they selected. They also scored well on analysis of leadership success, and they were less effective at explaining leadership concepts. The following is an analysis of comments provided along with the scores, enabling the identification of factors that made a difference between papers that met the standard and those that did not. **Explanation of Leadership Concepts**Papers that scored accomplished or proficient in this category included references to leadership concepts in the textbook and provided a definition and/or explanation of the concept. Several of the top papers went beyond the textbook and cited additional scholarly sources to build up their analysis. The papers provided examples of the concept or principle.  Papers that scored in the developing or beginning range in this category referred to leadership concepts at a very general level, without sufficient explanation or examples to support the analysis. Some of the papers failed to cite sources; others did not document their sources fully. There were sources listed on the references page that were not cited anywhere in the paper. Some of the cited sources were not scholarly.**Identification of Leadership Style** Papers scoring in the top two levels of this category effectively defined and explained the leadership style(s) that they used to character the leader in their paper. They were able to provide examples of the leader’s communications and actions that related the leadership style they had selected. Several of these papers identified more than one leadership style that their leader had employed and were able to provide examples of each. Papers that scored in the lower two levels provided too much general background or biographical information about their leader at the expense of specific information related to their leadership. They may not have identified a specific leadership style or they provided their own descriptors of a leadership style that were vague and did not seem connected to course concepts. They did not provide sufficient examples of how their leader employed the leadership style identified and many of the examples that were provided did not relate to leadership. For example, papers noted that a leader was philanthropic without noting any leadership efforts with respect to that philanthropic organization or noted achievements not inherently related to leadership, such as exceptional individual statistics in professional sports. In some cases, the person selected would be better classified as a hero rather than a leader.**Analysis of Leadership Success**Top papers were able to link the leadership concepts they cited to specific actions by the leader they had chosen. They went point by point, identifying a course concept relating to leadership and then providing an analysis of how their leader had adhered to the leadership principle they had identified. Specific examples were provided.  Papers rating developing or beginning often contained little theoretical material that could be applied to determine success. If theoretical material was included, it was not linked well to actions taken by their leader. Accomplishments that were cited were not related to leadership principles. |
| **4. What changes did you make as a result of the data?** Describe how the information from the assessment activity was reviewed and what action was taken based on the analysis of the assessment data. Because 80.7% of the papers were rated proficient or accomplished, the departmental goal was met. Consequently, no major changes are warranted. The results of this outcomes assessment have been shared with faculty members who are teaching the Communication 167 course, so they can have information about reasons why some students are facing challenges in understanding and applying course concepts or have been struggling to apply the concepts to assess real-world leadership examples. |
| **5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2018-2019 AY?** List the outcomes and measures or assessment activities you will use to evaluate them. These activities should be the same as those indicated on your current SOAP timeline; if they are not please explain.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. The department has been meeting regularly to implement the action items noted by the program review and SOAP outcome revisions are one element of this discussion. When the department reaches a consensus, the first outcomes scheduled for assessment under the revised learning outcomes will be evaluated in 2018-19. |
| **6. What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?** Please provide a brief description of progress made on each item listed in the action plan. If no progress has been made on an action item, simply state “no progress.”Our program review action plan was instituted in spring 2018. The department has been regularly meeting to discuss the implementation of the action plan and has not yet reached a consensus on the departmental vision and the implementation of that vision with respect to learning outcomes. The department will continue to work on achieving that consensus.**Additional Guidelines:** If you have not fully described the assignment then please attach a copy of the questions or assignment guidelines. If you are using a rubric and did not fully describe this rubric (or the criteria being used) than please attach a copy of the rubric. If you administered a survey please consider attaching a copy of the survey so that the Learning Assessment Team (LAT) can review the questions.**Rubric Applied to Assess Student Papers in Communication 167****Explanation of Leadership Concepts****4.** The paper provided a detailed discussion of multiple leadership concepts. Scholarly sources were cited to document the concepts and the paper explained the concepts effectively. Examples were used to illustrate the concepts.**3.** The paper provided a clear explanation of one or more leadership concepts. Concepts from the course textbook were cited and explained well. The definition of the concept(s) were accurate and clear.**2.** The paper noted leadership concept(s). An effort to explain the concept(s) was made. The explanation was plausible, but not fully accurate.**1.** The paper either failed to note leadership concepts or noted concepts that were developed on an ad hoc basis and not related to course concepts or the course textbook.**Identification of Leadership Style****4.** The paper clearly defines relevant leadership style(s) and applies that criteria to the leader that has been selected. Examples of their leader’s behavior and communication are used to warrant the leadership style classification that has been selected.**3.** The paper identifies relevant leadership style(s) and provides a reasonable explanation of how the leader that has been selected meets the criteria for that leadership style.**2.** The paper notes leadership styles and makes an effort to explain how the leader that has been selected utilizes that leadership style.**1.** The paper fails to identify a recognized leadership style and/or provides minimal analysis of how the leadership style that has been identified relates to the leader that the author has selected.**Analysis of Leadership Success****4.** The paper provides a thorough analysis of how a leader’s communication and behaviors meet the criteria for quality leadership. Specific examples that relate to the author’s claims are presented and documented.**3.** The paper provides a plausible explanation of how the leader’s communication and behaviors meet the criteria for quality leadership. Evidence is provided that support the author’s claims.**2.** The paper includes an explanation to support the claim that the leader’s communication and behaviors meet the criteria for quality leadership. The explanation is plausible but does not clearly relate to the course concepts relating to quality leadership. **1.** The paper does not relate the leader’s communication and behaviors to criteria for quality leadership. |