Mission / Purpose

To prepare students to be competent communicators in their personal, civic, and professional roles by fostering their abilities to think critically, to express and advocate ideas effectively, and to understand and appreciate the diversity of human communication practices. The mission of the department emphasizes the connections between thought, action, and public participation, studying theory and practice in the areas of rhetoric, persuasion, political communication, organizational communication, leadership, and culture.

The Department of Communication Studies at The University of Alabama is committed to excellence in teaching, research, and service and traces its disciplinary origins to the rhetorical traditions of ancient Greece and Rome. In twenty-first-century programs in the United States, this academic discipline developed into an interdisciplinary field of study, encompassing both humanistic and social scientific approaches to human communication issues and practices in a broad range of public, interpersonal, and cultural contexts.

Connected Documents
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 1 -- revised
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

Goals

G 1: digital portfolio project
We have come to recognize the difficulty of assessing the learning outcomes for our majors, given the diversity of course electives they may have, and plan to investigate the feasibility of piloting a digital portfolio project for in-coming Communication Studies majors. Such a measure could be especially helpful for assessing two of our SLOs, Critical Adaptation for Diversity (#3) and Analysis and Application (#4).

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Oral Performance Abilities
Demonstrate ability to communicate effectively in oral performances for audiences in various contexts (Skills/Abilities)

Connected Documents
- Assessment Rubric for Departmental Undergraduate Research Colloquia Presentations
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 1 -- revised
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

Related Measures

M 1: oral performances
assess ability with a common rubric designed to evaluate oral performances in courses
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

Target:
No Target Established

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Revision of the Common Rubric for Oral Performances in COM Courses
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
We plan to revise the common rubric for assessing oral performances in COM courses -- to simplify and align the instrument with...

M 2: speaker apprehension
assess reduction of speaker apprehension in a pre and post test survey
Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

Connected Document
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

Target:
No Target Established

M 3: performance effectiveness
assess performance effectiveness with audience evaluations of Undergraduate Research Colloquia presentations using a common rubric
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Connected Document
- Assessment Rubric for Departmental Undergraduate Research Colloquia Presentations
Target:
No Target Established

SLO 2: Written Performance Skills
Demonstrate ability to communicate effectively in written performances for audiences in various contexts (Skills/Abilities)

Connected Documents
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 1 -- revised
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

Related Measures

M 4: written course work
assess ability through a common rubric designed to evaluate written course work
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

Target:
No Target Established

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Revision of the Common Rubric for Written Performances in COM Courses
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
We are revising the common rubric for assessing the development of competency in writing skills in our students. Our initial ru...

M 5: written effectiveness in capstone course
assess written effectiveness in capstone course by review committee of faculty members and graduate students using a common rubric
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

Target:
No Target Established

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Revision of the Common Rubric for Written Performances in COM Courses
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
We are revising the common rubric for assessing the development of competency in writing skills in our students. Our initial ru...

SLO 3: Critical & Creative Adaptation for Diversity & Context
Use critical and creative thinking to adapt communication in respect for the values and diversity of audience members within specific contexts (Higher Learning)

Connected Documents
Assessment Rubric for Departmental Undergraduate Research Colloquia Presentations
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 1 -- revised
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

SLO 4: Application of Concepts/Analysis
Demonstrate ability to apply appropriate conceptual and analytical tools to various contexts for personal or professional communication endeavors (Higher Learning)

Connected Documents
Assessment Rubric for Departmental Undergraduate Research Colloquia Presentations
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 1 -- revised
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcn 5: Recognized quality
Continue to build and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Related Measures

M 9: past program reviews
past program reviews
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
No Target Established

M 10: next modified program review, due in 2013-14
next modified program review, due in 2013-14
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
No Target Established
**OthOtcn 6: Enrollment and Degree Completions**  
Continue to build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completions.

