**Executive Summary**

(After completing the questions on the next few pages, please replace this area with a written executive summary of the questions that follow, including your data analysis, findings, action plan, and improvements you have already made. This will be the top sheet of your report. This summary should be at least a paragraph, and can definitely be longer if desired.)

Our CLOs and the GELOs strongly align. Our analysis of the connection between our assessed CLOs and current GELOs indicates that the majority of our students completed their CLOs (and, by extension the aligned GELOs) within a range of 79% to 100%. We are pleased with these results but continue to seek ways to help our students succeed at even higher levels.

This process has brought to light some changes that need to be made to our GELO and CLO assessment process which include: (1) analyzing the relationship between the GELOs to our planned revised CLOs and the associated tools to be used for assessment; (2) integrating technology into the assessment process to track and support our work; and, (3) following a peer-led assessment process to assess all CLOs over the next two years.

Our department has begun making progress on this list of tasks. Based on this assessment we have modified the CLOs for SPCOM 100, 102, 104, 106, 122, 123, and 130. We also created a Communication Studies Lab to help our students succeed in their courses. We are currently exploring an alliance between our lab and the Integrated Learning Center in order to expand availability of this resource to our students and allow us to assess its impact in a more comprehensive manner.

**Faculty Included in the Preparation and Sharing of this Report:**

Barbara Adams

Leslie Collins

Todd Guy

Kim Gyuran

Allan McKissick

Charles Mullins

Jim Sahlman

The Speech Communication Department has met to complete this process on the following dates: 08/23/2013, 01/31/2013, 02/28/2013, 03/28/2013, 04/25/2013, 05/16/2013, and 05/24/2013.

**Please provide a brief and cogent narrative in response to each of the following questions.**

1. Are the course learning outcomes (CLOs) on your spreadsheet accurate (as of right now), and do they represent the overall purpose(s) of the course(s)? *Please explain why or why not.*

The majority of the CLOs are accurate and represent the overall purposes of the courses. SpCom 122—CLO #3 is too vague and will be revised in the Fall 2013 curriculum review schedule. SpCom 110—CLOs #1 and #2 will be revised to replace “demonstrate knowledge” with different terms reflected in Bloom’s Taxonomy. Overall, the outcomes for each course reflect the measurable skills students will be able to demonstrate at the end of the course, and closely align with the course objectives listed on the course outlines of record. The majority of courses are intended to fulfill various transfer degree requirements.

1. Are the general education learning outcomes (GELOs) on your spreadsheet accurate (as of right now), and do they represent the overall purpose(s) of the program? *Please explain why or why not.*

The GELOs on the spreadsheet are accurate and they represent the overall purposes of the Speech Communication program. The GELOs, which are listed in the MJC Catalog, represent the learning outcomes for the MJC-GE areas. There are SPCOM courses approved in Area B, C, and D, which illustrates the breadth and scope of our program. While many of our SPCOM courses fulfill Area D, Language and Rationality, there are also courses in Area B, Social/Behavioral Science, and in Area C, Humanities. The placements of courses in these three areas also align with their respective CSU-GE areas, and IGETC areas (where applicable).

1. How well do the course learning outcomes (CLOs) fulfill, support and align with the general education learning outcomes (GELOs)? Additionally, just in terms of the structure, do you think the assessment data from the CLOs can tell a qualitative *and* quantitative story about the GELOs? *Please explain, and take some time to think through and write about what kinds of GELO analysis your CLO assessments will foster.*

The CLOs strongly align with the GELOs. Many of our CLOs are aligned with either all or most of the GELOs. Quantitatively, there was a high alignment of CLOs to GELOs, with the highest alignment appearing in Area D. The high percentage of aligned CLOs was expected, as the majority of SPCOM courses qualify for CSU-GE and IGETC areas in addition to the MJC-GE areas. One of the distinctive aspects of the SPCOM program is the presence in three areas included in the minimum requirements for an A.A. or A.S. degree, per Title 5, Section 55063. As stated in “Guiding Notes for General Education Course Reviewers” (January 2011), general education represents the universal curriculum of the degree….It develops the intellectual capacities and versatility that employers say are most value: Effective oral and written communication…Critical thinking…Ability to work in groups…An understanding of a variety of cultures, including one’s own.” All of these skills are addressed in the SPCOM curriculum. Please note some courses had only one outcome assessed, based on the directive given in 2008.

