<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course SLOs 1 and ctu.unitid = 724</th>
<th>Assessment Methods &amp; Standard and Target for Success / Tasks</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Action &amp; Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECC: COMS 1 - Public Speaking - SLO #1</td>
<td><strong>Assessment Method Description:</strong> This narrative was distributed to the faculty assigned to conduct the assessment. Please pick an assignment in your class in the second half of the semester in which students have the option to use: 1. A Thesis 2. An Organizational Pattern 3. Credible Sources 4. Audience-based VA(s) 5. A Citation Page NOTE: The assignment need not REQUIRE a VA. However, students should have the option to use one (or not use one) at their own discretion. You, as the evaluator, will judge whether &quot;using or not using a VA&quot; was the correct, most effective choice. Randomly pick one of your speaking days for the assignment, and complete the rubric, rating at least (but no more than) 12 student presentations. (Also, be sure to complete the page which totals the ratings.) When finished, please give the forms to Jason Davidson, no later than 8am, Monday, December 1, 2014. NOTE: You are to fill out the forms anonymously, but make sure to hand them to Jason in person, so he can mark you off the list. All data will be kept strictly confidential. So, please be as objective as possible. Additionally, note that your ratings can never (and will never) be used in regards to salary or hiring decisions. In fact, after the data have been collected and totaled, your forms will be destroyed.</td>
<td>03/09/2015 - 17 faculty assessed 204 students on their preparation and delivery of one speech. Results indicate that students scored higher on &quot;Clear thesis&quot; (102 students) and &quot;Logical main points.&quot; (109 students). This is clearly an area of strength. Results indicate that students scored lower on &quot;Credible sources&quot; (82 students), &quot;Visual aid&quot; (86 students), and &quot;Citation page&quot; (71 students). This is an area of moderate weakness with potential for growth.</td>
<td>08/20/2015 - COMS-1 instructors should consider meeting to discuss assignments which stress the credibility of sources and effective use of visual aids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</strong> 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</td>
<td><strong>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</strong> 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</td>
<td><strong>Faculty Assessment Leader:</strong> Jason Davidson</td>
<td><strong>Action Category:</strong> Teaching Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input Date:</strong> 05/15/2014</td>
<td><strong>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</strong> All full- and part-time faculty teaching COMS 1 in Fall 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course SLO Status:</strong> Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rate each element for each student presentation with one of the following:
A = Exceptional (In the top 10% I’ve encountered in this course) In other words, “This element would receive a 90% or higher in my course.”
B = Above Average (In the top 20% I’ve encountered, but not extraordinary) In other words, “This element would receive an 80-89% in my course.”
C = Average (Adequate. Not bad. Not great. It was done.) In other words, “This element would receive a 70-79% in my course.”
D = Needed Work (Attempt was made, but needed refinement/alterations.) In other words,
ECC: COMS 11 - Organizational Communications - SLO #1 Theories of Organizational Communication - Upon completion of the course, students should be able to understand and explain theories of organizational communication.

**Course SLO Assessment Cycle:**
2014-15 (Fall 2014)

**Input Date:**
12/04/2013

**Course SLO Status:**
Active

**Assessment Method Description:**
Students took a pre-test and a post-test of 50 questions regarding theories of organizational communication.

**Assessment Method:**
Exam/Test/Quiz

**Standard and Target for Success:**
A score of 50-59% is considered Below Fair
A score of 60-69% is considered Fair
A score of 70-79% is considered Good
A score of 80-89% is considered Excellent
A score of 90-100% is considered Exceptional

It is expected that 80% of students will score 80% or above on this SLO which is considered an Excellent understanding of theories in organizational communication.

It is expected that 85% of students will score 75% or above on this SLO assessment

---

**ECC: COMS 22abcd - Forensics-Individual Events - SLO #1 Demonstrating Competitiveness**
- Upon completion of the course, students should be able to demonstrate competitiveness, at the junior-division level, in one or more individual Forensics event.

**Course SLO Assessment Cycle:**
2014-15 (Fall 2014)

**Input Date:**
12/02/2013

**Course SLO Status:**
Active

**Assessment Method Description:**
SLO will be assessed by faculty evaluation of written work and by performance.

**Assessment Method:**
Presentation/Skill Demonstration

**Standard and Target for Success:**
Standard for success: a minimum of 70% of students achieve the outcome.

**Related Documents:**
COMS 22 SLO #1 Rubric.docx

04/17/2014 - DATA
18 students participated. Of those, all 18 scored 90% in two of the three components tested, and 70% scored 90% in the third. All 18 students met the standard of 70% or better.