**Related Measures**

**M 11: University statistics on majors**  
University statistics on the number of program majors during the past six years  
*Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other*  
*Target: No Target Established*

**OthOtcn 7: Program Value**  
Demonstrate how the program is valued by its graduates and other key constituencies it serves

**Related Measures**

**M 12: Graduating Senior Survey**  
Data obtained from the Graduating Senior Survey  
*Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other*  
*Target: No Target Established*

**M 13: Data from NSSE results**  
Data from NSSE results or other data when appropriate

*Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other*  
*Target: No Target Established*

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Revision of the Common Rubric for Oral Performances in COM Courses**  
We plan to revise the common rubric for assessing oral performances in COM courses -- to simplify and align the instrument with the rhetorical canon of invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery to help us better assess student competency, as well as to highlight our discipline’s theoretical foundations and departmental mission.

*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*  
*Implementation Status: In-Progress*  
*Priority: High*

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** oral performances | **Outcome/Objective:** Oral Performance Abilities

**Responsible Person/Group:** The Departmental Undergraduate Program Committee

**Revision of the Common Rubric for Written Performances in COM Courses**  
We are revising the common rubric for assessing the development of competency in writing skills in our students. Our initial rubric proved to be too cumbersome to use across different courses. The plan is to simplify it, along the lines of the rhetorical canon, to enable better assessment of our students and to highlight our discipline’s theoretical foundations in connection with the departmental mission.

*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*  
*Implementation Status: In-Progress*  
*Priority: High*

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** written course work | **Outcome/Objective:** Written Performance Skills

**Measure:** written effectiveness in capstone course | **Outcome/Objective:** Written Performance Skills

**Responsible Person/Group:** The Departmental Undergraduate Program Committee
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Mission / Purpose
To prepare students to be competent communicators in their personal, civic, and professional roles by fostering their abilities to think critically, to express and advocate ideas effectively, and to understand and appreciate the diversity of human communication practices. The mission of the department emphasizes the connections between thought, action, and public participation, studying theory and practice in the areas of rhetoric, persuasion, political communication, organizational communication, leadership, and culture.

The Department of Communication Studies at The University of Alabama is committed to excellence in teaching, research, and service and traces its disciplinary origins to the rhetorical traditions of ancient Greece and Rome. In twentieth-century programs in the United States, this academic discipline developed into an interdisciplinary field of study, encompassing both humanistic and social scientific approaches to human communication issues and practices in a broad range of public, interpersonal, and cultural contexts.

Connected Documents
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 1 -- revised
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

Goals
G 1: digital portfolio project
We have come to recognize the difficulty of assessing the learning outcomes for our majors, given the diversity of course electives they may have, and plan to investigate the feasibility of piloting a digital portfolio project for in-coming Communication Studies majors. Such a measure could be especially helpful for assessing two of our SLOs, Critical Adaptation for Diversity (#3) and Analysis and Application (#4).

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Oral Performance Abilities
Demonstrate ability to communicate effectively in oral performances for audiences in various contexts (Skills/Abilities)

Connected Documents
Assessment Rubric for Departmental Undergraduate Research Colloquia Presentations
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 1 -- revised
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

Related Measures
M 1: oral performances
assess ability with a common rubric designed to evaluate oral performances in courses
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

Target:
No Target Established

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then the n alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Revision of the Common Rubric for Oral Performances in COM Courses
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
We plan to revise the common rubric for assessing oral performances in COM courses -- to simplify and align the instrument with...

M 2: speaker apprehension
assess reduction of speaker apprehension in a pre and post test survey
Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

Connected Document
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

Target:
No Target Established

M 3: performance effectiveness
assess performance effectiveness with audience evaluations of Undergraduate Research Colloquia presentations using a common rubric
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Connected Document
Assessment Rubric for Departmental Undergraduate Research Colloquia Presentations
Target:
No Target Established

**SLO 2: Written Performance Skills**
Demonstrate ability to communicate effectively in written performances for audiences in various contexts (Skills/Abilities)

**Connected Documents**
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 1 -- revised
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

**Related Measures**

**M 4: written course work**
assess ability through a common rubric designed to evaluate written course work
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Connected Document**
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

Target:
No Target Established

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Revision of the Common Rubric for Written Performances in COM Courses**
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
We are revising the common rubric for assessing the development of competency in writing skills in our students. Our initial ru...