MJC-GE Area B – Social and Behavioral Sciences - SPCOM 103 and 130 are included in this area because students are able to describe principles, value systems and ethics employed in social scientific inquiry. These two courses are also approved for CSU-GE Area D7 and IGETC Area 4G (SPCOM 130 also approved for Area D3 and Area 4C), illustrating that the course outlines contain the relevant content and objectives which will enable students to obtain the desired general education learning outcomes for this area.

MJC-GE Area C – Humanities – SPCOM 120, 122, 123 and 124 are included in this area because students are able to explain cultural influences on individuals and society, and are able to make aesthetic judgments. These courses are also approved for CSU-GE Area C1, showing that the course outlines contain the relevant content and objectives which will enable students to obtain the desired general education learning outcomes for this area. These courses meet Area C1 in the CSU-GE Breadth pattern because they address aesthetic and cultural study (Executive Order 1033); however, they do not meet the stronger requirement in the IGETC pattern that they *predominantly* emphasize cultural and/or aesthetic study (Guiding Notes for General Education Course Reviewers, p. 16). This may explain why SPCOM 124 CLO #1 does not align with GELO #2. However, a review of the results indicates the CLO alignment of all courses is strong for both GELOs.

MJC-GE Area D – Language and Rationality – SPCOM 100, 102, 104, 106, 107 and 110 are included in this area because students are able to demonstrate their effective use of communication, their critical thinking skills, and their information competency. SPCOM 100, 102 and 110 are also approved for CSU-GE Area A1 and IGETC Area 1C (CSU only). Rhetorical principles must be covered (e.g., study of effective communication in formal speeches or social interaction) to qualify for this area, and the alignment to the Area D GELOs is evident. SPCOM 104 and SPCOM 107 are also approved for CSU-GE Area A3 (SPCOM 104 also approved for IGETC Area 1B), the critical thinking requirement. The requirement area’s title shares the same terminology used in GELO #2, “…critical thinking….”

To provide further analysis of a specific CLO to GELO alignment the following is an example from SPCOM 100. SPCOM 100 CLO#1 states, “Create and effectively deliver professional and engaging speeches that are cogent, clear and concise.” This highly supports and aligns with Area D GELOs #1, 2 and 3, as a student who is able to successfully complete this outcome will show his/her proficiency in demonstrating an awareness of the interactive nature of communication involving effective listening, reading, writing, and speaking (GELO #1); demonstrating critical thinking in the analysis and production of communication (GELO#2); and, demonstrating the ability to find, evaluate, and use information in a variety of formats (GELO #3).

1. You’ve mapped your CLOs to GELOs. You’ve also been provided CLO assessment data in your packet. Now, take some time to reflect on, consider and analyze the data you have. This is not an easy section to complete, and the purpose of this pilot is to generate thoughtful reflection on—and assessment of—GELOs in relationship to our CLO assessment data.

Please look at every CLO data sheet included. Then, analyze, engage and write as much as you can, addressing the following question: ***what does your CLO data tell you about each of your GELOs?*** *Be detailed, descriptive and analytical.*

*As you consider this question…*

* + Discuss what kinds of trends you see in the data provided, and provide a qualitative assessment of each GELO.
	+ Try to fill in the CLO data from each sheet on your spreadsheet, and attempt to come up with an aggregate percentage for your GELOs. Can you give a GELO quantitative assessment based only on your discipline/department courses?
	+ **Please be thorough and provide as much reflection and analysis as possible. The more analysis, the better. Feel free to write beyond this page.**

After the assessment results were entered into the alignment map, the CLO data indicates a high percentage of students are successfully completing the outcomes that are not only for SPCOM courses, but also for their aligned GELOs.

