



Evangel University Due: September 14, 2016
Academic Program Assessment Report

Instructions: Please complete a separate Report for every academic program/major.

Department: COMMUNICATION

Term: FALL 2016

Academic Program Evaluated: ADVERTISING & PUBLIC RELATIONS

Faculty members involved in this assessment process:

Name	Title	Assessment Role
1. Dr. Cameron Pace	Professor	Data collection and evaluation
2. Dr. Chip Stanek	Assoc. Professor	Data collection and evaluation
3. Mr. Nancy Pace-Miller	Ass't. Professor	Evaluation
4. Dr. Mark Kelton	Professor	Evaluation
5. Ms. Melinda Booze	Ass't. Professor	Evaluation

Number of students in sample:

Breakdown by year if known

Number of students in sample = 19 (8 of which are seniors in this program)

Instrument(s) used in assessment:

1. Senior Capstone Project presentation – rubric used by faculty
2. Senior Portfolio project – rubric used by professor
3. Curriculum Advisor Committee – professionals and alumni evaluating our program
4. State and National Competition in related media/communication categories.

Methodology:

1. For the Senior Capstone Project presentation – a rubric that expresses various outcomes was used by faculty during evaluation. The rubric evaluation was not used for grading, but for the purpose of assessment. At least three faculty were available for each senior capstone presentation. Students were evaluated on a number of criteria that represented many of the overall outcomes of the department and program. After the presentations were completed, a statistical analysis was applied to the evaluation results for use in assessment decision-making. The purpose is to see how our seniors perform in terms of these outcomes near the end of the degree program.

2. Senior Portfolio project – each senior has to prepare a complete portfolio both in notebook form and online that demonstrates their learning and skills in communication. A rubric has been developed to evaluate these in terms similar to the outcomes of the major programs. The rubric has not been in use up to this semester, so there are not results yet that can be analyzed. In the future, the rubrics based on these portfolios can be tabulated and analyzes for comparison year-to-year. The portfolios provide a concrete way of seeing the results of completing the degree program. In the future, we want to tie this analysis to survey results of freshmen who, through self-evaluation, indicate the level of professionalism in the areas considered to be evident in the portfolios. This can give us a better indicator of progress during the four years, and eventually longitudinal assessment for the individuals who were at Evangel all four years. We can also move toward comparing these senior outcomes to those collected in earlier coursework.

3. Curriculum Advisory Committee – This is an opportunity for our faculty to receive feedback on our programs from professionals and alumni who are familiar with our programs and objectives. Some have hired our students or had them as interns. Their feedback gives us qualitative data to consider in regards to changes that benefit students. This committee meets at least every other year, if not each year. Before meeting with the committee to go over their observations and suggestions, they receive data, documents, and catalog information from the department. They are asked to consider our objectives, outcomes, and methods of assessment for the purpose of improvement.

4. Many Advertising/PR majors are involved in student media and/or forensics and debate. These participations influence the quality of materials submitted for contests sponsored by communication organizations. At this time, there is little to no competition in advertising or public relations outside of promotional video and TV spots in communication contests. In order to use this for assessment for this program, we will need to monitor more closely how Advertising/PR students participate in related contests and look for opportunities to participate in contests held in marketing and promotion. Some of our students participate in the student business organization Enactus where intercollegiate competition in marketing takes place. No record is available of communication participation specifically, but going forward, this might be an area to monitor.

Results of Assessment (data in summary format):

Capstone Project Presentation – Rubric Results (score out of 4)
 Number of students in sample = 19.

	Preparation	Demonstrated Learned Skills	Demonstrated Learned Theory	Professional Level of Project	Presentation	Average Per Evaluation	Overall Average for Student
Total of All Students Average	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5

Score for each major out of 4.

COMR	COMF & COMB	COMJ & COAE	COMM	COMD
3.633333	3.633333	3.3	3.285714	3.7

Senior Portfolio Rubric Results – not available at this time as this assessment is being used for the first time this semester (fall 2016).

Results from the Curriculum Advisory Committee listed in Appendix A of the program review.

Strengths:

Rubric results for capstone are not conclusive with such a small sample at this first attempt at use.

The fact that COMF and COMR students did well, in comparison, may be due to the specifics of the projects involved in capstone work. COMM majors tended to have more generalized approaches to their projects, making it more difficult to present. There isn't enough difference in the scores to warrant changes at this point. However, after another semester of capstone, some clarity might be available.

As to media contest results, broadcasting and film students have won awards consistently, especially in news. Strengths in longer films and in the weekly TV shows is evident.

Comments from the Curriculum Advisory Committee indicated strengths in all areas, especially in media production, professional character, and basic knowledge of communication in regards to our students.

Areas in need of improvement:

The capstone results don't give much clarity for change, however, some changes to the instrument might be needed. Having only four levels of evaluation scoring might skew evaluators to giving 3's and 4's and not 2's. Maybe a 5-point scale would allow for more accuracy in scoring. This idea will be discussed prior to the next rubric use.

Senior portfolios will be evaluated this December with the new rubric, so no results are available at this time.

The Curriculum Committee mentioned a few areas that need attention including holding students to higher standard, workplace expectations, cooperation and collaboration, and doing quality work the first time around.

Future monitoring of advertising/PR student participation in communication and business competition is needed in order to track progress in this area.

Plans for improvement:

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Changed the late policy in all communication classes to a stricter standard .	Fall 2016	All faculty
Added additional material in Senior Seminar to cover professional standards.	Fall 2016	Dr. Cameron Pace
Re-evaluate the rubric for capstone presentations as to more levels of evaluation.	Fall 2016	Dr. Chip Stanek
Emphasize quality of advertising products through additional experience in the workshops.	Fall 2016	Nancy Pace-Miller or related adjunct
Seek out contests in this field that can help gauge our student learning in comparison to other schools.	Spring 2017	Nancy Pace-Miller and Melinda Booze

Improvements made:

The late policy is in effect now and has had some impact on projects being turned in on time. We did not keep track of how many late assignments had occurred in the past, so it is mostly anecdotal information from faculty that indicates improvement.

The Senior Seminar Portfolio rubric was developed from an evaluation checklist that had been used. This makes for a clearer method of grading and helps with assessment as well.

The rubric for the Senior Capstone Project was changed to reflect more on the type of program the student had followed that should have affected the project in some way. Both the Capstone and Portfolio rubrics are partial assessments in that they show much, but not all of the possible learning objectives that need to be assessed.

Work has begun on a course database system through the LMS (Canvas) so that all learning objectives for each program would be covered in assessment. The various objectives in each program will be categorized and matched up to various assignments in the courses taken where an assessment instrument can be used for data collection. The plan is to enact this process for the spring 2017 semester.



Evangel University Due: September 14, 2016
Academic Program Assessment Report

Instructions: Please complete a separate Report for every academic program/major.

Department: COMMUNICATION

Term: FALL 2016

Academic Program Evaluated: COMMUNICATION ARTS EDUCATION

Faculty members involved in this assessment process:

Name	Title	Assessment Role
1. Dr. Cameron Pace	Professor	Data collection and evaluation
2. Dr. Chip Stanek	Assoc. Professor	Data collection and evaluation
3. Mr. Nancy Pace-Miller	Ass't. Professor	Evaluation
4. Dr. Mark Kelton	Professor	Evaluation
5. Ms. Melinda Booze	Ass't. Professor	Evaluation

Number of students in sample:

Breakdown by year if known

Total Students: 19 (0 with 4 or more years of college in comm. arts ed.)

Instrument(s) used in assessment:

1. Senior Capstone Project presentation – rubric used by faculty
2. Senior Portfolio project – rubric used by professor
3. Curriculum Advisor Committee – professionals and alumni evaluating our program
4. Education Department assessment for state accreditation.

Methodology:

1. For the Senior Capstone Project presentation – a rubric that expresses various outcomes was used by faculty during evaluation. The rubric evaluation was not used for grading, but for the purpose of assessment. At least three faculty were available for each senior capstone presentation. Students were evaluated on a number of criteria that represented many of the overall outcomes of the department and program. After the presentations were completed, a statistical analysis was applied to the evaluation results for use in assessment decision-making. The purpose is to see how our seniors perform in terms of these outcomes near the end of the degree program.

2. Senior Portfolio project – each senior has to prepare a complete portfolio both in notebook form and online that demonstrates their learning and skills in communication. A rubric has been developed to evaluate these in terms similar to the outcomes of the major programs. The rubric has not been in use up to this semester, so there are not results yet that can be analyzed. In the future, the rubrics based on these portfolios can be tabulated and analyzes for comparison year-to-year. The portfolios provide a concrete way of seeing the results of completing the degree program. In the future, we want to tie this analysis to survey results of freshmen who, through self-evaluation, indicate the level of professionalism in the areas considered to be evident in the portfolios. This can give us a better indicator of progress during the four years, and eventually longitudinal assessment for the individuals who were at Evangel all four years. We can also move toward comparing these senior outcomes to those collected in earlier coursework.

3. Curriculum Advisory Committee – This is an opportunity for our faculty to receive feedback on our programs from professionals and alumni who are familiar with our programs and objectives. Some have hired our students or had them as interns. Their feedback gives us qualitative data to consider in regards to changes that benefit students. This committee meets at least every other year, if not each year. Before meeting with the committee to go over their observations and suggestions, they receive data, documents, and catalog information from the department. They are asked to consider our objectives, outcomes, and methods of assessment for the purpose of improvement.

