# Annual Assessment Report for 2020-2021 AY

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

Provide detailed responses for each of the following questions within this word document. Please do NOT insert an index or add formatting. For purposes of this report, you should only report on two or three student learning outcomes (department’s choice) even if your external accreditor requires you to evaluate four or more outcomes each year. Also be sure to explain or omit specialized or discipline-specific terms.

Department/Program: Communication Degree: M.A.

Assessment Coordinator: Kevin Macy-Ayotte

1. Please list the learning outcomes you assessed this year.

* Goal 1: Students will demonstrate proficiency in the dominant theories and programs of research in the communication discipline. **Learning Outcome 2. Explain the role of rhetorical and communication theory in the examination and analysis of human communication research.**
* Goal 1: Students will demonstrate proficiency in the dominant theories and programs of research in the communication discipline. **Learning Outcome 3: Apply appropriate scholarly criteria to evaluate rhetorical and communication inquiry and scholarship.**

1. What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment? **Please describe the assignment and the criteria or rubric used to evaluate the assignment in detail and, if possible, include copies of the assignment and criteria/rubric at the end of this report.**

In COMM 241 Seminar in Rhetorical Theory, students write 2 response papers to course readings of their choice, each 1500 words in length; each paper requires them to summarize and then respond to one or more arguments made by the author(s) regarding one of the major theories of rhetoric covered in the course. The grading rubric for this assignment includes categories for accurate description of the theory (“Comprehension” on the rubric, consistent with Goal 1 Outcome 2) and application of critical analysis to evaluate and make an argument in response to the author’s scholarship (“Interpretation” on the rubric, consistent with Goal 1 Outcome 3); students can earn 1-10 points in each category on this rubric. The term paper, 4500-5000 words in length, requires students to advance an original argument utilizing one or more theories covered in the course; the same rubric is used and assesses the students’ ability to explain and evaluate/apply the theory.

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

1. What did you learn from your analysis of the data? Please include sample size (how many students were evaluated) and indicate how many students (number or percentage instead of a median or mean) were designated as proficient. Also indicate your benchmark (e.g. 80% of students will be designated as proficient or higher) and indicate the number of students who met that benchmark.

A score of 7 points out of 10 possible in the category of “Comprehension” or “Interpretation” was considered demonstrative of minimally acceptable proficiency for the learning outcome associated with that category of the assignment rubric. 8 total students constituted the sample, with 2 response papers and 1 term paper submitted by each student (i.e., each learning outcome was assessed on each of 3 assignments for each student in the sample).

For learning outcome 1.2 (explanation of rhetorical theory), all 8 students (100%) showed proficiency on at least one response paper (although 2 different students fell below proficiency on one response paper), and all 8 students showed proficiency on the term paper. Given that the term paper demonstrates learning acquired by the end of the course, that data point seems most significant.

For learning outcome 1.3 (evaluation of rhetorical scholarship), 6 students (75%) showed proficiency on the first response paper, all 8 students (100%) showed proficiency on the second response paper, and 7 students (88%) showed proficiency on the term paper. All of the students (100%) demonstrated proficiency on at least 2 of the papers assessed, suggesting that, overall, students are meeting this learning outcome with a high level of success.

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

Given the high level of proficiency in both learning outcomes demonstrated by all of the students on most, if not all, assignments used in this assessment, no specific changes are recommended.

1. If you recommended any changes in your response to Question 4 in your 2018-19 assessment report, what progress have you made in implementing these changes? If you did not recommend making any changes in last year’s report please write N/A as your answer to this question.

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

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

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

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

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