

**Department and Degree:** Media, Communications & Journalism, B.A.

**Assessment Coordinator:** Dr. Tamyra Pierce

## 1. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?

The MCJ department routinely assesses most or all of the learning outcomes within our SOAP and we did so in the 2017-2018AY (see below). However, the MCJ department concentrated much assessment efforts this past year on looking at our Learning Goal 2: Write. The department has been involved in major discussions about writing proficiency (or lack thereof) within the department due to some outcomes that arose in class assessments. In addition, the department has been discussing and working on major curriculum revisions to strengthen our program. In these discussions, we have examined whether to keep or discard our DQE (Department Qualifying Exam). Research has shown recently that qualifying exams are not proficient in determining student success in writing courses or in forecasting writing proficiency. Given this, the department is focusing this year's Assessment Report on the assessment efforts we have done to examine writing learning outcomes and proficiency (SLO 2.1).

**Learning Goal 1. Think** – Students will analyze and evaluate the history, roles, theories and practices of media in the U.S. and globally.

Student Learning Outcome 1.2: Evaluate the mass media's role in society.

Student Learning Outcome 1.3: Explain media theories.

Student Learning Outcome 1.4: Describe mass media business, professional and regulatory practices.

**Learning Goal 2. Write**—Students will acquire oral, written, and visual communication skills with personal quality or style through exposure to language, literature, art, design, and the mass media.

**Student Learning Outcome 2.1:** Demonstrate correct grammar, spelling and punctuation in written materials.

Student Learning Outcome 2.2: Write clearly and concisely in the appropriate media style.

Student Learning Outcome 2.3: Develop written content that is appropriate for specific audiences.

**Learning Goal 3. Produce** – Students will develop, design, and produce communication materials that address specific communication goals for a targeted audience.

Student Learning Outcome 3.1: Create media content that addresses a communication goal.

Student Learning Outcome 3.2: Prepare professional quality communication materials targeted at a specific audience.

\*Again, although our department looked at all of the above learning outcomes through various rubrics and with many course assignments, we concentrated our efforts on “Learning Goal 2: Write” in the 2017-2018AY.

## 2. What instruments did you use to assess the learning outcomes and evaluate the assignment?

The MCJ department has been working diligently to ensure that direct measures are used to assess learning outcomes in all MCJ courses. The following sections will outline the instruments the department used to assess writing competency.

### A. DIRECT MEASURES

- a. MCJ 102W: The instructor for one section of this course used the following assignment to assess 2 writing learning outcomes.
  1. **Assignment:** Social Issue In-Depth Article (final work submitted in the course)
  2. **Learning Outcomes Assessed:**
    - Demonstrate correct grammar, spelling and punctuation in written materials. (SLO 2.1)
    - Write clearly and concisely in the appropriate style. (SLO 2.2)
- b. The instructor for MCJ 124, News Writing, used a rubric to assess different learning outcomes such as a) demonstrating correct grammar, spelling and punctuation, b) writing clearly and concisely in appropriate broadcast style, c) developing written content that is appropriate for specific audiences – including broadcast and social media formats, and d) demonstrating news judgment in deciding which stories should be covered in a newscast and how the stories relate to the world around them. The specific writing learning outcomes addressed by using the rubric included: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 (2.3 was broken down to include 4 items: 1. Write stories that can easily be understood by the ear as well as matches video; 2. Write stories in active tense with a compelling lead; 3. Ensure the script follows proper broadcast formatting; 4. Use reporting skills to critically assess the information given in verbal interviews and written official sources to be able to write a factual and concise story). These categories of writing assessment give us a thorough review of the students' learning of the fundamentals of writing and applying these writing skills to a specific format and for specific audiences. This course is the first of several courses the Broadcast students are required to take and focuses on Broadcast writing. Students should have already taken several lower division writing courses prior to taking 124.
- c. The instructor in MCJ 128, broadcast reporting and production, used a rubric to assess several writing learning outcomes, such as a) demonstrating correct grammar, spelling and punctuation in written materials, b) writing clearly and concisely in the appropriate broadcast style, c) developing written content that is appropriate for specific audiences, d) preparing professional quality communication materials targeted at a specific audience, and e) demonstrating news judgment in deciding which stories should be covered in a newscast (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1 and 3.2). Since MCJ124 is a pre-requisite for 128, we would expect to see higher achievement of learning outcomes within this course.
- d. MCJ 191 is the department's internship course. The coordinator of the MCJ internships (MCJ 191) developed a rubric that incorporates the university's WASC learning outcomes (written

