

Assessment: Course Four Column

FALL 2016



El Camino: Course SLOs (FA) - Communication Studies

ECC: COMS 100 (formerly COMS 1):Public Speaking

| Course SLOs | Assessment Method Description | Results | Actions |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>SLO #1 Prepare and Deliver Speeches</p> <p>- Prepare and deliver speeches that contain informative and/or persuasive components with a clear thesis, logical organization of main points, credible sources, supplemental audience-based visual aids, and a citation page.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Input Date: 05/15/2014</p> <p>Inactive Date:</p> <p>Comments::</p> | <p>Performance - This narrative was distributed to the faculty assigned to conduct the assessment.</p> <p>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</p> <p>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 "using or not using a VA" was the correct, most effective choice.</p> <p>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</p> | <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>17 faculty assessed 204 students on their preparation and delivery of one speech.</p> <p>Results indicate that students scored higher on "Clear thesis" (102 students) and "Logical main points." (109 students). This is clearly an area of strength.</p> <p>Results indicate that students scored lower on "Credible sources" (82 students), "Visual aid" (86 students), and "Citation page" (71 students). This is an area of moderate weakness with potential for growth.</p> <p>(03/09/2015)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO:</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Jason Davidson</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: All full- and part-time faculty teaching COMS 1 in Fall 2014</p> | <p>Action:</p> <p>COMS-1 instructors should consider meeting to discuss assignments which stress the credibility of sources and effective use of visual aids.</p> <p>(08/20/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: We have discussed this action among ourselves within the department, offered ideas on how to share this information with part time faculty and have not yet made a decision on next steps to follow.</p> <p>(11/04/2015)</p> |

| <i>Course SLOs</i> | <i>Assessment Method Description</i> | <i>Results</i> | <i>Actions</i> |
|--------------------|---|----------------|----------------|
| | <p>later than 8am, Monday, December 1, 2014.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <p>Rate each element for each student presentation with one of the following:</p> <p>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."</p> <p>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."</p> <p>C = Average (Adequate. Not bad. Not great. It was done.) In other words, "This element would receive a 70-79% in my course."</p> <p>D = Needed Work (Attempt was made, but needed refinement/alterations.) In other words, "This element would receive a 60-69% in my course."</p> <p>E = Non-Existent In other words,</p> | | |

| Course SLOs | Assessment Method Description | Results | Actions |
|---|---|--|---|
| | <p>"This element would receive a 59% or lower in my course."</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 65% of students will score "Above Average" in each of the categories stipulated by the SLO.</p> <p>Additional Information:</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>COMS 1 SLO 1 Rubric.pdf</p> <p>COMS 1 SLO 1 study data.pdf</p> | | |
| <p>SLO #2 Exhibit Basic Competency in Verbal and Non-verbal Delivery Skills</p> <p>- Exhibit basic competency in both verbal and non-verbal delivery skills.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Input Date: 05/15/2014</p> <p>Inactive Date:</p> <p>Comments::</p> | <p>Performance - Instrument Attached – Given to faculty teaching (12 total) teaching COMS-1 in Fall 2015. 120 students were assessed.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 65% of students will score "Above Average" in each of the categories stipulated by the SLO rubric.</p> <p>Additional Information:</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>SLO 2 Rubric.pdf</p> | <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Results attached. Standard was met. Students scored higher on "Variety in Vocal Pitch & Rate" and "Sufficient Volume & Articulation", but scored lower overall in "Sustained Eye Contact" and "Effective Gestures & Physical Control". (02/05/2016)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO:</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Jason Davidson</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Gary Robertson, Katie Barone, Joseph Evans, Kelly Janke, Anthony Cuomo, Julia Matthews, Larry Leach, Lucretia Wright, Helene Wagner, Katrina Taylor, Minodora Moldoveanu, Elyse Peterson, Fariba Sadeghi-Tabrizi, Daryle Nagano</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>SLO2study.pdf</p> | <p>Action: COMS-1 instructors should consider meeting to discuss assignments which stress the credibility of sources and effective use of visual aids. (08/22/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: Action was discussed in department meeting and will be shared with instructors. (11/13/2017)</p> |
| <p>SLO #3 Reasoning and Evidence -</p> <p>Evaluate speeches for organization, sound reasoning, and verbal and non-verbal delivery skills.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2016-17 (Fall 2016)</p> <p>Input Date: 05/15/2014</p> <p>Inactive Date:</p> | <p>Survey/Focus Group - Students in 10 sections of COMS-100 were asked to attend "Phantasms 3", a lecture on campus, and to rate the speaker in 12 categories regarding content, verbal and nonverbal delivery.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 75 percent of the students will be able to effectively utilize the provided rubric to evaluate the speaker.</p> | <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Fall 2016)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>248 of potentially 320 students were able to effectively evaluate the speaker. Therefore, 77.5% of the students were able to evaluate the speaker. (03/02/2017)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO:</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Jason Davidson</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Fariba Sadeghi-Tabrizi</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> | <p>Action: This SLO needs to be changed. The assessment method was not particularly useful, nor meaningful. The only interesting item from this assessment was the differences between students from Adjunct Faculty sections vs. students from full-time faculty sections.---While students from full-time faculty sections closely</p> |