4. The Education Department conducts a battery of testing for secondary education majors. The results of these tests are available for review from that department.

Results of Assessment (data in summary format):

Capstone Project Presentation – Rubric Results (score out of 4)
 Number of students in sample 19.

	Preparation	Demonstrated Learned Skills	Demonstrated Learned Theory	Professional Level of Project	Presentation	Average Per Evaluation	Overall Average for Student
Total of All Students Average	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5

Score for each major out of 4.

COMR	COMF & COMB	COMJ & COAE	COMM	COMD
3.633333	3.633333	3.3	3.285714	3.7

Senior Portfolio Rubric Results – not available at this time as this assessment is being used for the first time this semester (fall 2016).

Results from the Curriculum Advisory Committee listed in Appendix A of program review.

Results from Praxis Testing in Secondary Education

Subject Area 10-11 11-12 12-13 13-14 14-15

Early Childhood 100% (3/3) 100% (7/7) 100% (5/5) 100% (15/15) 100% (4/4)
Elementary Ed. 100% (17/17) 100% (13/13) 100% (21/21) 100% (26/26) 95% (20/21)
Special Ed. 100% (5/5) 100% (1/1) 100% (4/4) 100% (1/1) 100% (4/4)
MS (Science) N/A 100% (2/2) N/A N/A 100% (1/1)
MS (Soc Stu) N/A N/A N/A N/A 75% (3/4)
MS (Lang. Arts) N/A N/A N/A N/A 100% (1/1)
MS(Math) 0% (0/1) N/A 100% (2/2) 100% (1/1) 50% (1/2)
Elem/MS Total 96% (25/26) 100% (23/23) 100% (32/32) 100% (43/43) 92% (34/37)
ART 100% (2/2) N/A N/A 100% (2/2) 0% (0/1)
BIOLOGY 100% (1/1) 100% (1/1) 100% (3/3) 100% (1/1) NA
BUSINESS 100% (1/1) 100% (2/2) 100% (4/4) 100% (5/5) 100% (1/1)
CHEMISTRY N/A N/A N/A 100% (1/1) 100% (1/1)
ENGLISH 100% (3/3) 100% (1/1) 100% (5/5) 100% (4/4) 100% (2/2)
MATHEMATICS 80% (4/5) 67% (2/3) 75% (3/4) 100% (3/3) 50% (1/2)
MUSIC 100% (5/5) 100% (6/6) 100% (3/3) 100% (11/11) 100% (5/5)
PHYS ED 67% (6/9) 78% (7/9) 100% (8/8) 88% (7/8) 100% (4/4)
SOC STU 100% (2/2) 100% (7/7) 100% (4/4) 50% (1/2) 50% (1/2)
SPANISH 100% (1/1) 50% (1/2) 100% (2/2) N/A 100% (2/2)
SPEECH/THEAT 100% (2/2) N/A 100% (1/1) N/A NA
UNIF SCIENCE N/A N/A N/A N/A NA
Secondary Total 87% (27/31) 87% (27/31) 97% (33/34) 95% (35/37) 85% (17/20)
Totals 91% (52/57) 93% (50/54) 98% (65/66) 97% (78/80) *89% (51/57)

Strengths:

Rubric results for capstone are not conclusive with such a small sample at this first attempt at use.

The fact that COMF and COMR students did well, in comparison, may be due to the specifics of the projects involved in capstone work. COMM majors tended to have more generalized approaches to their projects, making it more difficult to present. There isn't enough difference in the scores to warrant changes at this point. However, after another semester of capstone, some clarity might be available.

As to media contest results, broadcasting and film students have won awards consistently, especially in news. Strengths in longer films and in the weekly TV shows is evident.

Comments from the Curriculum Advisory Committee indicated strengths in all areas, especially in media production, professional character, and basic knowledge of communication in regards to our students.

This program of study includes a number of additional courses in English and Education that assessed in those respective departments. The assessment for these areas of this program are found there and occasionally reviewed by our faculty.

Areas in need of improvement:

The capstone results don't give much clarity for change, however, some changes to the instrument might be needed. Having only four levels of evaluation scoring might skew evaluators to giving 3's and 4's and not 2's. Maybe a 5-point scale would allow for more accuracy in scoring. This idea will be discussed prior to the next rubric use.

Senior portfolios will be evaluated this December with the new rubric, so no results are available at this time.

The Curriculum Committee mentioned a few areas that need attention including holding students to higher standard, workplace expectations, cooperation and collaboration, and doing quality work the first time around.

Plans for improvement:

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Changed the late policy in all communication classes to a stricter standard .	Fall 2016	All faculty
Added additional material in Senior Seminar to cover professional standards.	Fall 2016	Dr. Cameron Pace
Re-evaluate the rubric for capstone presentations as to more levels of evaluation.	Fall 2016	Dr. Chip Stanek
Emphasize quality of advertising products through additional experience in the workshops.	Fall 2016	Nancy Pace-Miller or related adjunct

Improvements made:

The late policy is in effect now and has had some impact on projects being turned in on time. We did not keep track of how many late assignments had occurred in the past, so it is mostly anecdotal information from faculty that indicates improvement.

The Senior Seminar Portfolio rubric was developed from an evaluation checklist that had been used. This makes for a clearer method of grading and helps with assessment as well.

The rubric for the Senior Capstone Project was changed to reflect more on the type of program the student had followed that should have affected the project in some way. Both

the Capstone and Portfolio rubrics are partial assessments in that they show much, but not all of the possible learning objectives that need to be assessed.

Work has begun on a course database system through the LMS (Canvas) so that all learning objectives for each program would be covered in assessment. The various objectives in each program will be categorized and matched up to various assignments in the courses taken where an assessment instrument can be used for data collection. The plan is to enact this process for the spring 2017 semester.



Evangel University Due: September 14, 2016
Academic Program Assessment Report

Instructions: Please complete a separate Report for every academic program/major.

Department: COMMUNICATION

Term: FALL 2016

Academic Program Evaluated: COMMUNICATION STUDIES

Faculty members involved in this assessment process:

Name	Title	Assessment Role
1. Dr. Cameron Pace	Professor	Data collection and evaluation
2. Dr. Chip Stanek	Assoc. Professor	Data collection and evaluation
3. Mr. Nancy Pace-Miller	Ass't. Professor	Evaluation
4. Dr. Mark Kelton	Professor	Evaluation
5. Ms. Melinda Booze	Ass't. Professor	Evaluation

Number of students in sample:

Total Students: 19 (8 with 4 or more years of college in comm. studies)

Instrument(s) used in assessment:

1. Senior Capstone Project presentation – rubric used by faculty
2. Senior Portfolio project – rubric used by professor
3. Curriculum Advisor Committee – professionals and alumni evaluating our program
4. Results from state, regional and national competition in debate and forensics.

Methodology:

1. For the Senior Capstone Project presentation – a rubric that expresses various outcomes was used by faculty during evaluation. The rubric evaluation was not used for grading, but for the purpose of assessment. At least three faculty were available for each senior capstone presentation. Students were evaluated on a number of criteria that represented many of the overall outcomes of the department and program. After the presentations were completed, a statistical analysis was applied to the evaluation results for use in assessment decision-making. The purpose is to see how our seniors perform in terms of these outcomes near the end of the degree program.

2. Senior Portfolio project – each senior has to prepare a complete portfolio both in

notebook form and online that demonstrates their learning and skills in communication. A rubric has been developed to evaluate these in terms similar to the outcomes of the major programs. The rubric has not been in use up to this semester, so there are not results yet that can be analyzed. In the future, the rubrics based on these portfolios can be tabulated and analyzed for comparison year-to-year. The portfolios provide a concrete way of seeing the results of completing the degree program. In the future, we want to tie this analysis to survey results of freshmen who, through self-evaluation, indicate the level of professionalism in the areas considered to be evident in the portfolios. This can give us a better indicator of progress during the four years, and eventually longitudinal assessment for the individuals who were at Evangel all four years. We can also move toward comparing these senior outcomes to those collected in earlier coursework.

3. Curriculum Advisory Committee – This is an opportunity for our faculty to receive feedback on our programs from professionals and alumni who are familiar with our programs and objectives. Some have hired our students or had them as interns. Their feedback gives us qualitative data to consider in regards to changes that benefit students. This committee meets at least every other year, if not each year. Before meeting with the committee to go over their observations and suggestions, they receive data, documents, and catalog information from the department. They are asked to consider our objectives, outcomes, and methods of assessment for the purpose of improvement.

4. Competition in Forensics and Debate - All communication studies students must participate in forensics and often debate. A significant group of these students are on the intercollegiate forensics and debate team that compete each semester. The results are in the process of being recorded and analyzed for discovering strengths and weaknesses in these areas. This has not been recorded as thoroughly as it needs to be. Changes are being made to make this a better assessment tool.

Results of Assessment (data in summary format):

Capstone Project Presentation – Rubric Results (score out of 4)
19 students included in sample

	Preparation	Demonstrated Learned Skills	Demonstrated Learned Theory	Professional Level of Project	Presentation	Average Per Evaluation	Overall Average for Student
Total of All Students Average	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5

Score for each major out of 4.