communication skills, oral communication skills, information literacy and critical thinking), as well as other key learning outcomes directly aligned with the MCJ program. At the completion of the student's internship, the professional supervisor evaluates their performance using this rubric. The specific learning outcomes addressed by this rubric are 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2. (\* given that the concentration of this report pertains primarily to writing learning outcomes, only the results for 2.1 will be given). This rubric helps us to understand the students' writing proficiency within a professional setting and not just the regurgitation of material on an exam.

- e. The DQE is the MCJ department's qualifying exam. The department spent a great amount of time this past year assessing if the DQE was necessary and beneficial. After much review, the department has elected to eliminate the DQE and to also make adjustments to pre-requisites and writing courses. Specifically, all MCJ students will now be required to have English 5b and 10 in order to enroll in MCJ 10 (the first writing course required by all MCJ students and that should be taken in their freshman or sophomore year) Prior to ending the DQE, writing competency was assessed using an exam that measures grammar, spelling and punctuation proficiency. Much more discussion and outcomes on this exam will be discussed later. The specific learning outcome addressed by this direct measure is 2.1 and breaks it down into the following sections of writing:

- i. Confused/Misused words
- ii. Verbs
- iii. Modifiers
- iv. Agreement
- v. Plurals/Possessives
- vi. Punctuation
- vii. Spelling

## **B. INDIRECT MEASURES**

The department used several indirect measures to assess other learning outcomes aside from writing but we will not discuss these since our focus is on our assessment of writing.

### **3. What did you discover from these data?**

A. The instructor of 102W used a rubric to assess learning outcomes 2.1 (demonstrating correct grammar, spelling and punctuation) and 2.2 (writing clearly and concisely in the appropriate style). Specifically, there were three criteria within the rubric: 1) sufficient interviews, adequate and accurate information; 2) spelling, grammar and punctuation; and 3) adherence to AP style. Six out of eight students scored excellent or very proficient in the learning outcomes. Two of the eight students only adequately showed proficiency and no students fell below adequate. Given this is the department's writing competency course and the course that is normally taken directly after MCJ 10 (the incoming lower level writing course), it was expected that students would show strong writing skills and the data confirmed this.

- b. The instructor for MCJ 124, News Writing, used a rubric to assess the following learning outcomes 2.1, 2.2, 2.3. The rubric assessed writing within the following categories: 1) Conversational writing; 2) Broadcast formatting; 3) Material in factually correct; 4) Grammar, spelling, punctuation; 5) written text matches the video content. Although this is the first of several courses that Broadcast Journalism students must take, they should have previously taken MCJ 10 and 102W (both writing courses) that should ensure sufficient foundational writing skills. The results showed that 26% scored excellent and showed strong proficiency in writing skills. However, 60% scored well and 10% fell below expectations, scoring only fair and therefore showing the lack of achievement of learning writing skills and specifically, effective script writing. Although the majority of the students did well and reflected strong learning outcomes, those who fell below the expectations also failed to meet the deadline for the assignment and failed to reach out to the instructor for initial feedback prior to the deadline.
- c. The professor of MCJ 128 is an upper-division broadcast reporting course. The assignment used to assess learning outcomes was a final class broadcast package script. Of the 12 students, 11 noted significant improvement in the vocal delivery. The results of the assessment of the assignment showed that 36% achieved success and scored excellent and 36% scored well. These results showed that the majority of the class scored high on being able to effectively: 1) use conversational writing; 2) put the script in the proper broadcast format; 3) present the written material as factually correct; 4) proofread and write without grammatical errors; and 5) write the script to accurately match the video content. However, 27% of the students scored poorly or failed the assignment, reflecting a lack of achievement of the writing learning outcome. As with 124, the biggest weakness was in the students failing to meet deadlines and/or reach out to the instructor for initial feedback prior to the deadline.
- e. Results of the assessment of students enrolled in MCJ191 (internships) found that overall their writing skills, oral communication skills, information literacy and critical thinking skills were strong. The results from spring 2018 found the following:  
Written Communication skills: 67% exceptional, 10% above average and 20% satisfactory. These results were as expected; however, we did not expect 20% to fall below our expectations after completing their internship.  
Oral Communication skills: 44% exceptional, 44% above average and 10% needs improvement.  
Information Literacy (ability to apply core knowledge from within field of study): 67% exceptional, 10% above average and 20% satisfactory.  
Critical Thinking skills: 56% exceptional, 33% above average and 10% satisfactory.