| <i>Course SLOs</i> | <i>Assessment Method Description</i> | <i>Results</i> | <i>Actions</i> |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Comments:: | Additional Information: | COMS100SLO3.xlsx | <p>agreed on their ratings of the speaker, the students from Adjunct Faculty sections either rated much higher or much lower than the average students from full-time faculty sections. If anything, this assessment revealed less about how well we're helping students achieve this outcome and revealed more regarding the lack of standardization among Adjunct Faculty sections. This SLO statement needs to be revised, preferably with a more effective method of assessment in mind. (03/02/2018)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p> <p>Follow-Up: SLO has been changed. (11/13/2017)</p> |

ECC: COMS 120 (formerly COMS 4):Argumentation and Debate

| Course SLOs | Assessment Method Description | Results | Actions |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>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.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Input Date: 02/06/2014</p> <p>Inactive Date:</p> <p>Comments::</p> | <p>Exam/Test/Quiz - 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).</p> <p>Students were given ten minutes to complete the exam.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: Since the method I selected was a multiple choice exam, the standard to determine success was pretty straight forward. 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.</p> <p>My goal was for no student to score below a 70% on any of the</p> | <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>All students scored 70% or better thus meeting the minimum requirement for SLO success.</p> <p>Question Breakdown:</p> <p>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%</p> <p>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%</p> <p>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%</p> <p>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%</p> <p>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%</p> <p>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%</p> <p>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</p> | <p>Action: Since question #4 demonstrated student weaknesses in ancient argumentation theory, I suggest that teachers spend a bit more time explaining not only the concepts but also how the ancient theories tie into modern theories of argumentation. I personally plan to spend a full week (not just a class) on this concept the next time I teach Comm 4. Additionally, I suggest referencing the ancient argumentation theory when modern theory is discussed or lectured. Thus, students can understand the concepts within the proper contexts. (01/25/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: Recommended action was suggested to faculty who teach the course. (03/03/2017)</p> |

| Course SLOs | Assessment Method Description | Results | Actions |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>questions.</p> <p>I expected that 80% of students would score a 70% or higher</p> <p>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 surrounding the major argumentation theories. With the large test group, it appears that the students are retaining the correct information pertaining to their course.</p> <p>Additional Information:</p> | <p>answer was partially correct and missing detail, "Excellent" means that the student's answer was mostly correct but missed minor details, and "Exceptional" means that the student answered the question completely correct.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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. (02/04/2015)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: Faculty Assessment Leader: Joseph Evans Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Francesca Bishop Related Documents: SLO data breakdown</p> | |
| <p>SLO #2 Basic Ability to Argue Logically - Upon completion of the course, students should be able to demonstrate basic ability to argue logically using sound reasoning and credible evidence that support and defend claims.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Input Date: 12/02/2013</p> | <p>Performance - Students argued in team debate formats. Each student was evaluated based on delivery, logic/reasoning, organization, and refutation.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 70% of students will complete the exercise with a score of 70% or above.</p> <p>Additional Information:</p> | <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met 60 students were evaluated at the completion of the Fall Semester of 2015. Students were provided a partner, a topic, and were obligated to research both sides of that topic. The day of the assessment, students presented either the affirmative or negative side of the topic in a debate. Scores revealed that 48 out of 60 students received a score of 70% or better-or 80 percent of the 60 students received a score of 70 percent or better. The analysis of the</p> | <p>Action: Add course prerequisite to Comms 4 to increase student readiness to take the course. Eligibility for English 1A has been suggested by the department in the past. (01/29/2017) Action Category: Curriculum Changes Follow-Up: Recommended action has been discussed again and suggested to the Dean.</p> |