COMR	COMF & COMB	COMJ & COAE	COMM	COMD
3.633333	3.633333	3.3	3.285714	3.7

Senior Portfolio Rubric Results – not available at this time as this assessment is being used for the first time this semester (fall 2016).

Results from the Curriculum Advisory Committee listed in Appendix A of the Program Review.

Results from national and state competition in forensics and debate:

School Year	Award Year	Medium		Category	Place	Organization
2013	2013	Forensics Tournaments	Forensics	Team Debate	First place	International Public Debate Association
2013	2013	Forensics Tournaments	Forensics	Team Debate	First Place	International Public Debate Association
2013	2013	Forensics Tournaments	Forensics	Individual Speaker	Fouth Place	International Public Debate Association
2013	2013	Forensics Tournaments	Forensics	Impromptu Speaking	semifinalist	International Public Debate Association
2013	2013	Forensics Tournaments	Forensics	Dramatic Duo	semifinalist	International Public Debate Association
2013	2013	Forensics Tournaments	Forensics	Dramatic Duo	semifinalist	International Public Debate Association
2012	2012	Forensics Tournaments	Forensics	Informative Speaking	First Place	October Slam Forensics Tournament
2012	2012	Forensics Tournaments	Forensics	Communication Analysis	First Place	October Slam Forensics Tournament
2012	2013	Forensics Tournaments	Forensics	Impromptu Speaking	Fifth Place	October Slam Forensics Tournament
2012	2012	Forensics Tournaments	Forensics	After Dinner Speaking	Third Place	October Slam Forensics Tournament
2012	2012	Forensics Tournaments	Forensics	Persuasive Speaking	Sixth	October Slam Forensics Tournament
2012	2012	Forensics Tournaments	Forensics	Communication Analysis	Sixth Place	October Slam Forensics Tournament
2012	2012	Forensics Tournaments	Forensics	Dramatic Duo	Finalists	October Slam Forensics Tournament
2012	2012	Forensics Tournaments	Forensics	Commedia Dell'arte	Third Place	International Forensic Association Speech and Debate Tournament

*The results are rather old, but efforts are being made to locate updated data and do better in recording this information.

Strengths:

Rubric results for capstone are not conclusive with such a small sample at this first attempt at use.

The fact that COMF and COMR students did well, in comparison, may be due to the specifics of the projects involved in capstone work. COMM majors tended to have more generalized approaches to their projects, making it more difficult to present. There isn't enough difference in the scores to warrant changes at this point. However, after another semester of capstone, some clarity might be available.

Comments from the Curriculum Advisory Committee indicated strengths in all areas, especially in media production, professional character, and basic knowledge of communication in regards to our students.

As to speech and debate contest results, Evangel students have won awards consistently, especially in debate. Some individuals have won in various categories. The data reported here is incomplete and does not include information about the categories entered. In order

to use this as assessment tool, a comparison of winners to number who competed would be helpful. Also, it would be helpful to know what categories were winners and non-winners.

Areas in need of improvement:

The capstone results don't give much clarity for change, however, some changes to the instrument might be needed. Having only four levels of evaluation scoring might skew evaluators to giving 3's and 4's and not 2's. Maybe a 5-point scale would allow for more accuracy in scoring. This idea will be discussed prior to the next rubric use.

Senior portfolios will be evaluated this December with the new rubric, so no results are available at this time.

The Curriculum Committee mentioned a few areas that need attention including holding students to higher standard, workplace expectations, cooperation and collaboration, and doing quality work the first time around.

Results from competition needs to be more closely evaluated and recorded so that results can be analyzed for the purposes of assessment.

Plans for improvement:

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Changed the late policy in all communication classes to a stricter standard .	Fall 2016	All faculty
Added additional material in Senior Seminar to cover professional standards.	Fall 2016	Dr. Cameron Pace
Re-evaluate the rubric for capstone presentations as to more levels of evaluation.	Fall 2016	Dr. Chip Stanek
Emphasize quality of advertising products through additional experience in the workshops.	Fall 2016	Nancy Pace-Miller or related adjunct
Forensics competition will be recorded in terms of entries and awards.	Spring 2017	Dr. Mark Kelton and Wanda Potter

Improvements made:

The late policy is in effect now and has had some impact on projects being turned in on time. We did not keep track of how many late assignments had occurred in the past, so it is mostly anecdotal information from faculty that indicates improvement.

The Senior Seminar Portfolio rubric was developed from an evaluation checklist that had been used. This makes for a clearer method of grading and helps with assessment as well.

The rubric for the Senior Capstone Project was changed to reflect more on the type of program the student had followed that should have affected the project in some way. Both the Capstone and Portfolio rubrics are partial assessments in that they show much, but not all of the possible learning objectives that need to be assessed.

Work has begun on a course database system through the LMS (Canvas) so that all learning objectives for each program would be covered in assessment. The various objectives in each program will be categorized and matched up to various assignments in the courses taken where an assessment instrument can be used for data collection. The plan is to enact this process for the spring 2017 semester.



Evangel University Due: September 14, 2016
Academic Program Assessment Report

Instructions: Please complete a separate Report for every academic program/major.

Department: COMMUNICATION

Term: FALL 2016

Academic Program Evaluated: DIGITAL ARTS

Faculty members involved in this assessment process:

Name	Title	Assessment Role
1. Dr. Cameron Pace	Professor	Data collection and evaluation
2. Dr. Chip Stanek	Assoc. Professor	Data collection and evaluation
3. Mr. Nancy Pace-Miller	Ass't. Professor	Evaluation
4. Dr. Mark Kelton	Professor	Evaluation
5. Ms. Melinda Booze	Ass't. Professor	Evaluation

Number of students in sample:

Breakdown by year if known

Total Students: 19 (0 with 4 or more years of college in digital arts BS)

Instrument(s) used in assessment:

1. Senior Capstone Project presentation – rubric used by faculty
2. Senior Portfolio project – rubric used by professor
3. State and National competition in digital media categories
4. Curriculum Advisor Committee – professionals and alumni evaluating our program

Methodology:

1. For the Senior Capstone Project presentation – a rubric that expresses various outcomes was used by faculty during evaluation. The rubric evaluation was not used for grading, but for the purpose of assessment. At least three faculty were available for each senior capstone presentation. Students were evaluated on a number of criteria that represented many of the overall outcomes of the department and program. After the presentations were completed, a statistical analysis was applied to the evaluation results for use in assessment decision-making. The purpose is to see how our seniors perform in terms of these outcomes near the end of the degree program.

2. Senior Portfolio project – each senior has to prepare a complete portfolio both in notebook form and online that demonstrates their learning and skills in communication. A rubric has been developed to evaluate these in terms similar to the outcomes of the major programs. The rubric has not been in use up to this semester, so there are not results yet that can be analyzed. In the future, the rubrics based on these portfolios can be tabulated and analyzes for comparison year-to-year. The portfolios provide a concrete way of seeing the results of completing the degree program. In the future, we want to tie this analysis to survey results of freshmen who, through self-evaluation, indicate the level of professionalism in the areas considered to be evident in the portfolios. This can give us a better indicator of progress during the four years, and eventually longitudinal assessment for the individuals who were at Evangel all four years. We can also move toward comparing these senior outcomes to those collected in earlier coursework.

3. State and National Competition in the areas of digital media – Every year we submit student materials for competition in communication-based, media contests sponsored by station and national organizations. Such categories include films, broadcasts, scripts, radio shows, web materials, animations, and other related productions. How we do in these contests gives us an assessment of the level of learning our students receive in comparison to other colleges and universities. It also gives us some year-to-year comparisons for our own submissions. This can vary much from year to year due to judging or failure to compete in certain areas, however, looking over a series of years can help us make some conclusions as to our long-range assessment.

4. Curriculum Advisory Committee – This is an opportunity for our faculty to receive feedback on our programs from professionals and alumni who are familiar with our programs and objectives. Some have hired our students or had them as interns. Their feedback gives us qualitative data to consider in regards to changes that benefit students. This committee meets at least every other year, if not each year. Before meeting with the committee to go over their observations and suggestions, they receive data, documents, and catalog information from the department. They are asked to consider our objectives, outcomes, and methods of assessment for the purpose of improvement.

Results of Assessment (data in summary format):

Capstone Project Presentation – Rubric Results (score out of 4)

Number of students in sample 19

	Preparation	Demonstrated Learned Skills	Demonstrated Learned Theory	Professional Level of Project	Presentation	Average Per Evaluation	Overall Average for Student
Total of All Students Average	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5

Score for each major out of 4.

COMR	COMF & COMB	COMJ & COAE	COMM	COMD
3.633333	3.633333	3.3	3.285714	3.7

Senior Portfolio Rubric Results – not available at this time as this assessment is being used for the first time this semester (fall 2016).