These results reflect that the majority of the students are reflecting the desired learning outcomes in a work environment. Since this course is typically taken at the end of the students' academic careers, we would expect for them to exhibit exceptional or above average written and oral skills, information literacy and critical thinking.

- f. For many years, the department has used the DQE (the departmental qualifying exam) as a requirement for entrance into the department. Students are required to take and pass this exam, showing at least adequate proficiency in the fundamentals of writing. As mentioned above, this exam assesses grammar, word usage and agreement, punctuation and spelling (SLO 2.1). Students, up until this past spring 2018 semester, were required to pass the DQE before enrolling in the

# MCJ Department Assessment Report | 2018

department's writing courses (MCJ 10 and 102W) and most of the major courses. In spring 2018, the department conducted its final DQEs after a department-wide vote. In an effort to examine writing skills thoroughly, this year we broke down the results of each category to see where, if any, students were lacking in writing skills. The following table shows the percentages of correct answers on the DQE from 2015-2018.

**2015-2018 DQE Results by category:** the chart shows the total percentage of correctly answered questions in the following categories.

Category 1: Confusing and misused words

Category 2: Verbs

Category 3: Modifiers

Category 4: Agreement

Category 5: Plural/Possessives

Category 6: Punctuation

Category 7: Spelling

Year	Category1	Category2	Category3	Category4	Category5	Category6	Category7	N
4/2015	86%	86%	85%	75%	80%	71%	80%	47
10/2015	86%	84%	85%	80%	80%	74%	71%	39
4/2016	89%	72%	80%	75%	74%	70%	69%	73
8/2016	89%	88%	91%	71%	71%	70%	64%	27
8/2017	88%	85%	96%	66%	67%	70%	65%	60
10/2017	83%	81%	84%	77%	72%	74%	66%	49
1/2018	84%	80%	89%	80%	75%	74%	70%	27
4/2018	88%	72%	74%	68%	75%	75%	67%	72

By examining the percentage of correct responses in each category of the DQE (departmental qualifying exam) over the years, we can see trends and the specific areas of strength and weaknesses in students' writing skills. From these results, the majority of the students throughout the past three years have shown good proficiency in being able to correctly identify confusing/misused words, verbs, modifiers and agreement. The trend overall also shows that students struggle to identify correct plural/possessives, punctuation and spelling. These results help the MCJ department to understand what areas of instruction we should give more focus. In addition to identifying key weaknesses in writing skills, the results showed that overall scores fell considerably in all but one category (confusing and misused words) in April 2018. This may be just coincidence but it could be due to decreased attendance

in the workshop prior to the exam (approximately 1/3 of the students scheduled for the exam did not attend the workshop) or it may reveal declining writing skills in undergraduates coming into our program. Given that the department has now eliminated the DQE, we are actively seeking new ways to continue to assess writing skills. The Outcome Assessment Coordinator has already initiated discussions with instructors in MCJ 10 and MCJ 102W (both of the department's lower-level writing courses and pre-requisites for other MCJ courses). Starting in fall 2018, we will re-instate our pre/post exams in these courses and will continue to examine all of the categories that were originally on the DQE.

#### **g. Additional Assessment unrelated to Writing Outcomes:**

**1. Alumni Surveys:** The department has not successfully surveyed alumni in recent years due to inaccurate contact information. However, with social media, in spring 2018, we were able to reach out and get 48 alumni to respond to our online alumni survey. Along with assessing various elements of the department (class size, class content, career preparation, advising, etc.), we also began collecting contact information. This is one element of our ongoing outreach efforts.