**M 5: written effectiveness in capstone course**
assess written effectiveness in capstone course by review committee of faculty members and graduate students using a common rubric
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Connected Document**
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

Target:
No Target Established

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Revision of the Common Rubric for Written Performances in COM Courses**
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
We are revising the common rubric for assessing the development of competency in writing skills in our students. Our initial ru...

**SLO 3: Critical & Creative Adaptation for Diversity & Context**
Use critical and creative thinking to adapt communication in respect for the values and diversity of audience members within specific contexts (Higher Learning)

**Connected Documents**
- Assessment Rubric for Departmental Undergraduate Research Colloquium Presentations
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 1 -- revised
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

**Related Measures**

**M 6: evaluations of URC presentations**
measure display of use by audience evaluations of Undergraduate Research Colloquium presentations
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Connected Document**
- Assessment Rubric for Departmental Undergraduate Research Colloquium Presentations

**M 7: COM 499 final projects**
measure display of use in COM 499 final projects with a common evaluation rubric by graduate students
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Connected Document**
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

**M 8: presentations in COM 499**
review display of use with a common rubric to evaluate and score presentations in COM 499 by faculty members
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Connected Document**
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

**SLO 4: Application of Concepts/Analysis**
Demonstrate ability to apply appropriate conceptual and analytical tools to various contexts for personal or professional communication endeavors (Higher Learning)

**Connected Documents**
- Assessment Rubric for Departmental Undergraduate Research Colloquium Presentations
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 1 -- revised
Related Measures

M 6: evaluations of URC presentations
measure display of use by audience evaluations of Undergraduate Research Colloquia presentations
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Connected Document
Assessment Rubric for Departmental Undergraduate Research Colloquia Presentations

M 7: COM 499 final projects
measure display of use in COM 499 final projects with a common evaluation rubric by graduate students
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Connected Document
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

M 8: presentations in COM 499
review display of use with a common rubric to evaluate and score presentations in COM 499 by faculty members
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Connected Document
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2 -- revised

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 5: Recognized quality
Continue to build and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Related Measures

M 9: past program reviews
past program reviews
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
No Target Established

M 10: next modified program review, due in 2013-14
next modified program review, due in 2013-14
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
No Target Established

OthOtcm 6: Enrollment and Degree Completions
Continue to build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completions.

Related Measures

M 11: University statistics on majors
University statistics on the number of program majors during the past six years
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
No Target Established

OthOtcm 7: Program Value
Demonstrate how the program is valued by its graduates and other key constituencies it serves

Related Measures

M 12: Graduating Senior Survey
Data obtained from the Graduating Senior Survey
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
No Target Established

M 13: Data from NSSE results
Data from NSSE results or other data when appropriate

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
No Target Established

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Changing the Departmental Assessment Plan
Because we had very little new information we were able to report this year, we have come to the conclusion that many of the assessment plans we developed last year just weren’t workable. We have added an overall goal for the program that addresses this issue. Furthermore, we plan to eliminate two of the SLOs in our plan for next year, perhaps adding another, and to try some different short-term assessment measures until we decide about the feasibility of the digital...
portfolio as an assessment measure for our program.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Projected Completion Date:** 10/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Program Director, Dr. Carol Mills

**Revision of the Common Rubric for Oral Performances in COM Courses**
We plan to revise the common rubric for assessing oral performances in COM courses -- to simplify and align the instrument with the rhetorical canon of invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery to help us better assess student competency, as well as to highlight our discipline's theoretical foundations and departmental mission.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* oral performances | *Objective:* Oral Performance Abilities  
**Responsible Person/Group:** The Departmental Undergraduate Program Committee

**Revision of the Common Rubric for Written Performances in COM Courses**
We are revising the common rubric for assessing the development of competency in writing skills in our students. Our initial rubric proved to be too cumbersome to use across different courses. The plan is to simplify it, along the lines of the rhetorical canon, to enable better assessment of our students and to highlight our discipline's theoretical foundations in connection with the departmental mission.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* written course work | *Objective:* Written Performance Skills  
*Measure:* written effectiveness in capstone course | *Objective:* Written Performance Skills  
**Responsible Person/Group:** The Departmental Undergraduate Program Committee
**Mission / Purpose**

To prepare students to be competent communicators in their personal, civic, and professional roles by fostering their abilities to think critically, to express and advocate ideas effectively, and to understand and appreciate the diversity of human communication practices. The mission of the department emphasizes the connections between thought, action, and public participation, studying theory and practice in the areas of rhetoric, persuasion, political communication, organizational communication, leadership, and culture.