State and National competition results (last five years):

<p><u>2015</u> MBEA Sports Update: Best Sports Program Newswatch: Best Newscast SCJ Newswatch:TV Show Overall Excellence - 1st Place</p>
<p><u>2014</u> MBEA and SCJ Sports Update: 1st place Sports Show, Sports Package Pro Day - 1st Place Newswatch: 1st place News Show - Recurring, TV Show Overall Excellence - 3rd Place, News Show - Recurring, Newswatch Today-1st place</p>
<p><u>2013</u> MBEA Sports Update: 1st place Sports Show, Newswatch: 1st place News Show EUTV Commercial: Hallmark Commercial - 1st place, Keaurig_1 - Honorable Mention, Short Film:Buisness as Usual: Honorable Mention Feature Film: EU Anodyne Movie and Second Signt Movie: Honorable Mention and 1st Place Coffee and Culture Documentary: Honorable Mention Documentary/Public affairs: Evangel Doc Transfer Gallery: 1st Place</p>
<p><u>2012</u> SJC and MBEA Sports Update: 1st place Best Television Sports Sports Update: Honorable Mention Newswatch: Honorable Mention</p>
<p><u>2011</u> MBEA Sports Update: 1st place Sports Programming</p>

Results from the Curriculum Advisory Committee listed in Appendix A of the program review.

Strengths:

Rubric results for capstone are not conclusive with such a small sample at this first attempt at use.

The fact that COMF and COMR students did well, in comparison, may be due to the specifics of the projects involved in capstone work. COMM majors tended to have more generalized approaches to their projects, making it more difficult to present. There isn't enough difference in the scores to warrant changes at this point. However, after another semester of capstone, some clarity might be available.

As to media contest results, digital arts students have won awards consistently, especially in animation and web design. More categories need to be included from digital arts. Many digital arts students are involved with the film and broadcasting categories listed above.

Comments from the Curriculum Advisory Committee indicated strengths in all areas, especially in media production, professional character, and basic knowledge of communication in regards to our students.

Areas in need of improvement:

The capstone results don't give much clarity for change, however, some changes to the instrument might be needed. Having only four levels of evaluation scoring might skew evaluators to giving 3's and 4's and not 2's. Maybe a 5-point scale would allow for more accuracy in scoring. This idea will be discussed prior to the next rubric use.

Senior portfolios will be evaluated this December with the new rubric, so no results are available at this time.

There needs to be more audio/radio projects submitted to contests in the future to better evaluate those areas. Also, short films and documentaries are not doing as well in the competition, though there is the occasional standout. Either more practice in these areas are needed in class activities or the competition is significantly better in these areas, making it a tougher win.

The Curriculum Committee mentioned a few areas that need attention including holding students to higher standard, workplace expectations, cooperation and collaboration, and doing quality work the first time around.

Plans for improvement:

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Changed the late policy in	Fall 2016	All faculty

all communication classes to a stricter standard .		
Added additional material in Senior Seminar to cover professional standards.	Fall 2016	Dr. Cameron Pace
Re-evaluate the rubric for capstone presentations as to more levels of evaluation.	Fall 2016	Dr. Chip Stanek
Enter more competition with digital arts categories.	Spring 2017	Dr. Chip Stanek

Improvements made:

The late policy is in effect now and has had some impact on projects being turned in on time. We did not keep track of how many late assignments had occurred in the past, so it is mostly anecdotal information from faculty that indicates improvement.

The Senior Seminar Portfolio rubric was developed from an evaluation checklist that had been used. This makes for a clearer method of grading and helps with assessment as well.

The rubric for the Senior Capstone Project was changed to reflect more on the type of program the student had followed that should have affected the project in some way. Both the Capstone and Portfolio rubrics are partial assessments in that they show much, but not all of the possible learning objectives that need to be assessed.

Work has begun on a course database system through the LMS (Canvas) so that all learning objectives for each program would be covered in assessment. The various objectives in each program will be categorized and matched up to various assignments in the courses taken where an assessment instrument can be used for data collection. The plan is to enact this process for the spring 2017 semester.



Evangel University Due: September 14, 2016
Academic Program Assessment Report

Instructions: Please complete a separate Report for every academic program/major.

Department: COMMUNICATION

Term: FALL 2016

Academic Program Evaluated: DIGITAL ARTS - BFA

Faculty members involved in this assessment process:

Name	Title	Assessment Role
1. Dr. Cameron Pace	Professor	Data collection and evaluation
2. Dr. Chip Stanek	Assoc. Professor	Data collection and evaluation
3. Mr. Nancy Pace-Miller	Ass't. Professor	Evaluation
4. Dr. Mark Kelton	Professor	Evaluation
5. Ms. Melinda Booze	Ass't. Professor	Evaluation

Number of students in sample:

Breakdown by year if known

Total students: 19 (1 with 4 or more years of Digital Arts in BFA)

Instrument(s) used in assessment:

1. Senior Capstone Project presentation – rubric used by faculty
2. Senior Portfolio project – rubric used by professor
3. State and National competition in digital media categories
4. Curriculum Advisor Committee – professionals and alumni evaluating our program
5. Assessment methods employed by the Humanities Dept. for graphic design/art.

Methodology:

1. For the Senior Capstone Project presentation – a rubric that expresses various outcomes was used by faculty during evaluation. The rubric evaluation was not used for grading, but for the purpose of assessment. At least three faculty were available for each senior capstone presentation. Students were evaluated on a number of criteria that represented many of the overall outcomes of the department and program. After the presentations were completed, a statistical analysis was applied to the evaluation results for use in assessment decision-making. The purpose is to see how our seniors perform in terms of these outcomes near the end of the degree program.

2. Senior Portfolio project – each senior has to prepare a complete portfolio both in notebook form and online that demonstrates their learning and skills in communication. A rubric has been developed to evaluate these in terms similar to the outcomes of the major programs. The rubric has not been in use up to this semester, so there are not results yet that can be analyzed. In the future, the rubrics based on these portfolios can be tabulated and analyzed for comparison year-to-year. The portfolios provide a concrete way of seeing the results of completing the degree program. In the future, we want to tie this analysis to survey results of freshmen who, through self-evaluation, indicate the level of professionalism in the areas considered to be evident in the portfolios. This can give us a better indicator of progress during the four years, and eventually longitudinal assessment for the individuals who were at Evangel all four years. We can also move toward comparing these senior outcomes to those collected in earlier coursework.

3. State and National Competition in the areas of digital media – Every year we submit student materials for competition in communication-based, media contests sponsored by station and national organizations. Such categories include films, broadcasts, scripts, radio shows, web materials, animations, and other related productions. How we do in these contests gives us an assessment of the level of learning our students receive in comparison to other colleges and universities. It also gives us some year-to-year comparisons for our own submissions. This can vary much from year to year due to judging or failure to compete in certain areas, however, looking over a series of years can help us make some conclusions as to our long-range assessment.

4. Curriculum Advisory Committee – This is an opportunity for our faculty to receive feedback on our programs from professionals and alumni who are familiar with our programs and objectives. Some have hired our students or had them as interns. Their feedback gives us qualitative data to consider in regards to changes that benefit students. This committee meets at least every other year, if not each year. Before meeting with the committee to go over their observations and suggestions, they receive data, documents, and catalog information from the department. They are asked to consider our objectives, outcomes, and methods of assessment for the purpose of improvement.

5. A portion of the coursework Digital Arts majors with bachelor of fine arts degrees is completed in the Humanities Department where these areas are assessed separately. Faculty in communication are able to view these procedures and results as they are made available from Humanities.

Results of Assessment (data in summary format):

Capstone Project Presentation – Rubric Results (score out of 4)
19 students included in sample.

	Preparation	Demonstrated Learned Skills	Demonstrated Learned Theory	Professional Level of Project	Presentation	Average Per Evaluation	Overall Average for Student
Total of All Students Average	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5

Score for each major out of 4.

COMR	COMF & COMB	COMJ & COAE	COMM	COMD
3.633333	3.633333	3.3	3.285714	3.7

Senior Portfolio Rubric Results – not available at this time as this assessment is being used for the first time this semester (fall 2016).

State and National competition results (last five years):

<p><u>2015</u></p> <p>MBEA</p> <p>Sports Update: Best Sports Program</p> <p>Newswatch: Best Newscast</p> <p>SCJ</p> <p>Newswatch:TV Show Overall Excellence - 1st Place</p>
<p><u>2014</u></p> <p>MBEA and SCJ</p> <p>Sports Update: 1st place Sports Show, Sports Package Pro Day - 1st Place</p> <p>Newswatch: 1st place News Show - Recurring, TV Show Overall Excellence - 3rd Place, News Show - Recurring, Newswatch Today-1st place</p>
<p><u>2013</u></p> <p>MBEA</p> <p>Sports Update: 1st place Sports Show,</p> <p>Newswatch: 1st place News Show</p> <p>EUTV Commercial: Hallmark Commercial - 1st place, Keaurig_1 - Honorable Mention,</p> <p>Short Film:Buisness as Usual: Honorable Mention</p> <p>Feature Film: EU Anodyne Movie and Second Sigt Movie: Honorable Mention and 1st Place</p> <p>Coffee and Culture Documentary: Honorable Mention</p> <p>Documentary/Public affairs: Evangel Doc Transfer Gallery: 1st Place</p>
<p><u>2012</u></p> <p>SJC and MBEA</p> <p>Sports Update: 1st place Best Television Sports</p> <p>Sports Update: Honorable Mention</p>

Newswatch: Honorable Mention
<u>2011</u>
MBEA
Sports Update: 1st place Sports Programming

Results from the Curriculum Advisory Committee listed in Appendix A.