#### **4. What changes did you make as a result of these findings?**

##### **a. Writing Outcomes**

The results of our assessment of writing skills show that the majority of our MCJ students are achieving and exhibiting the desired learning outcomes and showing acceptable writing skills. However, there is still much we can do to increase writing proficiency. The department will continue to evaluate our rubrics to ensure that we are accurately measuring the desired learning outcomes and all aspects of writing skills (e.g. literacy, critical thinking, grammar and punctuation and the writing formats in different areas of media). The analysis of the DQE scores over the past few years and additional comparative testing to determine if and how DQE scores may predict success in other writing courses was instrumental. Subsequently, the department has elected to discontinue the DQE. MCJ students will now be required enroll in writing classes such as English 5A and 5B prior to taking MCJ 10 and MCJ102W. In addition, students will be required to obtain a permission number in order to enroll in these two classes. The department will also increase its efforts to ensure that students enroll in 10 and 102W during their freshman or sophomore year so that they get crucial writing instruction prior to enrolling in future major courses. The efforts to increase writing proficiency is ongoing and the department will continue to do every possible activity to assess this learning outcome and others. In summer of 2018, the Outcomes Assessment Coordinator met with instructors who will be teaching MCJ10 and 102W in fall 2018. She explained the importance of listing the correct learning outcomes on their syllabi and how to assess these learning outcomes. New rubrics were developed to assist the instructors. In addition, a new pre and post test will be done in the 2018-2019 AYs to further assess writing competency in MCJ 10 and 102W (the courses that are pre-requisites to most all of MCJ courses). We anticipate that these efforts will increase our assessment of writing skills, and especially in lower-level MCJ writing courses.

**b. Overall:** The MCJ department is pleased with the assessment efforts that have been made in recent years and continue to be made. Our assessment efforts help the department to effectively assess the curriculum and program and continue to make changes to improve and strengthen the department.

As a result of the continued assessment efforts, one major change that the MCJ department has made during the 2017-2018AY is to re-evaluate our curriculum and assess writing proficiency. In addition, the department continues to assess the effectiveness of our rubrics that are being used in all MCJ courses in order to make sure that they are accurately and effectively measuring the learning outcomes listed in our SOAP. To evaluate our assessment tools, we continue to examine all of the syllabi used in MCJ courses and the learning outcomes listed. Several years ago, the department learned that many of the MCJ faculty (especially part-time faculty) were not accurately listing the learning outcomes nor assessing whether these learning outcomes were being achieved by our students. As a result of these efforts, all MCJ syllabi now include the proper learning outcomes and instructors are being taught how to effectively construct and use rubrics. Given the extensive changes in curriculum, the department is also re-evaluating our SOAP and the learning outcomes in each course. The department is also in discussion about adding a new category to our SOAP: **Learning Goal 4: Career-Ready**

Student Learning Outcome 4.1: **Critical Thinking/Problem Solving:** Exercise sound reasoning to analyze issues, make decisions, and overcome problems. The individual is able to obtain, interpret, and use knowledge, facts, and data in this process, and may demonstrate originality and inventiveness.

Student Learning Outcome 4.2: **Digital Technology:** Leverage existing digital technologies ethically and efficiently to solve problems, complete tasks, and accomplish goals. The individual demonstrates effective adaptability to new and emerging technologies.

Student Learning Outcome 4.3: **Global/Intercultural Fluency:** Value, respect, and learn from diverse cultures, races, ages, genders, sexual orientations, and religions. The individual demonstrates, openness, inclusiveness, sensitivity, and the ability to interact respectfully with all people and understand individuals' differences.

Student Learning Outcome 4.4: **Professionalism/Work Ethic:** Demonstrate personal accountability and effective work habits, e.g., punctuality, working productively with others, and time workload management, and understand the impact of non-verbal communication on professional work image. The individual demonstrates integrity and ethical behavior, acts responsibly with the interests of the larger community in mind, and is able to learn from his/her mistakes.