In Area B, there is a range of 70 to 94% for successful completion of corresponding CLOs. The data reveals an extremely high success rate for SPCOM 103, while SPCOM 130 had a range of average to high success rates.

For Area C, success rates range from 88 to 100%. While many of the CLOs align with the GELOs, only around 50% of the outcomes have been assessed to provide a conclusive quantitative analysis.

For Area D, success rates range from 79 to 98%. The lowest success rate indicated is included in SPCOM 104 CLO#4, a course which includes a prerequisite of ENGL 101. This course also fulfills CSU-GE Area A3 and IGETC Area 1B (the course outline has been written to include requirements for UC and is therefore also approved for the IGETC area).

1. **Action Plan.** Based on the assessments and analysis you have provided in questions 1-4, please consider what changes or improvements you would like to make, which might include updating your CLO or GELO statements, modifying course outlines, rethinking instruction efforts, using different assessment instruments, etc. ***Based on the analysis you have provided in questions 1-4, provide an action plan for improvement that draws on your assessment results and efforts.***

Curriculum Actions – In Fall 2013, SPCOM courses will be updated in the curriculum review cycle. SPCOM 101 and 109 will be inactivated. It was determined that SPCOM 101 CLOs did not align with any PLOs or GELOs. It is possible some methods of evaluation will be modified on course outlines.

Based on the assessment and analysis, the SPCOM faculty determined some CLO statements should be modified. In addition, different assessment tools will be reviewed to attempt to create standardized tools among the department.

The GELO statements were created at the college level and therefore the SPCOM faculty will not be updating or modifying them. It would be beneficial for there to be discussions among the disciplines having courses in each area to design tools to be utilized across disciplines to assess each course.

1. The college should be making improvements based on student learning outcomes assessment, and we need to continue to document and share the improvements and progress you have already made. *This is extremely important.*
	* Did you make any changes in your CLO statements during the last 4-year cycle that ended in 2012, or any changes this year? *Please explain what you accomplished.*
	* Did you make any improvements in the areas of teaching and instruction processes, your courses, or your program? *Please explain and provide details about your efforts!*

Yes, changes have been made to our CLO statements. Based on discussions, we determined some courses had too many outcomes.

The following CLO changes were made during this period:

\* SPCOM 100 CLOs were rewritten to demonstrate clear and measurable outcomes.

\* SPCOM 102 CLO #2 was changed to reflect a singular rather than dual focus.

\* SPCOM 104 CLOs were rewritten to demonstrate clear and measurable outcomes.

\* SPCOM 106 CLOs were rewritten to demonstrate clear and measurable outcomes.

\* SPCOM 122 CLO #3 was changed to create a more measurable outcome.

\* SPCOM 123 CLO #4 was eliminated due to its immeasurability.

\* SPCOM 130 CLOs were rewritten to demonstrate clear and measurable outcomes.

Also, during the spring 2012 semester, the Speech Communication faculty established a Communication Studies Lab. The primary goal of the lab is to support student success in Speech Communication courses. The department uses the lab to help students develop presentation outlines, conduct academic research, practice presentations, and reduce communication apprehension. The Communication Studies Lab attendance increased from Spring 2012 to Spring 2013 at a rate of 117% (57 to 124 students). Room utilization of the practice rooms increased from Spring 2012 to Spring 2013 at a rate of 97.5% (125 to 247 students). We are currently working at maximum capacity in the lab and are seeking an alliance with the Integrated Learning Center to increase lab hours in order to serve more students. This relationship will also help faculty assess the impact of the lab in a more organized and comprehensive manner.

7. Please reflect on the process of learning outcomes assessment in your division and at Modesto Junior College. What do you think would make it more meaningful? How could it be improved? What would help you?