Strengths:

Rubric results for capstone are not conclusive with such a small sample at this first attempt at use.

The fact that COMF and COMR students did well, in comparison, may be due to the specifics of the projects involved in capstone work. COMM majors tended to have more generalized approaches to their projects, making it more difficult to present. There isn't enough difference in the scores to warrant changes at this point. However, after another semester of capstone, some clarity might be available.

As to media contest results, broadcasting and film students have won awards consistently, especially in news. Strengths in longer films and in the weekly TV shows is evident.

Comments from the Curriculum Advisory Committee indicated strengths in all areas, especially in media production, professional character, and basic knowledge of communication in regards to our students.

Areas in need of improvement:

The capstone results don't give much clarity for change, however, some changes to the instrument might be needed. Having only four levels of evaluation scoring might skew evaluators to giving 3's and 4's and not 2's. Maybe a 5-point scale would allow for more accuracy in scoring. This idea will be discussed prior to the next rubric use.

Senior portfolios will be evaluated this December with the new rubric, so no results are available at this time.

There needs to be more audio/radio projects submitted to contests in the future to better evaluate those areas. Also, short films and documentaries are not doing as well in the competition, though there is the occasional standout. Either more practice in these areas are needed in class activities or the competition is significantly better in these areas, making it a tougher win.

The Curriculum Committee mentioned a few areas that need attention including holding students to higher standard, workplace expectations, cooperation and collaboration, and doing quality work the first time around.

Plans for improvement:

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Changed the late policy in all communication classes to a stricter standard .	Fall 2016	All faculty
Added additional material in Senior Seminar to cover professional standards.	Fall 2016	Dr. Cameron Pace
Re-evaluate the rubric for capstone presentations as to more levels of evaluation.	Fall 2016	Dr. Chip Stanek
Emphasize quality of production in documentary film class lessons.	Fall 2016	Dr. Cameron Pace

Improvements made:

The late policy is in effect now and has had some impact on projects being turned in on time. We did not keep track of how many late assignments had occurred in the past, so it is mostly anecdotal information from faculty that indicates improvement.

The Senior Seminar Portfolio rubric was developed from an evaluation checklist that had been used. This makes for a clearer method of grading and helps with assessment as well.

The rubric for the Senior Capstone Project was changed to reflect more on the type of program the student had followed that should have affected the project in some way. Both the Capstone and Portfolio rubrics are partial assessments in that they show much, but not all of the possible learning objectives that need to be assessed.

Work has begun on a course database system through the LMS (Canvas) so that all learning objectives for each program would be covered in assessment. The various objectives in each program will be categorized and matched up to various assignments in the courses taken where an assessment instrument can be used for data collection. The plan is to enact this process for the spring 2017 semester.



Evangel University Due: September 14, 2016
Academic Program Assessment Report

Instructions: Please complete a separate Report for every academic program/major.

Department: COMMUNICATION

Term: FALL 2016

Academic Program Evaluated: FILM AND BROADCASTING

Faculty members involved in this assessment process:

Name	Title	Assessment Role
1. Dr. Cameron Pace	Professor	Data collection and evaluation
2. Dr. Chip Stanek	Assoc. Professor	Data collection and evaluation
3. Mr. Nancy Pace-Miller	Ass't. Professor	Evaluation
4. Dr. Mark Kelton	Professor	Evaluation
5. Ms. Melinda Booze	Ass't. Professor	Evaluation

Number of students in sample:

Breakdown by year if known

Total Students: 19 (3 with 4 or more years of college in film and broadcasting)

Instrument(s) used in assessment:

1. Senior Capstone Project presentation – rubric used by faculty
2. Senior Portfolio project – rubric used by professor
3. State and National competition in film and broadcasting categories
4. Curriculum Advisor Committee – professionals and alumni evaluating our program

Methodology:

1. For the Senior Capstone Project presentation – a rubric that expresses various outcomes was used by faculty during evaluation. The rubric evaluation was not used for grading, but for the purpose of assessment. At least three faculty were available for each senior capstone presentation. Students were evaluated on a number of criteria that represented many of the overall outcomes of the department and program. After the presentations were completed, a statistical analysis was applied to the evaluation results for use in assessment decision-making. The purpose is to see how our seniors perform in terms of these outcomes near the end of the degree program.

2. Senior Portfolio project – each senior has to prepare a complete portfolio both in notebook form and online that demonstrates their learning and skills in communication. A rubric has been developed to evaluate these in terms similar to the outcomes of the major programs. The rubric has not been in use up to this semester, so there are not results yet that can be analyzed. In the future, the rubrics based on these portfolios can be tabulated and analyzes for comparison year-to-year. The portfolios provide a concrete way of seeing the results of completing the degree program. In the future, we want to tie this analysis to survey results of freshmen who, through self-evaluation, indicate the level of professionalism in the areas considered to be evident in the portfolios. This can give us a better indicator of progress during the four years, and eventually longitudinal assessment for the individuals who were at Evangel all four years. We can also move toward comparing these senior outcomes to those collected in earlier coursework.

3. State and National Competition in the areas of film and broadcasting – Every year we submit student materials for competition in communication-based, media contests sponsored by station and national organizations. Such categories include films, broadcasts, scripts, radio shows, and other related productions. How we do in these contests gives us an assessment of the level of learning our students receive in comparison to other colleges and universities. It also gives us some year-to-year comparisons for our own submissions. This can vary much from year to year due to judging or failure to compete in certain areas, however, looking over a series of years can help us make some conclusions as to our long-range assessment.

4. Curriculum Advisory Committee – This is an opportunity for our faculty to receive feedback on our programs from professionals and alumni who are familiar with our programs and objectives. Some have hired our students or had them as interns. Their feedback gives us qualitative data to consider in regards to changes that benefit students. This committee meets at least every other year, if not each year. Before meeting with the committee to go over their observations and suggestions, they receive data, documents, and catalog information from the department. They are asked to consider our objectives, outcomes, and methods of assessment for the purpose of improvement.

Results of Assessment (data in summary format):

Capstone Project Presentation – Rubric Results (score out of 4)

Number of students in sample – 19.

	Preparation	Demonstrated Learned Skills	Demonstrated Learned Theory	Professional Level of Project	Presentation	Average Per Evaluation	Overall Average for Student
Total of All Students Average	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5

Score for each major out of 4.

COMR	COMF & COMB	COMJ & COAE	COMM	COMD
3.633333	3.633333	3.3	3.285714	3.7

Senior Portfolio Rubric Results – not available at this time as this assessment is being used for the first time this semester (fall 2016).

State and National competition results (last five years):

<p><u>2015</u> MBEA Sports Update: Best Sports Program Newswatch: Best Newscast SCJ Newswatch:TV Show Overall Excellence - 1st Place</p>
<p><u>2014</u> MBEA and SCJ Sports Update: 1st place Sports Show, Sports Package Pro Day - 1st Place Newswatch: 1st place News Show - Recurring, TV Show Overall Excellence - 3rd Place, News Show - Recurring, Newswatch Today-1st place</p>
<p><u>2013</u> MBEA Sports Update: 1st place Sports Show, Newswatch: 1st place News Show EUTV Commercial: Hallmark Commercial - 1st place, Keaurig_1 - Honorable Mention, Short Film:Buisness as Usual: Honorable Mention Feature Film: EU Anodyne Movie and Second Signt Movie: Honorable Mention and 1st Place Coffee and Culture Documentary: Honorable Mention Documentary/Public affairs: Evangel Doc Transfer Gallery: 1st Place</p>
<p><u>2012</u> SJC and MBEA Sports Update: 1st place Best Television Sports Sports Update: Honorable Mention Newswatch: Honorable Mention</p>
<p><u>2011</u> MBEA Sports Update: 1st place Sports Programming</p>

Results from the Curriculum Advisory Committee listed in Appendix A.

Strengths:

Rubric results for capstone are not conclusive with such a small sample at this first attempt at use.

The fact that COMF and COMR students did well, in comparison, may be due to the specifics of the projects involved in capstone work. COMM majors tended to have more generalized approaches to their projects, making it more difficult to present. There isn't enough difference in the scores to warrant changes at this point. However, after another semester of capstone, some clarity might be available.

As to media contest results, broadcasting and film students have won awards consistently, especially in news. Strengths in longer films and in the weekly TV shows is evident.

Comments from the Curriculum Advisory Committee indicated strengths in all areas, especially in media production, professional character, and basic knowledge of communication in regards to our students.

Areas in need of improvement:

The capstone results don't give much clarity for change, however, some changes to the instrument might be needed. Having only four levels of evaluation scoring might skew evaluators to giving 3's and 4's and not 2's. Maybe a 5-point scale would allow for more accuracy in scoring. This idea will be discussed prior to the next rubric use.

Senior portfolios will be evaluated this December with the new rubric, so no results are available at this time.

There needs to be more audio/radio projects submitted to contests in the future to better evaluate those areas. Also, short films and documentaries are not doing as well in the competition, though there is the occasional standout. Either more practice in these areas are needed in class activities or the competition is significantly better in these areas, making it a tougher win.