Student Learning Outcome 4.5: **Career Management:** Identify and articulate one's skills, strengths, knowledge, and experiences relevant to the position desired and career goals, and identify areas necessary for professional growth. The individual is able to navigate and explore job options, understands and can take the steps necessary to pursue opportunities, and understands how to self-advocate for opportunities in the workplace.

These learning outcomes will be assessed in MCJ capstone courses and will assess the readiness of students for careers in MCJ.



**Critical Thinking:** The department's current SOAP does not include a critical thinking component, and as a result of our recent findings, the department is engaged in discussions and will be adding a critical thinking component to the SOAP. Several of our rubrics also now include critical thinking elements.

**Internship:** The inclusion of the WASC learning outcomes as part of the assessment has proven to be valuable. The internship coordinator continues to examine the rubric that company internship supervisors use to assess students' learning outcomes and progress. One area the department is changing as a result of assessment items is to offer MCJ 191 (internships) as 1-3 units, giving the students the ability to take the internship more than once. In addition, the course will be changed from a CR/NC to a letter grade, which will better reflect the students' learning outcomes. These changes are being implemented in the fall 2018 AY.

## 5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2018-2019 AY?

As mentioned previously, the department will continue to engage in assessment of all learning outcomes in our SOAP; however, given that writing is essential to all MCJ courses, our efforts to assess writing proficiency will continue fervently. As mentioned above, we will continue to assess all areas of writing by using pre/post exams and other assessment direct measures. In addition, due to our proposed curriculum revisions and changes, the department will re-evaluate our SOAP and all learning outcomes. As mentioned, the Outcomes Assessment Coordinator is continuing to educate faculty (TT, tenured, full-time and part-time instructors) about assessment and use of effective rubrics to assess our learning outcomes. Prior to 2018, the department gave little to no instruction or guidance to part-time faculty about assessment processes and procedures. Since many part-time faculty teach lower-level writing courses (e.g., MCJ10 and 102W) that are pre-requisites to all MCJ courses, we feel these efforts will increase our assessment of writing skills. Prior to this past AY, instructors in these courses were not routinely or effectively assessing writing skills. Now that we are working closely with these instructors, we believe this will strengthen this area.

The department will also increase its efforts with outreach and recruitment by utilizing indirect measures.

Finally, we will continue to examine the effectiveness of our assessment tools and adjust where needed.

## 6. What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?

Although some items were mentioned above, the department has made progress on the following items since our last program review:

- Revisions to curriculum and SOAP.
  - **Actions:**
    - Ensured proper learning outcomes were listed on all MCJ syllabi
    - Revised learning outcomes in all MCJ courses due to curriculum changes and revisions.



- Started the discussion on including Critical Thinking and Career Reading learning outcomes into the SOAP and curriculum framework.
- Revision of rubrics to better assess learning outcomes.
  - **Actions:**
    - Worked with all faculty to develop and revise rubrics to ensure they were effectively assessing proper learning outcomes.
    - Included the university's WASC learning outcomes on at least one department assessment.
    - New instructors are being trained on how to develop rubrics and how to routinely use them to assess learning outcomes.
- Assessment.
  - **Actions:**
    - Concentrating efforts to assess "writing" learning outcomes and improve results in this area. In fall 2015, the department started conducting pre/post tests to directly measure writing competency in all MCJ writing courses. This was the first step and efforts continue in this area. These pre-post tests are being re-introduced.
    - Evaluated all syllabi to ensure correct learning outcomes were listed and being assessed. Worked with new faculty to teach them how to develop rubrics and assess student learning outcomes. Also, advised all instructors on the proper learning outcomes that should be listed on syllabi and assessed in MCJ courses.
    - Will continue to examine ways to include "critical thinking" into our SOAP and assessment.
    - Examined and revised curriculum based on assessment. Based on responses from exit surveys and a thorough review of journalism programs throughout the country, the department continue to discuss and implement many changes to the MCJ curriculum: new courses; name changes on courses to better reflect the content and to align with industry standards.
    - Changed the "Journalism" option back to two separate options: Broadcast Journalism and Print Journalism. In 2014, the department made a name adjustment to the Broadcast and Print Journalism options by combining "Broadcast Journalism" and "Print Journalism" under one option heading of "Journalism." After reviewing our enrollments and recruitment efforts, the department learned that this change was negatively impacting the department's enrollment in Broadcast Journalism. In addition, prospective students were interpreting this one option incorrectly and thought we did not have a Broadcast Journalism option area. Also, campus advisors were also telling new students that the MCJ department did not have a "Broadcast" Journalism program. As a result, the department initiated a change in the program and separated these two options again. Broadcast