The Department of Communication Studies at The University of Alabama is committed to excellence in teaching, research, and service and traces its disciplinary origins to the rhetorical traditions of ancient Greece and Rome. In twentieth-century programs in the United States, this academic discipline developed into an interdisciplinary field of study, encompassing both humanistic and social scientific approaches to human communication issues and practices in a broad range of public, interpersonal, and cultural contexts.

**Goals**

**G 1: digital portfolio project**
We have come to recognize the difficulty of assessing the learning outcomes for our majors, given the diversity of course electives they may have, and are investigating the feasibility of piloting a digital portfolio project for in-coming Communication Studies majors. If adopted, the portfolio would be especially helpful for assessing SLOs 1, 4, 5, and 6.

**Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**SLO 1: Foundational Principles**
Demonstrate understanding of the foundational principles and practices of human communication (Discipline Knowledge)

**Connected Documents**
- Comm Studies BA
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 1
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2

**Related Measures**

**M 1: embedded content questions**
assess understanding with embedded content questions

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
No Target Established

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
no data collected this year

**M 2: audience evaluations of URC presentations**
assess understanding with audience evaluations of Undergraduate Research Colloquia presentations using a common rubric

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
No Target Established

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**
Summary of Results (on a 5 point scale):

*Fall 2011*
Knowledge of Communication Principles = 4.72

*Spring 2012*
Knowledge of Communication Principles = 4.29

**Interpretation:**
Students were impressed with the presenters' abilities to explain complex information in an easily understandable way in the fall semester. In the spring semester, students showed clear critical evaluation skills, commenting on the disparity between the presented in this session. The contrast in abilities resulted in lower scores.

**M 3: identifying use of key content words**
assess understanding by identifying use of key content words in essay questions

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
No Target Established

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This measure is still in development.

**SLO 2: Oral Performance Abilities**
Demonstrate ability to communicate effectively in oral performances for audiences in various contexts (Skills/Abilities)

**Connected Documents**
- Comm Studies BA
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 1
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2

**Related Measures**

**M 4: oral performances**
assess ability with a common rubric designed to evaluate oral performances in courses

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
No Target Established

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The implementation of this measure is still in development. We have a common rubric developed, but not all sections of performance courses used it consistently or reported results.

**Connected Document**
- Communication Studies BA Oral Performance Rubric

**M 5: speaker apprehension**
assess reduction of speaker apprehension in a pre and post test survey

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

**Target:**
No Target Established

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**

**Summary of Results:**

PRCA results in COM performance classes (not including COM 123 Public Speaking) --

**Fall 2011:**
The data for fall on the COM performance courses was inconsistent and incomplete, as we were training instructors on how to implement the measure.

**Spring 2012:**

Pre-test Averages
Group = 15.08
Meeting = 16.23
Interpersonal = 14.69
Public Speaking = 21.31
Overall = 67.31

The pre-test indicated that students exhibited moderate apprehension in the contexts of group, meeting, and interpersonal and high apprehension (over 18) in public speaking. The overall average reflects moderate apprehension.

Post-test Averages
Group = 13.80
Meeting = 13.60
Interpersonal = 13.90
Public Speaking = 17.90
Overall = 59.20

Although the overall apprehension score indicates a moderate level of communication apprehension, the post-test results indicated significant improvement in the individual contexts, especially in the area of public speaking.