| <i>Course SLOs</i> | <i>Assessment Method Description</i> | <i>Results</i> | <i>Actions</i> |
|---|---|---|--|
| Inactive Date: Comments:: | | data reveals that we are meeting the goal, but could continue to improve to reach those students who have not met the goal. (01/29/2016) % of Success for this SLO: Faculty Assessment Leader: Mark Crossman Faculty Contributing to Assessment: | (03/03/2017) |
| SLO #3 Basic Competency in Verbal and Non-verbal Delivery Skills - Upon completion of the course, students should be able to exhibit basic competency in both verbal and non-verbal delivery skills. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2016-17 (Fall 2016) Input Date: 12/02/2013 Inactive Date: Comments:: | Presentation/Skill Demonstration - Students in Comms 120 (Argumentation) in the Communication Department were assessed for their verbal and nonverbal delivery skills. At least one section from each of the above courses was selected and students in each class were evaluated while giving a speech or presentation using a common rubric (below). Rubric - students were evaluated for proficiency in the following 6 categories: I - Vocal expressiveness > varying volume, pitch, tone, rate II - Fluency > without vocal fillers (Uhs, ums, like, etc.) III - Facial expressiveness > varying to match content IV - Posture > firm without adaptors (unnecessary/unconscious movements) V - Eye contact > encompassing entire audience VI - Gestures > emblems, illustrators, signposts Grading Rubric 0 = Not assessed/non-existent 1 = Below expectation > 79 or less 2 = Met expectation > 80 - 89% > Target | Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Fall 2016) Standard Met? : Standard Met ____27____ of students scored 2 or 3 (Target or above) on this assessment ____3____ of students scored 1 or 0 (Below Target) on this assessment Data indicates that students were more proficient in Eye contact in terms of nonverbal communication delivery skills. Data indicates that students were generally more proficient in verbal delivery skills. Overall, students' scores in nonverbal delivery skills in courses related to Argumentation and Forensics were lower than other courses. (02/01/2017) % of Success for this SLO: Faculty Assessment Leader: Joseph Evans Faculty Contributing to Assessment: | Action: More opportunities to practice nonverbal delivery skills in Forensics and Argumentation courses. (03/30/2018) Action Category: Teaching Strategies |

| <i>Course SLOs</i> | <i>Assessment Method Description</i> | <i>Results</i> | <i>Actions</i> |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|

3 = Above expectation > 90 - 100%

Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 80% of students will score 80% or higher on this assessment.

Additional Information:

Related Documents:

[FALL 2016 COMS 4 SLO 3.docx](#)

ECC: COMS 140 (formerly COMS 3):Small Group Communication

| <i>Course SLOs</i> | <i>Assessment Method Description</i> | <i>Results</i> | <i>Actions</i> |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>SLO #1 Understanding Basic Communication - Upon completion of the course, students should be able to understand and explain basic communication theories related to group membership.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/02/2013</p> <p>Inactive Date:</p> <p>Comments::</p> | <p>Exam/Test/Quiz - 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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>Additional Information:</p> <p>Related Documents: SLOforCommunicationsStudies3.pdf</p> | <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Not Met</p> <p>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%.</p> <p>Data analyses show that students scored in the 80% range on questions regarding group membership theory. This result is well above department norm.</p> <p>Data analyses show that on average students scored in the 50% range for questions regarding critical thinking and group decision making.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>(12/08/2014)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO:</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Rosemary Swade</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Full- and part-time faculty teaching COMS 3</p> <p>Related Documents: COMS 3 SLO TEMPLATE.doc</p> | <p>Action: Recommend that all instructors to teach at least one unit on critical thinking and group decision making. (12/08/2014)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: We have discussed this action among ourselves within the department, offered ideas on how to share this information with part time faculty and have not yet made a decision on next steps to follow.</p> <p>(10/22/2015)</p> |
| <p>SLO #2 Audience-based Group Projects - Upon completion of the course, students should be able to prepare and participate in delivery of audience-based group projects that include credible research, logical organization, supplemental visual aid/s, and a citation page.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> | <p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration - All, but one, COMS 3 courses were assessed. Faculty graded students' group-presentations using a standard rubric.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 80% of students will</p> | <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>199 students in multiple courses that related to this SLO were assessed.</p> <p>Students' strengths - Data analyses show that all students in all classes either met or exceeded departmental standards and goals (ratings of 4 = Excellent) for preparing an audience-based presentation and were able to find and</p> | <p>Action: Also suggested is that instructors lecture and show examples of appropriate power point slide etiquette and usage. (04/04/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: Faculty teaching this course were advised to provide</p> |

