

Undergraduate Program-Specific Student Learning Outcome Assessment Annual Report – 2020-21 GUIDELINES for the 2020-21 ACADEMIC YEAR

Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning, and Assessment

Updated July 20, 2020

For more information, please contact: Robert E. Smith, Ed.D. Email: <u>rsmith91@esu.edu</u> | Phone: #3080

Undergraduate Program-Specific Student Learning Outcome Assessment Annual Report – 2020-21

I. Program Information

Program/Department: CMSTDepartment Chair:Rob McKenzieDepartment Assessment Coordinator:Rob McKenzieE-mail:mckenzie@esu.eduPhone:3886Department Assessment Coordinator:Rob McKenzieE-mail:mckenzie@esu.eduPhone:3886

II. Program-Specific Student Learning Outcomes (Educational Objectives) Assessed During Last Academic Year

List ALL Program-Specific SLOs first, their direct alignment to University SLOs, and the assessment timeline (annual or bi-annual) for assessing each program SLO.

* Numbers are derived from September 2019 counts.

Program SLO:	UNIVERSITY SLO	TIMELINE for
This class has improved my critical		ASSESSMENT (annual,
thinking skills.	Challenging and	semester, bi-annual, etc.)
	Contemporary	
	undergraduate and	Annual
	graduate curricula that	
	engage and equip	
	students to critically	
	appraise and apply	
	knowledge in their	
	lives and chosen fields	
	of study	

III. Direct Measures Used

Using the table below, list and briefly describe the direct methods used to collect information assessing (If applicable).

Dept. SLO #	Direct Assessment Measure(s) Used	Assessment description (exam, observation, national standardized exam, oral presentation with a rubric, etc.)	Assessment completed by (student, supervisor, faculty, etc.)	When the assessment was administered in the student (internship, 4 th year, 1 st year, etc.)	To which students were assessments administered (all, only a sample, etc.)
This course has improved my critical thinking skills.	Mid-term grades	Mid-term grade distribution part of the course grade is dependent on students' critical thinking skills.	Faculty	1 st /2 nd year for CMST 250 4 th year for CMST 496	All All

CMST 250 Mid-term grade distribution:

- A: 4 students
- B: 9 students
- C: 5 students
- D: 4 students
- E: 7 students

CMST 495 Mid-term grade distribution:

- A: 7 students
- B: 2 students
- C: 0 students
- D: 0 students
- E: 0 students

IV. <u>Indirect</u> Measures Used

Using the table below, list and briefly describe the indirect methods used to collect information assessing (If applicable).

Dept. SLO #	Indirect Assessment Measure(s) Used	Assessment description (Exit and other interviews, focus groups, written surveys, and questionnaires, etc.)	Assessment completed by (student, supervisor, faculty, etc.)	When the assessment was administered in the student program (internship, 4 th year, 1 st year, etc.)	To which students were assessments administered (all, only a sample, etc.)
This course has improved my critical thinking skills	Informal mid-term assessment conducted by the department	Survey Students anonymously responded to the following question via Zoom: "This course has improved my critical thinking skills." A Likert scale was implemented: 1 – Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 – Neutral 4 – Agree 5 – Strongly Agree	Faculty	October 2020 (CMST 250) October 2020 (CMST 495)	All for CMST 250 All for CMST 495

CMST 250 self-report distribution:

Strongly Disagree — 0 Students Disagree — 0 Students Neutral — 0 Students Agree — 16 Students Strongly Agree — 8 students

<u>CMST 495 self-report distribution:</u> Strongly Disagree — 0 Students Disagree — 2 Students Neutral — 1 Student Agree — 3 Students Strongly Agree — 4 Students

V. Student Performance Outcomes

How did the student perform on each assessment, compared to the department/program goal? What is the target/goal/score for each assessment? Then briefly summarize the results.

Assessment number/name	Target/Acceptable score	Number assessed in 2018-2019 (N) 2019-2020 (N)	Number & % meeting target/ Number and % not meeting target
CMST 250/495 grades	CMST 250:	2019-2020: CMST 250:	CMST 250:
gruues	55% of students at a B or above	n = 29	Meeting target: 13/44.8% Not meeting target: 16/55.2%
	CMST 495: 55% of students at a B or above	CMST 495: n = 9	CMST 495: Meeting target: 9/100% Not meeting target: 0/100%

Assessment number/name	Target/Acceptable score	Number assessed in 2018-2019 (N) 2019-2020 (N)	Number & % meeting target/ Number and % not meeting target
CMST 250/495 survey	CMST 250:	2019 – 2020: CMST 250:	CMST:
	90% agree or strongly agree	n = 29	Meeting target: 24/82.7% Not meeting target: 5/17.2%
	CMST 495:		
	90% agree or strongly agree	n = 10	Meeting target: 7/70%
			Not meeting target: 3/30%

VI. Key Findings: Briefly summarize the results of the assessments and how do these compare to the goals you have set?

In my interpretation, we account for the pedagogical difficulties that the current pandemic challenges all of us to overcome.

CMST 250:

Given the mid-term grade distribution, we estimate that students are encountering difficulty in independently meeting the course's critical thinking challenges. We partially attribute the university wide shift in learning modality to this observation. While it appears that students recognize that the course challenges them to critically think (via the survey), many students are not meeting the challenges presented to them (via their mid-term grades).

Despite the pandemic challenges, one might argue that falling 7.3% under target for the survey is acceptable. However, nevertheless, the Department of Communication strive for excellence, meaning that we did not achieve our initial target.

CMST 495:

Given the grade distribution, we estimate that students are aptly prepared to address the course's critical thinking challenges. However, the disparity between the grade distribution and perceptions about the critical thinking challenges the course presents suggests that a few students do not believe they are engaging in critical thought.

Given the low number of students in this course, it is somewhat difficult to interpret what 20% under target means. In addition, the pandemic may have affected student motivation. However, we still believe that 90% should be our target and that we did not achieve this target.

VII. Describe Process Used by Program Faculty to Discuss and Interpret Key Findings

Through what modes were assessment results shared with program faculty? What process was used by program faculty to discuss and interpret the key findings? What hypotheses do program faculty have for why these are the results?

Results will be shared with CMST Faculty in the November department meeting. The process that is used is to ask the instructors how they interpret the results, and then for all members to discuss interpreting the results.

VIII. Changes Made as a Result of the Key Findings / Actions Taken

What changes or actions were taken or are planned for 2020-2021 and in the future in response to your key findings?

The department has yet to meet. However, we of the assessed courses will advance the following actions:

Based on the CMST 250 data, the department will work to better inform students that tutoring help is available to help them as sophomores navigate the writing demands of the course. We estimate that improved student support will increase students' confidence in and perception of the course's critical thinking curriculum.

The instructor for CMST 250 writes: "I will focus more on application of the theories with the hope of getting to 100% strongly agree."

Based on the results of CMST 495, the department will work harder to provide feedback that clearly details how student work, (discussion-based, theoretical, and application-based) relates to critical thinking. We will also strive to challenge students who have advanced their critical thinking skills throughout their studies.

The instructor for CMST 495 writes: "I will try harder to engage students who do not participate in class and who show no evidence of having done the reading. I will emphasize to them that no critical thinking will develop without their taking the initiative and applying themselves."

IX. Adjustments to/Deviation from the Department Assessment Plan

Describe any disparity from the submitted assessment plan and why it occurred.

No adjustments were made.