**M 6: performance effectiveness**
assess performance effectiveness with audience evaluations of Undergraduate Research Colloquia presentations using a common rubric

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
No Target Established

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**

**Summary of Results (on a 5 point scale):**

**Fall 2011**
Communication Skills = 4.55

**Spring 2012**
Communication Skills = 3.98

**Interpretation:**
In the faculty response to the fall colloquium, it was noted that these students used effective visual aids, related well to the audience and participated effectively in the question/answer session following the presentations. Likewise, the students indicated that they appreciated the engaged delivery of all the presenters. In the spring colloquium, however, the presentational skills of the speakers were quite disparate,
and students showed a higher opinion of the more effective speaker. Their responses indicated that they were particularly turned off by the frequent use of verbal fillers. The average score is noticeably lower than in the fall.

**SLO 3: Written Performance Skills**
Demonstrate ability to communicate effectively in written performances for audiences in various contexts (Skills/Abilities)

**Connected Documents**
- Comm Studies BA
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 1
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2
- Communication Studies BA Written Performance Rubric

**Related Measures**

**M 7: written course work**
assess ability through a common rubric designed to evaluate written course work

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Connected Document**
- Communication Studies BA Written Performance Rubric

**Target:**
- No Target Established

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**
Comparison of Average Scores in W courses (50 points possible in each category):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>1st paper</th>
<th>2nd paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>organization</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mechanics</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spring**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>organization</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mechanics</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation:**
These scores show that students' writing ability improved in all four of these areas, from their first papers to their second, both semesters.

**M 8: writing competence**
assess writing competence through quantitative analysis of avoiding common mechanical/stylistic errors in course work

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Connected Document**
- Communication Studies BA Written Performance Rubric

**Target:**
- No Target Established

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This measure is still in development. We had hope to use the program in Turnitin to help with this, but that program is still in development and proved cumbersome and unreliable.

**M 9: written effectiveness in capstone course**
assess written effectiveness in capstone course by review committee of faculty members and graduate students using a common rubric

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Connected Document**
- Communication Studies BA Written Performance Rubric

**Target:**
- No Target Established

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This measure is still in development.

**SLO 4: Appropriate Methods for Communication Practice**
Demonstrate understanding of appropriate methods for investigating communication practice (Discipline Knowledge)

**Connected Documents**
- Comm Studies BA
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 1
- Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2

**Related Measures**

**M 10: appropriate investigative methods**
assess understanding of appropriate investigative methods by use of written responses to common scenarios in COM 300 and COM 310

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
No Target Established

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This assessment is still in development -- there is some resistance to the idea among faculty who teach these courses.

M 11: critique or investigate communication practices
assess understanding of how to critique or investigate communication practices by audience evaluations of URC presentations using common rubric
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
No Target Established

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Summary of Results (on a 5 point scale):

Fall 2011
Critical Application and Investigation of Communication Practice = 4.62

Spring 2012
Critical Application and Investigation of Communication Practice = 4.13

Interpretation:
Students were impressed with the presenters' ability to explain complex information in an easily understandable way and showed clear critical evaluation skills in their qualitative responses.

M 12: embedded questions in COM 300 and COM 310
assess understanding by use of embedded questions in COM 300 and COM 310
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
No Target Established

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This assessment is still in development -- not all faculty members give exams in these courses.

SLO 5: Critical & Creative Adaptation for Diversity & Context
Use critical and creative thinking to adapt communication in respect for the values and diversity of audiences and specific contexts (Higher Learning)

Connected Documents
Comm Studies BA
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 1
Communication Studies BA Curriculum Map 2

Related Measures

M 13: evaluations of URC presentations
measure display of use by audience evaluations of Undergraduate Research Colloquia presentations
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
No Target Established

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Summary of Results (on a 5.0 point scale):

Fall 2011
Critical and Creative Thinking in Adapting for Diversity = 4.5

Spring 2012
Critical and Creative Thinking in Adapting for Diversity = 4.13

M 14: COM 499 final projects
measure display of use in COM 499 final projects with a common evaluation rubric by graduate students
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
No Target Established

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not implemented this year

M 15: presentations in COM 499
review display of use with a common rubric to evaluate and score presentations in COM 499 by faculty members
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
No Target Established