The Curriculum Committee mentioned a few areas that need attention including holding students to higher standard, workplace expectations, cooperation and collaboration, and doing quality work the first time around.

Plans for improvement:

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Changed the late policy in all communication classes to a stricter standard .	Fall 2016	All faculty

Added additional material in Senior Seminar to cover professional standards.	Fall 2016	Dr. Cameron Pace
Re-evaluate the rubric for capstone presentations as to more levels of evaluation.	Fall 2016	Dr. Chip Stanek
Emphasize quality of production in documentary film class lessons.	Fall 2016	Dr. Cameron Pace

Improvements made:

The late policy is in effect now and has had some impact on projects being turned in on time. We did not keep track of how many late assignments had occurred in the past, so it is mostly anecdotal information from faculty that indicates improvement.

The Senior Seminar Portfolio rubric was developed from an evaluation checklist that had been used. This makes for a clearer method of grading and helps with assessment as well.

The rubric for the Senior Capstone Project was changed to reflect more on the type of program the student had followed that should have affected the project in some way. Both the Capstone and Portfolio rubrics are partial assessments in that they show much, but not all of the possible learning objectives that need to be assessed.

Work has begun on a course database system through the LMS (Canvas) so that all learning objectives for each program would be covered in assessment. The various objectives in each program will be categorized and matched up to various assignments in the courses taken where an assessment instrument can be used for data collection. The plan is to enact this process for the spring 2017 semester.



Evangel University Due: September 14, 2016
Academic Program Assessment Report

Instructions: Please complete a separate Report for every academic program/major.

Department: COMMUNICATION

Term: FALL 2016

Academic Program Evaluated: FILM MAJOR - BFA

Faculty members involved in this assessment process:

Name	Title	Assessment Role
1. Dr. Cameron Pace	Professor	Data collection and evaluation
2. Dr. Chip Stanek	Assoc. Professor	Data collection and evaluation
3. Mr. Nancy Pace-Miller	Ass't. Professor	Evaluation
4. Dr. Mark Kelton	Professor	Evaluation
5. Ms. Melinda Booze	Ass't. Professor	Evaluation

Number of students in sample:

Breakdown by year if known

Total Students: 19 (1 with 4 or more years of college in film)

Instrument(s) used in assessment:

1. Senior Capstone Project presentation – rubric used by faculty
2. Senior Portfolio project – rubric used by professor
3. State and National competition in film categories
4. Curriculum Advisor Committee – professionals and alumni evaluating our program
5. Assessment methods employed by the Humanities Dept. for theatre.

Methodology:

1. For the Senior Capstone Project presentation – a rubric that expresses various outcomes was used by faculty during evaluation. The rubric evaluation was not used for grading, but for the purpose of assessment. At least three faculty were available for each senior capstone presentation. Students were evaluated on a number of criteria that represented many of the overall outcomes of the department and program. After the presentations were completed, a statistical analysis was applied to the evaluation results for use in assessment decision-making. The purpose is to see how our seniors perform in terms of these outcomes near the end of the degree program.

2. Senior Portfolio project – each senior has to prepare a complete portfolio both in notebook form and online that demonstrates their learning and skills in communication. A rubric has been developed to evaluate these in terms similar to the outcomes of the major programs. The rubric has not been in use up to this semester, so there are not results yet that can be analyzed. In the future, the rubrics based on these portfolios can be tabulated and analyzed for comparison year-to-year. The portfolios provide a concrete way of seeing the results of completing the degree program. In the future, we want to tie this analysis to survey results of freshmen who, through self-evaluation, indicate the level of professionalism in the areas considered to be evident in the portfolios. This can give us a better indicator of progress during the four years, and eventually longitudinal assessment for the individuals who were at Evangel all four years. We can also move toward comparing these senior outcomes to those collected in earlier coursework.

3. State and National Competition in the areas of film – Every year we submit student materials for competition in communication-based, media contests sponsored by station and national organizations. Such categories include films, broadcasts, scripts, radio shows, web materials, animations, and other related productions. How we do in these contests gives us an assessment of the level of learning our students receive in comparison to other colleges and universities. It also gives us some year-to-year comparisons for our own submissions. This can vary much from year to year due to judging or failure to compete in certain areas, however, looking over a series of years can help us make some conclusions as to our long-range assessment.

4. Curriculum Advisory Committee – This is an opportunity for our faculty to receive feedback on our programs from professionals and alumni who are familiar with our programs and objectives. Some have hired our students or had them as interns. Their feedback gives us qualitative data to consider in regards to changes that benefit students. This committee meets at least every other year, if not each year. Before meeting with the committee to go over their observations and suggestions, they receive data, documents, and catalog information from the department. They are asked to consider our objectives, outcomes, and methods of assessment for the purpose of improvement.

5. A portion of the coursework Film majors with bachelor of fine arts degrees is completed in the Humanities Department where these areas are assessed separately. Faculty in communication are able to view these procedures and results as they are made available from Humanities.

Results of Assessment (data in summary format):

Capstone Project Presentation – Rubric Results (score out of 4)
Number of students in the sample: 19

	Preparation	Demonstrated Learned Skills	Demonstrated Learned Theory	Professional Level of Project	Presentation	Average Per Evaluation	Overall Average for Student
Total of All Students Average	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5

Score for each major out of 4.

COMR	COMF & COMB	COMJ & COAE	COMM	COMD
3.633333	3.633333	3.3	3.285714	3.7

Senior Portfolio Rubric Results – not available at this time as this assessment is being used for the first time this semester (fall 2016).

State and National competition results (last five years):

<u>2015</u> MBEA Sports Update: Best Sports Program Newswatch: Best Newscast SCJ Newswatch: TV Show Overall Excellence - 1st Place
<u>2014</u> MBEA and SCJ Sports Update: 1st place Sports Show, Sports Package Pro Day - 1st Place Newswatch: 1st place News Show - Recurring, TV Show Overall Excellence - 3rd Place, News Show - Recurring, Newswatch Today-1st place
<u>2013</u> MBEA Sports Update: 1st place Sports Show, Newswatch: 1st place News Show EUTV Commercial: Hallmark Commercial - 1st place, Keaurig_1 - Honorable Mention, Short Film: Buisness as Usual: Honorable Mention Feature Film: EU Anodyne Movie and Second Sigt Movie: Honorable Mention and 1st Place Coffee and Culture Documentary: Honorable Mention Documentary/Public affairs: Evangel Doc Transfer Gallery: 1st Place
<u>2012</u> SJC and MBEA Sports Update: 1st place Best Television Sports Sports Update: Honorable Mention

Newswatch: Honorable Mention
<u>2011</u>
MBEA
Sports Update: 1st place Sports Programming

Results from the Curriculum Advisory Committee listed in Appendix A of the program review.

Strengths:

Rubric results for capstone are not conclusive with such a small sample at this first attempt at use.

The fact that COMF and COMR students did well, in comparison, may be due to the specifics of the projects involved in capstone work. COMM majors tended to have more generalized approaches to their projects, making it more difficult to present. There isn't enough difference in the scores to warrant changes at this point. However, after another semester of capstone, some clarity might be available.

As to media contest results, broadcasting and film students have won awards consistently, especially in news. Strengths in longer films and in the weekly TV shows is evident.

Comments from the Curriculum Advisory Committee indicated strengths in all areas, especially in media production, professional character, and basic knowledge of communication in regards to our students.

Areas in need of improvement:

The capstone results don't give much clarity for change, however, some changes to the instrument might be needed. Having only four levels of evaluation scoring might skew evaluators to giving 3's and 4's and not 2's. Maybe a 5-point scale would allow for more accuracy in scoring. This idea will be discussed prior to the next rubric use.

Senior portfolios will be evaluated this December with the new rubric, so no results are available at this time.

Evangel feature films dominate in the state competition. Short films and documentaries are not doing as well in the competition, though there is the occasional standout. Either more practice in these areas are needed in class activities or the competition is significantly better in these areas, making it a tougher win.

The Curriculum Committee mentioned a few areas that need attention including holding students to higher standard, workplace expectations, cooperation and collaboration, and doing quality work the first time around.

Plans for improvement:

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Changed the late policy in all communication classes to a stricter standard .	Fall 2016	All faculty
Added additional material in Senior Seminar to cover professional standards.	Fall 2016	Dr. Cameron Pace
Re-evaluate the rubric for capstone presentations as to more levels of evaluation.	Fall 2016	Dr. Chip Stanek
Emphasize quality of production in documentary film class lessons.	Fall 2016	Dr. Cameron Pace

Improvements made:

The late policy is in effect now and has had some impact on projects being turned in on time. We did not keep track of how many late assignments had occurred in the past, so it is mostly anecdotal information from faculty that indicates improvement.

The Senior Seminar Portfolio rubric was developed from an evaluation checklist that had been used. This makes for a clearer method of grading and helps with assessment as well.

The rubric for the Senior Capstone Project was changed to reflect more on the type of program the student had followed that should have affected the project in some way. Both the Capstone and Portfolio rubrics are partial assessments in that they show much, but not all of the possible learning objectives that need to be assessed.

Work has begun on a course database system through the LMS (Canvas) so that all learning objectives for each program would be covered in assessment. The various objectives in each program will be categorized and matched up to various assignments in the courses taken where an assessment instrument can be used for data collection. The plan is to enact this process for the spring 2017 semester.



