# Calendar-Year Program Report

Program Title: TCOM
Calendar Year: 2020

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## COURSES AND OUTCOMES ASSESSED

ISLO #1: Communication – W,O
PSLO #1: Utilize technology to share ideas

TCOM 100
ENGL 314
TCOM 420 (M)

ISLO #2: Critical Thinking – Inquiry & Analysis
PSLO #2: Critical Thinking Skills

TCOM 200
TCOM 360
TCOM 420 (M)

## AGGREGATE REPORT

**Assessment Results - AACU VALUE Rubric for ISLO 1 - PSLO 1**

| Subject | Course | Sections Participating | Total Measures | Outcome | Semester |
|---------|--------|------------------------|----------------|---------|----------|
| TCOM | 100 | 1 | 1 | Not Met | Fall |
| ENGL | 314 | 1 | 1 | Met | Spring |
| TCOM | 420(M) | | | Not Offered | |
| | | | | | |
| **Program Title Courses - Overall Findings for PSLO 1** | | | | | |
| Total Sections Selected for Assessment | | | 1 | | |
| Total Sections Assessed | | | 1 | | |
| % Sections Meeting or Exceeding Target (of those assessed) | | | 50% | | |
| | | | | | |
| **Recommendations, Reflections, and Notes:** | | | | | |
| Appended. | | | | | |

**Assessment Results - AACU VALUE Rubric for ISLO 2 – PSLO 2**

| Subject | Course | Sections Participating | Total Measures | Outcome | Semester |
|---------|--------|------------------------|----------------|---------|----------|
| TCOM | 200 | 1 | 1 | Met | Spring |
| TCOM | 360 | 1 | 1 | Met | Spring |
| TCOM | 360 | 1 | 1 | Met | Fall |
| TCOM | 420(M) | | | Not Offered | |
| | | | | | |
| **Program Title Courses - Overall Findings for PSLO 8** | | | | | |
| Total Sections Selected for Assessment | | | 3 | | |
| Total Sections Assessed | | | 3 | | |
| % Sections Meeting or Exceeding Target (of those assessed) | | | 100% | | |
| | | | | | |
| **Recommendations, Reflections, and Notes:** | | | | | |
| Appended. | | | | | |

## DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

**Directions:** This portion of the document is designed to provide context for results, to discuss individual instructors' input on whether or not the methods they are using are effective.

Some questions to consider: is the assessment process for the outcome you're assessing sufficiently robust?

Are enough sections of the course being assessed to represent an accurate portrayal of program success?

If the targets have been met, might they be raised in the future?

If targets are consistently exceeded, might the assignment be made more demanding to challenge students effectively?

## DATA-DRIVEN DECISIONS

**Directions:** What will you change as a result of the data?

**If targets are not met:** best practices suggest we make changes to course content, rubrics, or the assessment process, and spend the next cycle year reviewing the courses for which we didn't meet targets *in addition to* the PSLOs up for that cycle year. If there are problems, we want to catch them quickly. So, if targets are not met, what will be changed, and what is the timeline for addressing the issue?

**If targets are met:** Many people are under the impression that as long as targets are met, then there is no need to make changes. As evidenced in the directions in the previous section, we can still make changes. Perhaps a new target would be appropriate? Perhaps the assignment should be more challenging for students? Perhaps a more robust measurement of the PSLO or ISLO could be made?

## RESOURCE ALLOCATION REQUESTS

### RESOURCE ALLOCATION REQUEST FORM

Guidelines for Request:
1. Please ensure the request is linked to learning outcomes (course, program, and/or institutional)
2. Complete this form and send it to your academic dean for review and potential consideration at Provost's Cabinet.

PROPOSAL INFORMATION:
Applicant's Name: _____
Program Title: _____

a. Please describe the request (what is the problem that the request is trying to solve?)

b. Describe and or list the resource(s) you hope to acquire as a result of this request. (For instance, are you looking for course materials, additional instructors, etc.? What is the problem that this request is trying to solve?)

c. How is the request linked to learning outcomes assessment?

d. Please include any data that will help support this request (learning outcomes data)

e. Describe briefly your follow-up assessment (currently we assess on a three-year cycle, but learning outcomes that are addressed with resource allocation should be assessed again as soon as possible to determine the viability and sustainability of resource allocation)

f. Please include any alternative sources of funding you have considered for this initiative (grants, different pools of money on campus, etc.)

g. Approximately how many students do you anticipate will be served by this request each Academic year?

h.  Total Amount Requested: _____

## SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS

**Directions:** some proposed areas of improvement might include: collection of data, distribution of data, what kinds of data is included/omitted, timelines, when or how work is completed, delegation of responsibilities, etc.

## APPENDIX A: QUALITATIVE AND CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION FROM TASKSTREAM

TCOM 360 -  Spring:

| | |
|---|---|
| Summary of Findings: | This was a very small course - only 4 students, and only 3 who ultimately turned in their final papers, under the stress of COVID-19. However, the three who turned their papers in did put some clear effort into it, and all three received higher than a 70. |
| Results : | Target Achievement: Met |
| Recommendations: | |
| Reflections/Notes: | Given this highly unusual semester, I think I will have to see how the projects go next term, in the fall, to really get a sense of how well the final paper works as a culmination of all the other pieces of the project. I also have a bigger class next fall, so I should have a greater sample size to work from. |

TCOM 360 – Fall

| | |
|---|---|
| Results : | Target Achievement: Met |
| Recommendations: | I think, next semester, I will try to clarify a little bit more what should and should not be included in the paper. I gave them a list of optional points to cover, hoping they would understand that they could pick and choose what applied best to their project, and most students did, but there were a handful who tried to talk about all of them even when they really didn't need to. I think it would help to make that a little clearer on the assignment sheet itself. |
| Reflections/Notes: | I was a little more lenient with requirements because of the pandemic, but not much; I relaxed the rules on citation a bit, but most students who had outside sources provided citations anyway. I'm very pleased with how this assignment worked to synthesize all the previous parts of the project, and the presentation that they did before writing their final paper also helped many of them to identify key points for the paper itself. |

TCOM 100

Summary of Findings:     Four students completed course requirements and two failed: one did not submit work and the other submitted plagiarized wrk.

Results :     Target Achievement: Not Met

Recommendations:     Uncertain how much pandemic conditions or the shift to new online instruction impacted the course.

Reflections/Notes:     Rough semester.


## TCOM 200

Results :     Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations:     I need to introduce students to this rubric and use it as the primary variable in determining the grades.

I will need to isolate the criteria and prepare students for these criteria via other assignments. There are already assignments in the course which will fulfill this need. It is just going to take a bit of work to align all of this properly.

Reflections/Notes:     I think it is important to note that, while all students passed, not all students demonstrated proficiency in the areas of critical thinking.

Part of this is a problem with the assignment itself. The assignment doesn't ask students to explore the opinions of others regarding the narrative quality of the games. Some students naturally did this. Others students found different sources not related to the narrative quality or lack thereof (for example, they might find resources related to the history of a franchise or something like this). So, students are being asked to provide resources, but aren't being asked to provide a specific, focused type of resource.