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
no new data this year

SLO 6: Application of Concepts/Analysis
Demonstrate ability to apply appropriate conceptual and analytical tools to various contexts for personal or professional communication endeavors (Higher Learning)

Connected Documents
Comm Studies BA
Related Measures

**M 13: evaluations of URC presentations**
measure display of use by audience evaluations of Undergraduate Research Colloquia presentations
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target:
No Target Established
*Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met*

**Summary of Results (on a 5.0 scale):**

*Fall 2011*
Application of Appropriate Methods in Various Contexts = 4.53

*Spring 2012*
Application of Appropriate Methods in Various Contexts = 4.21

**M 14: COM 499 final projects**
measure display of use in COM 499 final projects with a common evaluation rubric by graduate students
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
Target:
No Target Established
*Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle*
Not implemented this year

**M 15: presentations in COM 499**
review display of use with a common rubric to evaluate and score presentations in COM 499 by faculty members
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target:
No Target Established
*Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle*
no new data this year

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

**OthOtcm 7: Recognized quality**
Continue to build and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

*Connected Document*
Comm Studies BA

**Related Measures**

**M 16: past program reviews**
past program reviews
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
No Target Established
*Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle*
The Department of Communication Studies is an academic, traditional liberal arts department, not subject to any accrediting agencies.

**M 17: next modified program review, due in 2013-14**
next modified program review, due in 2013-14
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
No Target Established
*Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle*
The Department of Communication Studies is an academic, traditional liberal arts department, not subject to any accrediting agencies.

**OthOtcm 8: Enrollment and Degree Completions**
Continue to build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completions.

*Connected Document*
Comm Studies BA

**Related Measures**

**M 18: University statistics on majors**
University statistics on the number of program majors during the past six years
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
No Target Established
*Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met*
The number of undergraduate COM majors for this year has increased again from last year, with 295 in the
fall and 271 in the spring. To show the growth in majors for the last five years, see the table below (based on QIRA data, September 2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>UG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OthOtcm 9: Program Value
Demonstrate how the program is valued by its graduates and other key constituencies it serves

**Connected Document**
Comm Studies BA

**Related Measures**

**M 19: Graduating Senior Survey**
Data obtained from the Graduating Senior Survey
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
No Target Established

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
If the institution did this survey this past year, no results were reported to the department.

**M 20: Data from NSSE results**
Data from NSSE results or other data when appropriate

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
No Target Established

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No new data reported

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Changing the Departmental Assessment Plan**
Because we had very little new information we were able to report this year, we have come to the conclusion that many of the assessment plans we developed last year just weren't workable. We have added an overall goal for the program that addresses this issue. Furthermore, we plan to eliminate two of the SLOs in our plan for next year, perhaps adding another, and to try some different short-term assessment measures until we decide about the feasibility of the digital portfolio as an assessment measure for our program.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Projected Completion Date:** 10/2012
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Program Director, Dr. Carol Mills
Curriculum Map I (Student Learning Outcomes) – This map reflects only the Department’s required courses for COM majors (including “W” courses). It does not include the entire curriculum of elective courses available to COM majors and minors.