Journalism and Print Journalism are now listed as two different option areas for MCJ majors. We continue to find errors in referring new/prospective students to the old major options. The department continues to examine problems in this area.

- The department will also be adding an “Assessment Committee” to help increase and ensure effective assessment in the department and to assist the Outcomes Assessment Coordinator.
- Indirect Measures:
  - The department continues to conduct exits surveys with its graduating students to assess the quality of our program. The department continues to evaluate this survey to strengthen the feedback from students.
  - The department continues to examine effective ways of surveying alumni and retrieving crucial information about how the program prepared them for their careers. The department has updated the webpage to assist to better connect with alumni and to be able to gather important feedback. The department began using social media in 2018 to reach out to alumni.
- Curriculum/Program:
  - **Actions:** Since the last review, the department has made numerous changes to the program and continue to make curriculum changes in order to better prepare our students and to ensure they are learning sufficient areas that are needed to succeed in their future careers. These changes include increasing the total number of units required for the MCJ major. This change was the result of assessing other departments across the university and within Mass Media and Journalism departments at other universities across the country. In addition, the department has updated CS designations, added new courses, changed course names and content descriptions, deleted courses that have not been taught in a number of years and/or are no longer pertinent to the current industry, and other curriculum changes.
- Outreach:
  - The department is increasing its outreach and recruitment efforts. The department developed and implemented MCJ Ambassadors (MCJ students) to visit local high schools and assist in outreach and recruitment efforts.
  - The department is also increasing its use of marketing materials and social media to reach prospective students and grow the department.
- Faculty:
  - **Actions:** The department has been involved in several tenure-track searches during the 2017-2018AY and continues with these efforts. The department was able to hire 3 new faculty in 2018. The department hopes to get additional searches to strengthen the department.

## RUBRICS

**New MCJ 10 Rubric to be used with certain writing assignments in the 2018-2019 AY:**

	<b>EXCELLENT 10 points</b>	<b>GOOD 8-9 points</b>	<b>FAIR 6-7 pts</b>	<b>UNACCEPTABLE 0-5 pts</b>	<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>
<b>LEAD</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Compelling</li> <li>- Clear/concise</li> <li>- Complies with format</li> <li>- Contains keyword</li> </ul>					
<b>BODY OF STORY</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Good organization</li> <li>- Info gathered through appropriate interviews</li> <li>- Carries out a theme</li> <li>- Complies with format</li> </ul>					
<b>WRITING MECHANICS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Good punctuation, grammar and spelling</li> <li>- Complies with AP style</li> </ul>					

**MCJ102W Rubric:**

Criteria	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Sufficient number of interviews (5), adequate and accurate information	80	
Spelling, grammar and punctuation	10	
Adherence to AP Style	10	

**MCJ 124 Rubric**

**1. Conversational Writing**

10-8 points: The script is exceptionally written in an active tense with no official jargon. Any broadcast station would be eager to air the work as written.

7-6 points: The script needs tweaking to make it air-worthy. Past tense or official jargon can be easily changed.

5-0 points: The script needs a major or total re-write to replace past tense and official jargon. It is 'old school' un-conversational writing. It would need to be written again in its entirety to get it on the air.

**2. Broadcast Formatting**

10-8 points: The script follows all precise formatting with no or few minor errors/exclusions. It is organized in the proper way for a news anchor, producer and director at any broadcast station to follow as-is.

7-6 points: The script is missing some important formatting cues.

5-0 points: The script is missing all or nearly all formatting cues that are necessary for a proper broadcast script.

**3. Factually Correct**

10-8 points: The script has all the Who, What, When, Where, Why, and Why Care information needed to make it a factual story that any broadcast station would be eager to air the work as written.