Evangel University Due: September 14, 2016
Academic Program Assessment Report

Instructions: Please complete a separate Report for every academic program/major.

Department: COMMUNICATION

Term: FALL 2016

Academic Program Evaluated: MULTIMEDIA JOURNALISM

Faculty members involved in this assessment process:

Name	Title	Assessment Role
1. Dr. Cameron Pace	Professor	Data collection and evaluation
2. Dr. Chip Stanek	Assoc. Professor	Data collection and evaluation
3. Mr. Nancy Pace-Miller	Ass't. Professor	Evaluation
4. Dr. Mark Kelton	Professor	Evaluation
5. Ms. Melinda Booze	Ass't. Professor	Evaluation

Number of students in sample:

Breakdown by year if known

Total Students: 19 (2 with 4 or more years of college in multimedia journalism)

Instrument(s) used in assessment:

1. Senior Capstone Project presentation – rubric used by faculty
2. Senior Portfolio project – rubric used by professor
3. Curriculum Advisor Committee – professionals and alumni evaluating our program
4. State and National competition in newspaper and yearbook publishing.

Methodology:

1. For the Senior Capstone Project presentation – a rubric that expresses various outcomes was used by faculty during evaluation. The rubric evaluation was not used for grading, but for the purpose of assessment. At least three faculty were available for each senior capstone presentation. Students were evaluated on a number of criteria that represented many of the overall outcomes of the department and program. After the presentations were completed, a statistical analysis was applied to the evaluation results for use in assessment decision-making. The purpose is to see how our seniors perform in terms of these outcomes near the end of the degree program.

2. Senior Portfolio project – each senior has to prepare a complete portfolio both in notebook form and online that demonstrates their learning and skills in communication. A rubric has been developed to evaluate these in terms similar to the outcomes of the major programs. The rubric has not been in use up to this semester, so there are not results yet that can be analyzed. In the future, the rubrics based on these portfolios can be tabulated and analyzes for comparison year-to-year. The portfolios provide a concrete way of seeing the results of completing the degree program. In the future, we want to tie this analysis to survey results of freshmen who, through self-evaluation, indicate the level of professionalism in the areas considered to be evident in the portfolios. This can give us a better indicator of progress during the four years, and eventually longitudinal assessment for the individuals who were at Evangel all four years. We can also move toward comparing these senior outcomes to those collected in earlier coursework.

3. Curriculum Advisory Committee – This is an opportunity for our faculty to receive feedback on our programs from professionals and alumni who are familiar with our programs and objectives. Some have hired our students or had them as interns. Their feedback gives us qualitative data to consider in regards to changes that benefit students. This committee meets at least every other year, if not each year. Before meeting with the committee to go over their observations and suggestions, they receive data, documents, and catalog information from the department. They are asked to consider our objectives, outcomes, and methods of assessment for the purpose of improvement.

4. State and National Competition – Each year the student newspaper *The Lance* and the yearbook *The Excalibur* submit student projects and content to competition with other universities through various media organizations. Reviewing those categories where awards were earned or not helps gauge student progress in these areas in comparison to other schools.

Results of Assessment (data in summary format):

Capstone Project Presentation – Rubric Results (score out of 4)

Number of students in sample – 19.

	Preparation	Demonstrated Learned Skills	Demonstrated Learned Theory	Professional Level of Project	Presentation	Average Per Evaluation	Overall Average for Student
Total of All Students Average	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5

Score for each major out of 4.

COMR	COMF & COMB	COMJ & COAE	COMM	COMD
3.633333	3.633333	3.3	3.285714	3.7

Senior Portfolio Rubric Results – not available at this time as this assessment is being used for the first time this semester (fall 2016).

Results from the Curriculum Advisory Committee listed in Appendix A of the program review.

State and National Competition Results:

<u>School Year</u>	<u>Award Year</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Place</u>
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	News Photography	First
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Page One Design	First
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Photo Page	First
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Sports Photography	First
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Sports Writing	First
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Editorial Cartoon	Second
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Entertainment Cartoon	Second
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Information Graphic	Second
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	News Photography	Second
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Page One Design	Second
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Sports Column	Second
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Regular Column	Second
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Sports Photography	Second
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Feature Photography	Third
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Information Graphic	Third
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Sports Page	Third
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Best Overall Newspaper, Division 3	Honorable Mention
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Story Illustration	Third
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Sports Photography	Third
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Sports Writing	Third
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Sports Photography	Honorable Mention
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Story Illustration	Honorable Mention
2011	2012	MCMA	Lance	Sports Writing	Honorable Mention
2011	2012	SCJ	Lance	Front Page, design content	First
2011	2012	SCJ	Lance	News Stories	First
2011	2012	SCJ	Lance	News Photography	Second
2011	2012	SCJ	Lance	Graphic Illustrations	Third
2011	2012	SCJ	Lance	News Photography	Third
2011	2012	SCJ	Lance	Photo Essay	Third
2011	2010	SCJ	Lance	Best Editorial Page	Honorable Mention
2011	2010	SCJ	Lance	Editorial	Second
2011	2010	SCJ	Lance	Front Page Layout	Third

2011	2010	SCJ	Lance	News Photography	Honorable Mention
2011	2010	SCJ	Lance	News Story	Second
2011	2010	SCJ	Lance	Sports Features	First
2011	2010	SCJ	Lance	Broadcast Feature	Fourth
2012	2013	MCMA	Lance	Feature Writing - Division 3	First Place
2012	2013	MCMA	Lance	Regular Column - Division 3	First Place
2012	2013	MCMA	Lance	Editorial Cartoon	First Place
2012	2013	MCMA	Lance	Page One Design - Division 3	First Place
2012	2013	MCMA	Lance	Best Overall Newspaper	Second Place
2012	2013	MCMA	Lance	In-Depth Reporting	Second Place
2012	2013	MCMA	Lance	News Photography	Honorable Mention
2012	2013	MCMA	Lance	Feature Page	Honorable Mention
2012	2013	MCMA	Lance	Sports Page	Honorable Mention
2012	2013	MCMA	Lance	Page One Design	Honorable Mention
2012	2013	MCMA	Lance	Page One Design	Honorable Mention
2012	2013	MCMA	Lance	Editorial Cartoon	Third Place
2012	2013	MCMA	Lance	Sports Photography	Second Place
2012	2013	MCMA	Lance	Feature Photography	Third Place
2012	2013	MCMA	Lance	Regular Column	Third Place
2012	2013	MCMA	Lance	News Writing	Honorable Mention
2012	2013	SCJ	Lance	Editorial	Third Place
2012	2013	SCJ	Lance	Breaking or Hard News	Second Place
2012	2013	SCJ	Lance	Sports Feature	Third Place
2012	2013	SCJ	Lance	Editorial Cartoons	Second Place
2012	2013	SCJ	Lance	Editorial Cartoons	Honorable Mention
2012	2013	SCJ	Lance	Newspaper Overall Experience: weekly or less	Second Place
2012	2013	SCJ	Lance	Front Page, design and content	Third Place
2012	2013	SCJ	Lance	Editorial Page, design and content	Second Place
2012	2013	SCJ	Lance	Sports page, design and content	Second Place
2012	2013	SCJ	Lance	News Page, design and content	First Place
2012	2013	SCJ	Lance	Feature Page, design and content	Second Place
2013	2014	SCJ	Lance	Individual Imaging - Editorial Cartoon	First Place
2013	2014	SCJ	Lance	Newspaper - Overall Excellence (weekly or less)	Second Place
2013	2014	SCJ	Lance	Newspaper - Front Page	Second Place
2013	2014	SCJ	Lance	Newspaper - Editorial Page	Second Place
2013	2014	SCJ	Lance	Newspaper - News page	Second Place
2013	2014	SCJ	Lance	Individual Imaging - Cartoon Strips and Panels	Second Place
2013	2014	SCJ	Lance	Newspaper - Sports Page	Third Place
2013	2014	SCJ	Lance	Newspaper - News page	Third Place
2013	2014	SCJ	Lance	Individual Imaging - Graphic Illustrations	Third Place
2013	2014	SCJ	Lance	Newspaper - Photo Essay	Honorable Mention