| <i>Course SLOs</i> | <i>Assessment Method Description</i> | <i>Results</i> | <i>Actions</i> |
|--|--|---|---|
| Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Input Date: 12/02/2013 Inactive Date: Comments:: | score 80 or higher on this assessment. Additional Information: | effectively use credible research, as well as, logically organize their material. Students weaknesses – although students scored Above Average (rating 3 = Above Average) for creating and effectively using visual aids and effectively preparing a citation page in APA format, there is room for improvement in these areas. (12/01/2015) % of Success for this SLO: Faculty Assessment Leader: Rosemary Swade Faculty Contributing to Assessment: All part- and full-time faculty teaching the course Related Documents: COMS 3 SLO #2 RESULTS.docx COMS 3 SLO #2 STANDARD RUBRIC.docx TracDat COMS 3 SLO #2 Template_FORM.doc | examples for students. (03/03/2017) <hr/> Action: It is recommended that all instructors lecture APA as a way to introduce it to students as it will be useful for them to become proficient in APA as their academic career continues. It is recommended that this is discussed at a COMS department meeting and if the department agrees we need to share this with our part time instructors. (04/04/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies Follow-Up: Recommended action was discussed in Department meeting and with faculty teaching the course. (03/03/2017) |
| SLO #3 Basic Competency - Upon completion of the course, students should be able to demonstrate basic competency in both verbal and non-verbal delivery skills. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2016-17 (Fall 2016) Input Date: 12/02/2013 Inactive Date: Comments:: | Presentation/Skill Demonstration - 120 Students (from 5 out of 8 sections of COMS140 - 63%) were assessed for this SLO. Students gave a presentation and were assessed for their verbal and nonverbal delivery skills using the rubric below. Rubric: 0 = Not assessed 1 = 79% or less 2 = 80 - 89% > Target 3 = 90% or higher Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 80% of students will score 80% or higher on this assessment Additional Information: | Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Fall 2016) Standard Met? : Standard Met 104 Students, 87% received a 2 (Target) or a 3 (Higher than Target) on their verbal delivery skills. 105 Students, 88% received a 2 (Target) or a 3 (Higher than Target) on their nonverbal delivery skills. 11 Students, 9% received a 1 (Below Target) on both verbal and nonverbal delivery skills. 3 Students, 2.5% received a 0 (Not Assessed) on both verbal and nonverbal delivery skills. The data indicates that the majority of students are performing at a basic competency level for both verbal and nonverbal delivery skills. The data also indicates that students who did not meet the Target scored low on both verbal and nonverbal delivery | Action: Eligibility for English 1A as pre-requisite. (09/14/2017) Action Category: Program/College Support Follow-Up: Recommendation was discussed in Department meetings and the Dean. (03/03/2017) <hr/> Action: Continue with current teaching methods (which are working for the majority of students). Possible discussion in department meeting in regards to tutoring for students who need extra help. (12/13/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies Follow-Up: Providing tutoring has |

| <i>Course SLOs</i> | <i>Assessment Method Description</i> | <i>Results</i> | <i>Actions</i> |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>skills. Important to note that the students with lower grades were non-native English speakers. These students may have benefited from taking English A prior to taking this class. Non-proficiency may lead to high Communication Apprehension or poor understanding of assignments and lower scores.</p> <p>The low percentage does not necessitate a change in teaching methods.</p> <p>(12/13/2016)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO:</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Rosemary Swade</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Julia Mathews</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>COMS 140 SLO 3 FALL 2016.docx</p> | <p>been discussed in Department meetings, but lack of funding is delaying implementation.</p> <p>(03/03/2017)</p> |