### COM Path A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhetoric/HU</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 4</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 5</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W courses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341, 342,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413, 415,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450, 463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COM Path B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comm./SB</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 4</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 5</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W courses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310, 341,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342, 413,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415, 450,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM Path A</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome 1</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome 2</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome 3</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome 4</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome 5</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric/HU</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Oral Performance Skills</td>
<td>Written Performance Skills</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Higher Learning</td>
<td>Higher Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>embedded questions; use of key words in essay question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td>Written performance rubric, quantitative measure of error avoidance</td>
<td>embedded questions; common scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>122, 123, or 210</td>
<td>oral performance rubric, PRCA pre/post test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>oral performance rubric</td>
<td>Written performance rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td>graduate student evaluations; faculty evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/5</td>
<td>W courses: 341, 342, 413, 415, 450, 463</td>
<td></td>
<td>Written performance rubric, quantitative measure of error avoidance</td>
<td></td>
<td>graduate student evaluations; faculty evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COM Path B</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 4</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 5</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comm./SB</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Oral Performance Skills</td>
<td>Written Performance Skills</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Higher Learning</td>
<td>Higher Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>embedded questions; use of key words in essay question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>embedded questions; common scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>122, 123, or 210</td>
<td>oral performance rubric, PRCA pre/post test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>oral performance rubric</td>
<td>Written performance rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td>graduate student evaluations; faculty evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/5</td>
<td>W courses: 310, 341, 342, 413, 415, 450, 463</td>
<td></td>
<td>Written performance rubric, quantitative measure of error avoidance</td>
<td></td>
<td>graduate student evaluations; faculty evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Written Performance Assessment Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Advanced (45-50 pts)</th>
<th>Strong (40-44 pts)</th>
<th>Adequate (35-39 pts)</th>
<th>Limited (30-34 pts)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (0-29 pts)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideas presented in logical order.</td>
<td>Paper presents information in logical order/easily follow.</td>
<td>Paper includes major idea but does not demonstrate organization at paragraph level.</td>
<td>Reader has difficulty following ideas.</td>
<td>Incomplete paragraphs.</td>
<td>No clear logical flow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear main ideas.</td>
<td>Reader has little difficulty following the ideas within the paper.</td>
<td>Main ideas difficult to identify.</td>
<td>Poor paragraph construction.</td>
<td>Incomplete intro and/or conclusion.</td>
<td>No transition sentences and poor paragraph construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate headings and information is ordered for ease of reading.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No spelling/grammar errors.</td>
<td>No more than one or two spelling errors.</td>
<td>Contains a few repeated grammatical errors.</td>
<td>Paper contains notable and repeated grammar/spelling errors.</td>
<td>Includes several misspellings, improper word usage, sentence fragments and poor idea flow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing style reflects advanced writing skills.</td>
<td>Few mechanical errors.</td>
<td>Writing and sentence structure do not reflect mastery of active style.</td>
<td>Paper shows poor command of mechanics</td>
<td>No evidence of style manual used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper follows proper style manual with no mistakes.</td>
<td>Paper follows appropriate style manual but may contain minor errors.</td>
<td>Paper may contain notable citation errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Appropriate tone. Writing demonstrates confidence.</td>
<td>Slightly above average work/meets expectations.</td>
<td>Writing does not properly communicate an understanding of the assignment or knowledge of the topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate tone. Writing demonstrates confidence.</td>
<td>Details enrich the content and the author produces well-developed, thoughtful prose.</td>
<td>Clear focus with relevant details.</td>
<td>Important source information is missing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details enrich the content and the author produces well-developed, thoughtful prose.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an understanding of the assessment.</td>
<td>Paper meets minimum expectations.</td>
<td>Details do not adequately support claims.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly above average work/meets expectations.</td>
<td>Paper demonstrates an above average level of critical thought.</td>
<td>Author includes some relevant details but main elements unclear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate tone. Writing demonstrates confidence.</td>
<td>Paper meets minimum expectations of critical thought.</td>
<td>Sourcing is present but may not be of top quality or quantity to support claims.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details enrich the content and the author produces well-developed, thoughtful prose.</td>