2013	2014	MCMA	Lance	News Writing	First Place
2013	2014	MCMA	Lance	Nonpolitical/Entertainment Cartoon	First Place
2013	2014	MCMA	Lance	Website Homepage	First Place
2013	2014	MCMA	Lance	Best Newspaper	Second Place
2013	2014	SCJ	Lance	News Writing	Second Place
2013	2014	MCMA	Lance	News Photography	Second Place
2013	2014	MCMA	Lance	Feature Page	Honorable Mention
2014	2015	SCJ	Lance	Individual Imaging Editorial Cartoon	Second
2014	2015	SCJ	Lance	Individual Imaging News Photography	Third
2014	2015	SCJ	Lance	Individual Writing Sports Columns	Second
2014	2015	SCJ	Lance	Newspaper Companion Website	Honorable Mention
2014	2015	SCJ	Lance	Newspaper - Editorial Page (Design & Content)	Honorable Mention
2014	2015	SCJ	Lance	Newspaper - Sports Page (Design & Content)	Third Place
2014	2015	SCJ	Lance	Newspaper - News Page (Design & Content)	Second Place
2014	2015	SCJ	Lance	Newspaper - Overall Excellence - Weekly	Second Place
2014	2015	SCJ	Lance	Newspaper - Editorial	Second Place
2014	2015	SCJ	Lance	Newspaper - Photo Essay	Honorable Mention
2014	2015	SCJ	Lance	Newspaper - Sports News	Honorable Mention
2014	2015	MCMA	Lance	Sweepstakes	Third
2014	2015	MCMA	Lance	News Writing	Second
2014	2015	MCMA	Lance	Sports Photography	Second
2014	2015	MCMA	Lance	Political/Editorial Cartoon	First
2014	2015	MCMA	Lance	Sports Writing	Second
2014	2015	MCMA	Lance	Editorial Writing	Third
2014	2015	MCMA	Lance	Sports Page	First
2014	2015	MCMA	Lance	Photo Page	First
2014	2015	MCMA	Lance	Information Graphic	Third
2014	2015	MCMA	Lance	Page One Design	Honorable Mention
2015	2016	SCJ	Lance	Cartoon	Second Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	Feature Writing	Second Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	News Writing	Honorable Mention
2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	Editorial Writing	Third Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	Sports Writing	Honorable Mention
2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	Sweepstakes	Second Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	Best Overall Newspaper	Second Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	Sports Column	First Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	Entertainment Review	Honorable Mention
2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	News Photography	First Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	Feature Photography	First Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	Feature Photography	Honorable Mention
2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	Nonpolitical/Entertainment Cartoon	First Place

2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	Page One Design	Second Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	Page One Design	Third Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	Editorial/Op-Ed Page	First Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	Photo Page	First Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	Sports Page	First Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Lance	Feature Page	First Place

<u>School year</u>	<u>Award year</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Award</u>	<u>Place</u>
2011	2012	MCMA	Excalibur	Portrait Design	First
2011	2012	MCMA	Excalibur	Feature Photography	First
2011	2012	MCMA	Excalibur	Student Life Design	Third
2011	2012	MCMA	Excalibur	Theme Development	Third
2011	2012	MCMA	Excalibur	Sports Photography	Honorable Mention
2011	2012	SCJ	Excalibur	Yearbook Overall Excellence, small schools	First
2011	2012	SCJ	Excalibur	Photography	Second
2011	2012	ACP	Excalibur	Best of Show Award	Tenth Place
2012	2013	MCMA	Excalibur	Portrait Design - Yearbook	Second Place
2012	2013	MCMA	Excalibur	Feature Photography - Yearbook	Honorable Mention
2012	2013	MCMA	Excalibur	Student Life Design - Yearbook	Second Place
2012	2013	MCMA	Excalibur	Overall Theme Development - Yearbook	Third Place
2012	2013	MCMA	Excalibur	Sports Photography - Yearbook	Third Place
2012	2013	MCMA	Excalibur	Sports Photography	Third Place
2012	2013	ACP	Excalibur	Best of Show	Sixth (out of ten)
2012	2013	ACP	Excalibur	Best of Show	Sixth (out of ten)
2013	2014	MCMA	Excalibur	Feature Photography	Second Place
2013	2014	MCMA	Excalibur	Feature Photography	Honorable Mention
2013	2014	MCMA	Excalibur	Sports Photography	Honorable Mention
2013	2014	MCMA	Excalibur	Student Life Design	Third Place
2013	2014	MCMA	Excalibur	Student Life Design	Honorable Mention
2013	2014	MCMA	Excalibur	Portrait Design	Honorable Mention
2013	2014	MCMA	Excalibur	Overall Theme Development	First Place
2013	2014	SCJ	Excalibur	Yearbook - Concept of the book	First Place
2013	2014	SCJ	Excalibur	Yearbook - Overall Excellence	Second Place
2013	2014	SCJ	Excalibur	Yearbook - Coverage of the Year	Second Place
2013	2014	SCJ	Excalibur	Yearbook - Reporting in Words	Second Place
2013	2014	SCJ	Excalibur	Yearbook - Photography	Second Place
2013	2014	SCJ	Excalibur	Yearbook - Display	Second Place
2013	2014	ACP	Excalibur	Best of Show	Eighth (out of ten)
2013	2014	SCJ	Excalibur	Best College Yearbook	First
2013	2014	MCMA	Excalibur	Best Overall Yearbook	Second
2014	2015	SCJ	Excalibur	Yearbook Display (Layout, Graphics, Design)	Second

2014	2015	SCJ	Excalibur	Yearbook Overall Excellence	Second
2014	2015	SCJ	Excalibur	Yearbook Coverage of the Year	Second
2014	2015	SCJ	Excalibur	Yearbook Concept of the book	First
2014	2015	SCJ	Excalibur	Yearbook Reporting in words	Second
2014	2015	SCJ	Excalibur	Yearbook Photography	Second
2014	2015	ACP	Excalibur	Best of Show	Sixth (out of ten)
2014	2015	MCMA	Excalibur	Feature Photography	Third
2014	2015	MCMA	Excalibur	Feature Writing	First
2014	2015	MCMA	Excalibur	Feature Writing	Third
2014	2015	MCMA	Excalibur	Student Life Design	First
2014	2015	MCMA	Excalibur	Student Life Design	Second
2014	2015	MCMA	Excalibur	Student Life Design	Honorable Mention
2014	2015	MCMA	Excalibur	Student Life Design	Honorable Mention
2014	2015	MCMA	Excalibur	Student Life Design	Honorable Mention
2014	2015	MCMA	Excalibur	Feature Photography	Honorable Mention
2014	2015	MCMA	Excalibur	Feature Photography	Honorable Mention
2014	2015	MCMA	Excalibur	Portrait Design	First
2014	2015	MCMA	Excalibur	Personality Sketch	Second
2014	2015	MCMA	Excalibur	Overall Theme Development	Second
2014	2015	MCMA	Excalibur	Best of Show	Sixth
2015	2016	SCJ	Excalibur	Photography	Second Place
2015	2016	SCJ	Excalibur	Design	First Place
2015	2016	SCJ	Excalibur	Reporting in Words	First Place
2015	2016	SCJ	Excalibur	Yearbook Overall Excellence	First Place
2015	2016	SCJ	Excalibur	Concept of Book	First Place
2015	2016	SCJ	Excalibur	Coverage of the Year	First Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Excalibur	Feature Photography	Honorable Mention
2015	2016	MCMA	Excalibur	Student Life Design	Third Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Excalibur	Student Life Design	Honorable Mention
2015	2016	MCMA	Excalibur	Sports Photography	Honorable Mention
2015	2016	MCMA	Excalibur	Sports Photography	Third Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Excalibur	Sports Photography	First Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Excalibur	Portrait Design	First Place
2015	2016	MCMA	Excalibur	Overall Theme Development	Second Place

Strengths:

Rubric results for capstone are not conclusive with such a small sample at this first attempt

at use.

The fact that COMF and COMR students did well, in comparison, may be due to the specifics of the projects involved in capstone work. COMM majors tended to have more generalized approaches to their projects, making it more difficult to present. There isn't enough difference in the scores to warrant changes at this point. However, after another semester of capstone, some clarity might be available.

As to media contest results, multimedia journalism students have won awards consistently, especially in layout and design. Strengths in photography also are indicated. Work on investigative stories is needed.

Comments from the Curriculum Advisory Committee indicated strengths in all areas, especially in media production, professional character, and basic knowledge of communication in regards to our students.

Areas in need of improvement:

The capstone results don't give much clarity for change, however, some changes to the instrument might be needed. Having only four levels of evaluation scoring might skew evaluators to giving 3's and 4's and not 2's. Maybe a 5-point scale would allow for more accuracy in scoring. This idea will be discussed prior to the next rubric use.

Senior portfolios will be evaluated this December with the new rubric, so no results are available at this time.

The Curriculum Committee mentioned a few areas that need attention including holding students to higher standard, workplace expectations, cooperation and collaboration, and doing quality work the first time around.

Plans for improvement:

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Changed the late policy in all communication classes to a stricter standard .	Fall 2016	All faculty
Added additional material in Senior Seminar to cover professional standards.	Fall 2016	Dr. Cameron Pace
Re-evaluate the rubric for capstone presentations as to more levels of evaluation.	Fall 2016	Dr. Chip Stanek
Emphasize quality of advertising products through additional experience in the	Fall 2016	Nancy Pace-Miller or related adjunct

workshops.		

Improvements made:

The late policy is in effect now and has had some impact on projects being turned in on time. We did not keep track of how many late assignments had occurred in the past, so it is mostly anecdotal information from faculty that indicates improvement.

The Senior Seminar Portfolio rubric was developed from an evaluation checklist that had been used. This makes for a clearer method of grading and helps with assessment as well.

The rubric for the Senior Capstone Project was changed to reflect more on the type of program the student had followed that should have affected the project in some way. Both the Capstone and Portfolio rubrics are partial assessments in that they show much, but not all of the possible learning objectives that need to be assessed.

Work has begun on a course database system through the LMS (Canvas) so that all learning objectives for each program would be covered in assessment. The various objectives in each program will be categorized and matched up to various assignments in the courses taken where an assessment instrument can be used for data collection. The plan is to enact this process for the spring 2017 semester.