# Annual Assessment Report for 2020-2021 AY

Reports completed on assessment activities carried out during the 2020-2021 AY will be due September 30th 2021 and must be e-mailed to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Douglas Fraleigh (douglasf@csufresno.edu).

Provide detailed responses for each of the following questions within this word document. Please do NOT insert an index or add formatting. For purposes of this report, you should only report on two or three student learning outcomes (department’s choice) 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: B.A.

Assessment Coordinator: Kevin Macy-Ayotte

1. Please list the learning outcomes you assessed this year.
* Goal 2: Students will demonstrate proficiency in the theoretical and methodological developments in communication and rhetorical theory and practice. **Learning Outcome 3. Use methods to test and advance communication theory and analyze rhetorical phenomena.**
* Goal 4: Students will demonstrate competency in personal, narrative, and research writing. **Learning Outcome 2: Utilize an organizational format that effectively develops an intended purpose.**
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.**

In COMM 142 Communication Criticism, students write 2 critique papers, each 1000 words in length; each paper requires them to utilize a different method of rhetorical criticism to analyze a communication artifact (speech, film, tv show, etc.) of their choice. The grading rubric for this assignment includes categories for application of the method and organization of the paper; students can earn 1-10 points in each category on this rubric.

A score of 7 points out of 10 possible in the category of “application of method” or “organization” was considered to demonstrate minimally acceptable proficiency for the learning outcome associated with that category of the assignment rubric.

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. Also indicate your benchmark (e.g. 80% of students will be designated as proficient or higher) and indicate the number of students who met that benchmark.

A score of 7 points out of 10 possible in the category of “application of method” or “organization” was considered demonstrative of minimally acceptable proficiency for the learning outcome associated with that category of the assignment rubric. 17 total students constituted the sample, with 2 separate papers following the same assignment guidelines submitted by each student (i.e., each learning outcome was assessed on each of two assignments for each student in the sample).

For learning outcome 2.3 (application of rhetorical methods), 6 students (35%) showed proficiency on both papers. However, 12 students (71%) demonstrated proficiency on 1 of the 2 papers assessed. Although the ideal is to have students proficient in multiple methods of rhetorical analysis, it is normal for some students to achieve a greater understanding of some methods above others. The number of instances where a given student showed proficiency in one method but not both utilized across the two papers may reflect difficulty with the particular method selected by the student for that paper (or the inappropriateness of the method selected for analysis of the particular artifact selected by the student). Although >70% of the students show proficiency with a method of rhetorical criticism, the analysis of this data shows that more work needs to be done to assess proficiency across multiple methods. Given that 7 different methods of criticism were taught in the course, but the assignments used for this assessment report only asked students to demonstrate knowledge of 2 methods, it is possible that students acquired proficiency in additional methods not covered in this report, suggesting that additional means of assessing proficiency are needed in the future. Alternatively, this data can also be interpreted to suggest that additional instruction and practice with the various methods may be needed to help students learn to use them adequately.

For learning outcome 4.2 (organization), 16 students (94%) showed proficiency on both papers, with all 17 students (100%) demonstrating proficiency on 1 of the 2 papers assessed. Students are clearly succeeding consistently at high levels with this learning outcome.

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

Given the number of methods of criticism taught but not assessed for this report, the seemingly most reasonable change at this point would be to collect more data in the future when assessing this learning outcome, either by including additional sections of the course or additional measures of learning outcome 2.3 to determine how many of the methods taught are being acquired with proficiency by the students.

1. If you recommended any changes in your response to Question 4 in your 2018-19 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.

I did not coordinate the assessment report for the Department of Communication in 2018-19 and I am not aware of any changes recommended as a result of that report.

1. What assessment activities will you be conducting during AY 2021-22?

The assessment activities for 2021-22 will be coordinated with the department’s curriculum committee but have not yet been defined to date.

1. Identify and discuss any major issues identified during your last Program Review and in what ways these issues have or have not been addressed.

No major issues related to outcomes assessment were identified during the last program review, but the department did decide that we want to update the department’s mission, goals (and corresponding learning outcomes), and the undergraduate and graduate curricula. Multiple meetings and discussions have occurred related to these revisions, with progress made on the department mission and goals. Curriculum revisions have been stalled as a result of significant disagreements among the faculty, but we have been working with our dean to address those disagreements so that progress can continue on the revisions to the curriculum.