**ANALYSIS**
Entry into this course is by audition. Because it is a repeatable course, to even enroll, a student must be at a level that is ready for competition; therefore, it is impossible that any student would score below “fair” (70-80%) in any category, and few would score as low as “good.” Additionally, since the course is being assessed in the Spring semester, and the forensics

04/17/2017 - Assess in the fall to determine if objective is achieved the first time the course is taken.

**Action Category:**
SLO/PLO Assessment Process

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</th>
<th>2014-15 (Fall 2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input Date:</td>
<td>12/02/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course SLO Status:</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Method Description:**
Students, in multiple sections of COMS 3, answered a quiz containing 10 questions on the basic communication theories related to group membership. 5 questions related to theories of group membership and 5 questions were critical thinking questions related to logic and group-decision making.

**Assessment Method:**
Exam/Test/Quiz

**Standard and Target for Success:**
- A score of 50-59% is considered Below Fair
- A score of 60-69% is considered Fair
- A score of 70-79% is considered Average
- A score of 80-89% is considered Above Average
- A score of 90-95% is considered Excellent
- A score of 95% or higher is considered Exceptional

**Results**
- 12/08/2014 - Out of 12 classes that were assessed, three classes met the 70% Average goal for passing the SLO assessment. 9 classes fell short of the expected goal. 3 of the 9 that fell short were in the high 60% range. 5 others were in the low 60% range. One class was at 47%.
- Data analyses show that students scored in the 80% range on questions regarding group membership theory. This result is well above department norm.
- Data analyses show that on average students scored in the 50% range for questions regarding critical thinking and group decision making.
- It is important to note that each faculty used their choice of textbook which may account for the lack of critical thinking taught in class. Students in classes that do focus on critical thinking generally passed or were close to passing the SLO goal.

**Standard Met?**
Yes

**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:**
2013-14 (Spring 2014)

**Faculty Assessment Leader:**
Francesca Bishop

**Related Documents:**
COMS 22 Assessment SLO#1 Spr 14 Data.docx

12/08/2014 - Recommend that all instructors to teach at least one unit on critical thinking and group decision making.

**Action Category:**
Teaching Strategies
### Course SLOs 1 and ctu.unitid = 724

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Methods &amp; Standard and Target for Success / Tasks</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Action &amp; Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Related Documents:**  
SLOforCommunicationsStudies3.pdf
| No | **Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:**  
2014-15 (Fall 2014)
| **Faculty Assessment Leader:**  
Rosemary Swade
| **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**  
Full- and part-time faculty teaching COMS 3
| **Related Documents:**  
COMS 3 SLO TEMPLATE.doc

### ECC: COMS 4 - Argumentation and Debate - SLO #1 Fundamental Concepts of Communication Theories - Upon completion of the course, students will be able to understand and identify fundamental concepts of communication theories that govern argumentation and debate.

#### Course SLO Assessment Cycle:
2014-15 (Fall 2014)

#### Input Date:
02/06/2014

#### Course SLO Status:
Active

#### Assessment Method Description:
Four sections of the Comm 4 course was tested using a multiple choice exam. 116 students were surveyed. They consented to the exam and were not given any preparation or notes. The exam consisted of six questions: Each of the six questions related to one of the four major theories of argumentation covered in the course material. The first two questions corresponded to "Toulmin's theory of argumentation", the third corresponded with "Aristotle's proofs", the fourth corresponded with Hagel's "Dialectic theory", and the fifth and sixth corresponded with the theory behind "trichotomy" (Fact, Value, and Policy debate).

Students were given ten minutes to complete the exam.

#### Assessment Method:
Exam/Test/Quiz

#### Standard and Target for Success:
Since the method I selected was a multiple choice exam, the standard to determine success was pretty straightforward. Each question had four possible answers. While there was one correct answer for each question, the "wrong" answers had varying bits of truth regarding the argumentation theory. Thus, I was able to get a 1-4 level grasp on how well the student understood the concept.

My goal was for no student to score below a 70% on any of the questions.

I expected that 80% of students would score a 70% or higher

The results exceeded my expectations. All students scored a 70% or higher on all six questions. The results demonstrate that the students have a very good grasp of the fundamental concepts.

#### Question Breakdown:
02/04/2015 - All students scored 70% or better thus meeting the minimum requirement for SLO success.