The problems with this process are numerous. In no particular order:

* CLOs should not drive PLOs; that process is backwards and counter-intuitive.
* The process would be more meaningful if ILOs were included to determine if the program’s purpose(s) met the overarching outcomes of the institution.
* The campus needs an Assessment Coordinator (or Director) to both guide this process, as well as train (and retrain) faculty. The current training modality is ineffective. It would be helpful to have an outcomes assessment expert be present when the department faculty meet to complete the reflection and analysis. Unfortunately, we continue to rely on serial communication between trainers and faculty. This particular position is too much for the Academic Senate President to attempt to do on top of his/her normal Senate duties.
* Currently, this process has been a constant moving target. Every year the college seems to change how this process is done, the rules that are involved, and what is required. Departments are typically told that “this is a learning process” and “try your best.” However, our perception based on past practices is that the work we do **WILL** have major repercussions on hiring, funding, etc. Therefore, "doing our best" without the proper support and training has a negative connotation.
* All full-time faculty within a department need originator rights in the outcomes assessment module in PRNet. This would enable department colleagues to input and edit assessment data. Without this very basic ability to work and edit each other’s work in a collaborative way, it requires individual faculty members to “fly blind” within the process. As a result, this becomes an exercise in futility and departments are simply jumping through hoops for some report’s checklist instead of restricting our ability to do this work as a result of the nonsensical gatekeeping that we face.
* The timing of when these expectations are given to departments, as well as when these reports are due, is poorly planned. Reports are usually due at the end of the semester in conjunction with other lengthy reports (e.g. Program Review). If the purpose is to provide meaningful information to guide departments, then the departments need lead-time to complete these reports in the manner in which they are intended. Due dates for reports and data driven documentation need to be planned college wide so that departments can collect and analyze data properly.
* The instructions for how to use the CLOs and PLOs are confusing. Even with a pilot program, there needs to be examples of how to do this process. Human and electronic resources need to be readily available throughout the process. Some written assessment reports models from other colleges would have been helpful, especially for those of us in the pilot program. Faculty are not getting the proper resources to complete these types of assignments. For example, we completed GELO/CLO alignment spreadsheet on August 23, 2012, but did not receive copies of it. Therefore, the Department had to recreate the GELO/CLO alignment sheet on May 24, 2013. This is a frustrating replication of work.
* Provide specific departmental resources. For example, the National Communication Association publishes “A Communication Assessment Primer” that is available in downloadable PDF format on their website. This resource could be shared by the SPCOM faculty to facilitate not only this process, but also assist us in improving our assessment tools by aligning with our professional organization’s standards.
* Suggestion: Rather than ask for the success rates to be inserted into the map ( or maybe in addition), have faculty map the type of assessment(s) they use for the CLO alignment to the GELO. I think it would be more meaningful to see what type of method of evaluation is being used to determine if student is completing outcome. It could also provide a bigger picture of what types of assessments are used in different disciplines in order to assess student achievement of GELOs. For example, some disciplines might use a research paper to assess a CLO that aligns with GELO #3. See brief example of assessment map.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | AREA D – GELO #1 | AREA D - GELO #2 | AREA D - GELO #3 |
| SPCOM 100 CLO #1 | Speeches |  | Persuasive Speech Outline |
| SPCOM 100 CLO #2 |  | Exam |  |

\* Departments have historically been told that if we do “X” by a certain date, then it will help determine if we receive new faculty hires or other resources. In practice, however, that is absolutely untrue. Even when we complete these arbitrarily assigned requirements, they never seem to pan-out when resources and faculty are being determined which undermines the utility of this activity. Further, the rationale that we often are told is that “We’ll follow the process next time, but we need to move forward.” That violates the trust that faculty members have within this process.

 \* It would be helpful to have the spreadsheets prefilled with the percentages for the CLO data.

 \* We know from experience that this process will change again—without much lead-time for faculty—and yet we will be held to the “new standard” even though the goal-posts have moved again.

 \* In sum, the most frustrating conclusion to this entire activity is this—We have been unable to complete this activity by the due date and the onus of responsibility is beyond our capability. Of major concern to the Speech Communication Department faculty is that we value doing good work. We typically are one of the leading departments on the campus to get reports and requirements like these done by expected due dates. However, even our department is having a difficult time completing this activity in a meaningful way. It is time to invest in the proper resources to complete these processes that are important to our institution's accreditation and student success formulas.