ECC: COMS 250 (formerly COMS 8): Oral Interpretation of Literature

| <i>Course SLOs</i> | <i>Assessment Method Description</i> | <i>Results</i> | <i>Actions</i> |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>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.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) Input Date: 02/06/2014 Inactive Date: Comments::</p> | <p>Exam/Test/Quiz - Eight multiple choice questions were given to a class of 19 students. Standard and Target for Success: 70% competency is the goal of the department. Additional Information:</p> | <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) Standard Met? : Standard Not Met 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. (12/11/2014) % of Success for this SLO: Faculty Assessment Leader: Rosemary Swade Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Diana Crossman</p> | <p>Action: 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. (01/20/2015) Action Category: Teaching Strategies Follow-Up: I have incorporated more details into the discussion of genre. (10/25/2015)</p> |
| <p>SLO #2 Prepare and Deliver Performances - Upon completion of the course, students will be able to prepare and deliver performances that clear organization, and audience adaptation.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Input Date: 02/06/2014 Inactive Date: Comments::</p> | <p>Performance - In their final monologue 28 students performed their choice of prose, poetry, or drama. The monologue was evaluated, in part, on the criteria of organization and audience adaptation. Using a 25 point scale, student mastery of organization and audience adaptation was assessed. Standard and Target for Success: It was expected that 75% percent of student would receive a score of 20 or higher. In other words, 75% of students would achieve a grade of B or higher on the assessment. Additional Information:</p> | <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met 23 students achieved a score of 20 or higher. Therefore, 85% percent of students completed the assessment with a B or higher. The data reveals that the vast majority of students in Communication Studies 8 are meeting or exceeding the standard expected for this SLO. (01/31/2016) % of Success for this SLO: Faculty Assessment Leader: Diana Crossman Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</p> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met Data analysis revealed that 80% percent of students achieved 75% or higher on the assessment. This standard exceeds the expected outcome and suggests that students are competent on the second slo standard for the course. (12/07/2015) % of Success for this SLO:</p> | <p>Action: While 80 percent of students did meet the standard for slo 2, 20 percent of students did not. As a consequence, I would recommend that the department provide more opportunities to help remediate lesser achieving students. There has been discussion about the</p> |

| <i>Course SLOs</i> | <i>Assessment Method Description</i> | <i>Results</i> | <i>Actions</i> |
|--|---|--|--|
| | | Faculty Assessment Leader: Diana Crossman Faculty Contributing to Assessment: | development of a tutorial lab for the comm department. I would support the development of this lab. (01/31/2016) Action Category: Program/College Support Follow-Up: Tutorial lab to assist students is still being discussed and recommended. (03/03/2017) |
| SLO #3 Exhibit Basic Performance Competency - Upon completion of the course, students will be able to exhibit basic performance competency in both verbal and non-verbal delivery skills. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2016-17 (Fall 2016) Input Date: 02/06/2014 Inactive Date: Comments:: | Performance - Student's final performance of a comedy duo was assessed. Students were evaluated both on verbal elements (script selection and edits) as well as non verbal elements (eye contact, vocal variety, facial expressions, gestures). Students were evaluated on a ten point scale. Competency was reflected in a score of 8 or higher (effectively a b grade). Nonverbal elements were weighted heavier than verbal elements, though both combined to create the average score out of ten. Standard and Target for Success: It was expected that 80 percent of students would compete the assessment with a score of 8 or higher. Additional Information: | Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Fall 2016) Standard Met? : Standard Met 30 students participated in the assessment. Data gleaned revealed that 26 out of 30 students received a score of 8 or higher on the assessment. This would indicate that roughly 88 percent of all students assessed demonstrated verbal and nonverbal competency. The standard, therefore, was achieved. (12/05/2016) % of Success for this SLO: Faculty Assessment Leader: Diana Davenport Crossman Faculty Contributing to Assessment: | Action: This class did not include a student aid. The current section (Spring of 2017) is utilizing a student aid. Our faculty development emphasis has been in the area of equity development. We have been told that one on one, peer coaching, facilitates equity. I would strongly recommend that we fund and facilitate the utilization of student aids in this course. (03/08/2018) Action Category: Program/College Support |