<td>Paper demonstrates an above average level of critical thought.</td>
<td>Paper meets minimum expectations of critical thought.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper citations</td>
<td>Observations are unique, clearly stated and well supported.</td>
<td>Major ideas receive minimal support and some elements may be incomplete or improperly supported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Observations are unique, clearly stated and well supported.</td>
<td>Only surface level observations exist with little to no reasoned support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student demonstrates deep level critical thought.</td>
<td>Paper demonstrates an above average level of critical thought.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations are unique, clearly stated and well supported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations are unique, clearly stated and well supported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Oral Performance Assessment Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Advanced (45-50 pts)</th>
<th>Strong (40-44 pts)</th>
<th>Adequate (35-39 pts)</th>
<th>Limited (30-34 pts)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (0-29 pts)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance follows organizational conventions appropriate for assignment.</td>
<td>Includes all major organizational elements required to determine flow of performance.</td>
<td>Meets minimum expectations for organizational elements.</td>
<td>Audience has difficulty following along with performance and cannot anticipate flow.</td>
<td>No clear organizational pattern exists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audience has no difficulty outlining flow of performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some Elements may be of poor quality or difficult to identify.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Audience cannot outline performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Superb understanding of content communicated.</td>
<td>Main message communicated within expected means.</td>
<td>Minimal effort to establish credibility through sources.</td>
<td>Poor attempt to establish credibility through adequate sourcing.</td>
<td>Student shows lack of understanding in topic area, depends heavily on notes and fails to establish credibility through sourcing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent sourcing in quality and quantity, sources equally distributed.</td>
<td>Knowledge of topic slightly exceeds expectations.</td>
<td>Student relies on notes and listeners can easily identify errors in content.</td>
<td>Student reads from notes and does not demonstrate knowledge of topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sourcing included with no overdependence on notes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Effectiveness</td>
<td>Complete sentences and grammatical accuracy.</td>
<td>Language appropriate.</td>
<td>Meets minimum expectations for adequate delivery.</td>
<td>Vocabulary is limited and may be inappropriate.</td>
<td>Listeners distracted by grammatical errors, use of slang, incomplete sentences, or poor vocal quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stylistic choices made with thought.</td>
<td>Includes vocal variety.</td>
<td>May include a few grammar mistakes and overly casual language.</td>
<td>Speaks clearly only sporadically and maintains a neutral tone throughout.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Includes vocal variety.</td>
<td>Stylistic elements incorporated lack precision.</td>
<td>Style not vivid or carefully chosen to engage audience.</td>
<td>Voice is weak and lacks confidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaks with clarity and confidence.</td>
<td>Tone of voice demonstrates an effort to remain controlled and clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintains ethical standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal Effectiveness</td>
<td>Maintains appropriate and consistent eye contact and incorporates gestures and movement appropriately.</td>
<td>Good eye contact.</td>
<td>Often breaks eye contact to read notes.</td>
<td>Rarely looks at audience.</td>
<td>Maintains no eye contact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Body language communicates interest.</td>
<td>Inviting body language with few awkward gestures.</td>
<td>Has obvious nervous gestures and fails to communicate confidently.</td>
<td>Uses only occasional, awkward gestures.</td>
<td>Physical movement is distracting and confusing for the audience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attire appropriate for context.</td>
<td>Pacing may be a little too fast or too slow.</td>
<td>Little effort to communicate interest.</td>
<td>Fails to make appropriate use of performance space.</td>
<td>Speaker’s volume inappropriate for room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remains confident in performance.</td>
<td>Attire not appropriate for context.</td>
<td>Communicates awkwardly with no effort to communicate interest or invite understanding.</td>
<td>Delivery and attire detract from message.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last modified: 08.30.2011
Curriculum Map I (Student Learning Outcomes) – This map reflects only the Department’s courses required for COM majors (including oral performance and “W” courses). It does not include the entire curriculum of elective courses available to COM majors and minors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COM BA Degree</th>
<th>SLO 1 Oral Performance Skills</th>
<th>SLO 2 Written Performance Skills</th>
<th>SLO 3 Critical/Creative Adaptation for Diversity &amp; Context</th>
<th>SLO 5 Analysis and Application of Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 122, 123, 210, 348</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 499</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W courses: COM 310, 341, 342, 413, 415, 450, 463, 465</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Curriculum Map 2: What Assessment Measures will be employed in which courses for each SLO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COM BA Degree</th>
<th>SLO 1 Oral Performance Skills</th>
<th>SLO 2 Written Performance Skills</th>
<th>SLO 3 Critical/Creative Adaptation for Diversity &amp; Context</th>
<th>SLO 4 Analysis and Application of Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 121, 122, 123, 210, or 348</td>
<td>oral performance rubric, PRCA pre/post test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 499</td>
<td>oral performance rubric</td>
<td>Written performance rubric</td>
<td>graduate student evaluations; faculty evaluations</td>
<td>graduate student evaluations; faculty evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W courses: 310, 341, 342, 413, 415, 450, 463, 465</td>
<td></td>
<td>Written performance rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>