1) POOR <60% CORRECT: 0%, FAIR 60-70% CORRECT: 1%, GOOD 70-80% CORRECT: 9%, EXCELLENT 80-90% CORRECT: 11%, AND EXCEPTIONAL 90-100% CORRECT: 79%

2) POOR <60% CORRECT: 0%, FAIR 60-70% CORRECT: 0%, GOOD 70-80% CORRECT: 8%, EXCELLENT 80-90% CORRECT: 17%, AND EXCEPTIONAL 90-100% CORRECT: 75%

3) POOR <60% CORRECT: 0%, FAIR 60-70% CORRECT: 0%, GOOD 70-80% CORRECT: 6%, EXCELLENT 80-90% CORRECT: 11%, AND EXCEPTIONAL 90-100% CORRECT: 83%

4) POOR <60% CORRECT: 0%, FAIR 60-70% CORRECT: 1%, GOOD 70-80% CORRECT: 9%, EXCELLENT 80-90% CORRECT: 19%, AND EXCEPTIONAL 90-100% CORRECT: 71%

5) POOR <60% CORRECT: 0%, FAIR 60-70% CORRECT: 0%, GOOD 70-80% CORRECT: 12%, EXCELLENT 80-90% CORRECT: 10%, AND EXCEPTIONAL 90-100% CORRECT: 84%

6) POOR <60% CORRECT: 0%, FAIR 60-70% CORRECT: 0%, GOOD 70-80% CORRECT: 14%, EXCELLENT 80-90% CORRECT: 6%, AND EXCEPTIONAL 90-100% CORRECT: 80%

#### Explanation of the data:
The scale from poor to exceptional relates to each possible answer for individual questions. "Poor" means that the student left the question blank, "Fair" means that the student's answer contained very little correct information, "Good" means that the student's answer was partially correct and missing detail, "Excellent" means that the
Course SLOs 1 and ctu.unitid = 724

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Methods &amp; Standard and Target for Success / Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>surrounding the major argumentation theories. With the large test group, it appears that the students are retaining the correct information pertaining to their course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>student's answer was mostly correct but missed minor details, and &quot;Exceptional&quot; means that the student answered the question completely correct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action &amp; Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As demonstrated by the statistics, no student in all four sections left a question blank. This means that 100% of the students surveyed had a foundational understanding of argumentation. Additionally, the fact that each question had at least 70% of students answer correctly is a positive indicator that this SLO has been satisfied.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengths and weaknesses: The data suggests that students had a strong foundation in the area of public debate theory. The last two questions (5-6) ask students to delineate between two debate theories. The fact that students scored the highest on these questions indicate that instruction in the area of debate theory appears to be adequate. In terms of weaknesses, question #4 had the lowest scoring data. It appears that students need a bit more instruction and explanation in older argumentation concepts since the question tested the students on an ancient Greek argumentation theory.

**Standard Met? :** Yes

**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:**
2014-15 (Fall 2014)

**Faculty Assessment Leader:**
Joseph Evans

**Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**
Francesca Bishop

**Related Documents:**
SLO data breakdown

---

### ECC: COMS 8 - Oral Interpretation of Literature - SLO #1 Interpret Literary Devices - Upon completion of the course, students will be able to interpret and explain genres of literature including poetry, prose, short-story, and drama.

**Course SLO Assessment Cycle:**
2014-15 (Fall 2014)

**Input Date:** 02/06/2014

**Course SLO Status:** Active

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Method Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eight multiple choice questions were given to a class of 19 students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Method:**
Exam/Test/Quiz

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard and Target for Success:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% competency is the goal of the department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/11/2014 - 19 students took the exam and half of the students surveyed either met the department norm or exceeded it. Students did well on 3 questions, moderately well on 2 questions, moderately poorly on 1 question, and poorly on 2 questions. The question they did poorest on concerned poetry and being able to determine the genre. The second to worst question concerned duo and if the nature of duo interpretation is prose, poetry, drama or none in particular.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Met? :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15 (Fall 2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Assessment Leader:**
Rosemary Swade

**Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**
Diana Crossman

**Action Category:**
Teaching Strategies

01/20/2015 - Next semester I plan to incorporate more detail into the discussion of genre. I believe I need more time for examples and I also assumed they already had a basic knowledge of literature. I think I overestimated this.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course SLOs 1 and ctu.unitid = 724</th>
<th>Assessment Methods &amp; Standard and Target for Success / Tasks</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Action &amp; Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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