ECC: COMS 270 (formerly COMS 11):Organizational Communications

| <i>Course SLOs</i> | <i>Assessment Method Description</i> | <i>Results</i> | <i>Actions</i> |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>SLO #1 Theories of Organizational Communication - Upon completion of the course, students should be able to understand and explain theories of organizational communication.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/04/2013</p> <p>Inactive Date:</p> <p>Comments::</p> | <p>Exam/Test/Quiz - Students took a pre-test and a post-test of 50 questions regarding theories of organizational communication.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It is expected that 85% of students will score 75% or above on this SLO assessment</p> <p>Additional Information:</p> | <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>For the pre-test the average was 51.5% and for the post-test the average was 79.3%.</p> <p>The score for 4 students did not change significantly from the pre- to the post-test. This can possibly be attributed to them doing really well on the pre-test and therefore not studying for the post-test.</p> <p>Students were most knowledgeable on classical approaches, human relations approaches and systems approaches.</p> <p>Students were least knowledgeable about constitutive approaches and critical and feminist approaches.</p> <p>Since 90% or more of students were communication studies majors who have completed at least 45 units, I anticipate lower scores in future classes that may not have as many communication studies majors or lower class standing.</p> <p>(12/01/2014)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO:</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Chris Wells</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</p> | <p>Action: In the future more time will be spent on constitutive, critical, and feminist approaches to enhance student knowledge and understanding. (12/01/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: More lecture time as been spent on constitutive, critical, and feminist approaches to enhance student knowledge and understanding. Future assessments will yield data for effectiveness of this strategy. (11/19/2015)</p> |
| <p>SLO #2 Demonstrate Leadership Techniques - Upon completion of the course, students should be able to demonstrate leadership techniques and group processes applicable to organizational contexts.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/04/2013</p> <p>Inactive Date:</p> <p>Comments::</p> | <p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration - 24 Students were assessed. Students worked as dyad teams and presented a strenghts, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis comparing 2 similar organizations.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 80% of students will</p> | <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Not Met</p> <p>4 students scored 100% 2 students scored 90% 3 students scored 85% 2 students scored 80% 2 students scored 75% 5 students scored 70% 2 students scored 65% 1 student scored 60%</p> | <p>Action: Lecture more on organizational theories (05/02/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: More emphasis on organizational theories is being implemented this semester. Future assessments will determine effectiveness. (03/03/2017)</p> |

| <i>Course SLOs</i> | <i>Assessment Method Description</i> | <i>Results</i> | <i>Actions</i> |
|---|---|--|---|
| | score 80% or above. Additional Information: | 3 students scored below 60% Based on the standard and target set for this SLO, 11 students (45%) met the standard and target and 13 students (55%) did not meet the standard and target. Data analysis indicates students strengths were in delivery and presentation while comparing and contrasting the two organizations. Data analysis indicates students weaknesses were in knowledge of leadership theories – specifically in terms of depth (11/19/2015) % of Success for this SLO: Faculty Assessment Leader: Chris Wells Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Related Documents: Copy of COMS 11 SLO 2 RUBRIC.xlsx COMS 11 SLO 2 TracDat Template.docx | |
| SLO #3 Explain Effective Leadership Techniques - Upon completion of the course, students should be able to explain effective leadership techniques in professional and non-profit organizations. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2016-17 (Fall 2016) Input Date: 12/04/2013 Inactive Date: Comments:: | Multiple Assessments - 27 Students took the exams and 26 students delivered a presentation. Students took exams that covered leadership techniques in professional and non-profit organizations. They also prepared and delivered individual presentations on the same material. Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 80% of students will score 80% or higher on this assessment. Additional Information: | Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Fall 2016) Standard Met? : Standard Not Met 44% of students scored 2 (Target) or above on the exams. 96% of students scored 2 (Target) or above on the presentation. 42% of students scored 2 (Target) or above on both exam and presentation section of the assessment. Analysis of the data indicates that students excelled at presenting the course material but did not do as well on the exams relating to the same material. These results may be due to the fact that the questions on the exams are application questions that use theoretical terminology. (11/30/2016) % of Success for this SLO: Faculty Assessment Leader: Rex Wells Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Related Documents: | Action: Have class activities or discussions that foster application of the terminology . Provide in-class study-group opportunities so students work together to learn the course material and theoretical terms. (11/30/2017) Action Category: Teaching Strategies Follow-Up: More in-class activities have been implemented. (11/13/2017) |

| <i>Course SLOs</i> | <i>Assessment Method Description</i> | <i>Results</i> | <i>Actions</i> |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|

[COMS 270 SLO 3 RESULTS.docx](#)