7-6 points: A fact is slightly incorrect or omitted and easily editable or added to an otherwise well-written and concise story.

5-0 points: Necessary facts are either missing or presented in an ineffective manner that requires a major re-write. It would need to be written again in its entirety to get it on the air.

#### **4. Grammar/Typos**

10-8 points: The English language is used properly with correct tense of verbs, subject/action match. Proper punctuation is used and there are no (or only one) misspellings or other incorrect typos.

7-6 points: A slight mistake in grammar or punctuation that is easily corrected in an otherwise well-written script.

5-0 points: The script is rife with errors in grammar, punctuation or spelling. It could not be aired because it is incomplete or confusing. It would need to be written again in its entirety to get it on the air.

#### **5. Matches Video**

10-8 points: The words in the script match and closely describe the video. The script either precisely describes the video or the video precisely exemplifies the words in the script.

7-6 points: Either the script needs to be slightly altered to match the video or a quick easy edit needs to be made to bring the two into unison.

5-0 points: The video and script do not match at all. Either the video is 'wallpaper' and generic or the timing of the edits is off. A complete re-write or re-edit is required to make the script worthy to make air.

#### **MCJ 128 Rubric**

Same as above that is used in MCJ124.

MCJ 191 Rubric

	1 Not acceptable	2 Needs improvement	3 Fair	4 Good	5 Excellent	N/A
<b>Written Communication Skills</b> (ability to clearly communicate in writing)						
<b>Oral Communication Skills</b> (ability to inform, persuade or express oneself verbally)						
<b>Information Literacy</b> (ability to apply core knowledge from within the field of study)						
<b>Critical Thinking</b> (ability to think clear, reflective, and open-minded when making a decision)						
Initiative (attitude required to take action)						
Leadership skills (ability to guide or direct a group)						
Teamwork (ability to work with others to accomplish a goal)						
Decision Making Skills (ability to select a course of action among alternatives)						
Self-confidence (realistic confidence in one's own ability)						
Time Management (ability to prioritize tasks in order to maximize efficiency)						

\* These highlighted items are key components in the university WASC learning outcomes.

**Sample DQE Rubric/Test** (there are more questions listed under each category on the DQE but this is a sample. These are the exact questions that will be used on the Pre/Post tests to assess writing learning outcomes. We will continue to revise this rubric to effectively assess writing skills.

## CATEGORY 1

### Confusing and misused words

1. Cecilia said that didn't (a) *faze* (b) *phase* her.
2. I'm afraid she's going to (a) *loose* (b) *lose* her grandmother's wedding band.

## CATEGORY 2

### Verbs

3. I should not have (a) *drank* (b) *drunk* so much last night.
4. Ashley and I have (a) *went* (b) *gone* to the movies every weekend for two months.

## CATEGORY 3

### Modifiers

5. The latest Olympic team performed (a) *well* (b) *good* at the latest trials.
6. Sip your juice (a) *slow* (b) *slowly* for the best taste sensation.

## CATEGORY 4

### Agreement

7. Either Fred or his children (a) *was* (b) *were* in the house.
8. The band was waiting to collect (a) *its* (b) *it's* (c) *their* (d) *they're* pay.
9. Athletes think the media (a) *has* (b) *have* blown this out of proportion.

## CATEGORY 5

### Plural/Possessive

10. When the check arrived, my cheapskate friend asked, "(a) *who's* (b) *whose* going to pay?"
11. The family trip was postponed when two (a) *childs'* (b) *childrens* (c) *children's* medications were forgotten at home.



## CATEGORY 6

### Punctuation

For the next 2 questions, mark (a) if it is punctuated correctly or (b) if not.

12. The district has struggled financially for at least two years, overestimating enrollment and overspending on personnel has led to questionable hires.
13. The House approved the measure, and so did the Senate.

## CATEGORY 7

### Spelling

In the following groups of words, select the word that is spelled incorrectly, or indicate "all correct."

14. (a) accommodate, (b) reccommend, (c) memento, (d) occasion, (e) all correct.
15. (a) lieutenant, (b) mischievous, (c) efficient, (d) embarrass, (e) all correct.