

**Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College**

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Communications	225	COM 225 06/20/2017- Intercultural Communication
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Humanities	Jennifer Jackson
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Deliver multiple presentations focused on topics within intercultural communication studies.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Student presentations
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2017
 - Course section(s)/other population: Random sample of all students enrolled in COM225 with a representative population from each section.
 - Number students to be assessed: More than 50% of all students enrolled in COM225.
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally developed rubric.
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% or more of the students will score 70% on the rubric.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Department faculty will analyze the rubric data.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2017	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
51	23

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

One face-to-face section was assessed. One face-to-face section was not assessed due to changes in faculty for this section. The adjunct instructor who was put on the course last minute was not instructed to assess the course.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

This course was offered only in a face-to-face format.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The outcome was assessed by using the Human Library Presentation. Students presented and the presentation was scored using a rubric.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

20 of 23 (87%) of the students scored 80% or higher on the rubric. Two students scored between 60%-69%, one student scored less than 10%. This exceeds the standard of success outlined on the Master Syllabus.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students were able to demonstrate public speaking proficiency and developed confidence by delivering presentations throughout the semester. With a success rate of 87%, it shows that students exhibited the concepts that were taught regarding intercultural communication.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

This is not a public speaking class, yet, speaking is a requirement. I plan to spend time at the start of the semester teaching basic public speaking skills that will be graded throughout the semester during presentations.

Outcome 2: Engage in small group interactions that optimize group dynamics and effective leadership functions.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Small Group Process
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2017
 - Course section(s)/other population: Random sample of all students enrolled in COM225 with a representative population from each section.
 - Number students to be assessed: More than 50% of all students enrolled in COM225.
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally developed rubric.
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% or more of the groups will achieve satisfactory or above.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Department faculty will analyze the rubric data.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2017	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
51	23

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

One face-to-face section was assessed. One face-to-face section was not assessed due to changes in faculty for this section. The adjunct instructor who was put on the course last minute was not instructed to assess the course.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

Both sections of this course were taught in a face-to-face format.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Students were placed into small groups where they interacted utilizing small group communication methods. The students gave a group presentation that was scored using a departmentally-developed rubric.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

22 of 23 students scored 75% or higher on the rubric. One student participated below expectations. This meets the standard of success outline in the Master Syllabus. Students did well, overall, on this project.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students were engaged, cooperative and respectful during this exercise. They demonstrated the ability to clearly express ideas while considering the ideas of other classmates. Students listened to the ideas of others while developing areas of interest themselves. They were excited to learn from and to teach one another.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

There was no clear rubric for assessing presentation portion of this process. The group interaction was scored and there needs to be an added section for presentations. Perhaps this will be improved in the next Master Syllabus revision.

Outcome 3: Demonstrate competent communication responses and behaviors for intercultural communication.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Essay question(s) on exam.
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2017
 - Course section(s)/other population: Random sample of all students enrolled in COM225 with a representative population from each section.

- Number students to be assessed: More than 50% of all students enrolled in COM225.
- How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% or more of the students will score a 70% or higher.
- Who will score and analyze the data: Department faculty will analyze the exam.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2017	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
51	23

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

This outcome was not assessed because an essay exam was not used this semester.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

This outcome was not assessed because an essay exam was not used this semester.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

This outcome was not assessed because an essay exam was not used this semester.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: No

This outcome was not assessed because an essay exam was not used this semester.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

This outcome was not assessed because an essay exam was not used this semester.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

This outcome was not assessed because an essay exam was not used this semester.

Outcome 4: Identify major theoretical concepts of intercultural communication.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Essay and Multiple Choice Exam
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2017
 - Course section(s)/other population: Random sample of all students enrolled in COM225 with a representative population from each section.
 - Number students to be assessed: More than 50% of all students enrolled in COM225.
 - How the assessment will be scored: Multiple-choice questions will be scored using an answer key. Essay question will be scored using a departmentally-developed rubric.
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% or more of the students will score a 70% or higher.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Department faculty will analyze the exam.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2017	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
51	23

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

One face-to-face section was assessed. One face-to-face section was not assessed due to changes in faculty for this section. The adjunct instructor who was put on the course last minute was not instructed to assess the course.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

Both sections of this course were taught in the face-to-face format.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The students were given an exam that was scored using an answer key. The exam covered theoretical concepts of intercultural communication.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

22 of 23 (96%) students scored 70% or higher on the exam. One student scored between 60%-69% on the exam. 96% exceeds the standard of success identified for this outcome.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students recognized theories and put them into practice. The students showed understanding of concepts through their group discussion, exams, paper and presentation. There were theories included as well as practical application of tools.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Students did extremely well on this outcome.

II. Course Summary and Action Plans Based on Assessment Results

1. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

Each instructor of COM 225 must include an examination of some sort in order to assess this course successfully. The rubrics can be simplified and more specific to the outcome being assessed. I was pleased to see that students did well on the papers and presentations and group work, even though there was no essay exam question to verify that.

2. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

Departmental meeting

3. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Assessment Tool	The assessment tool will be more specific, yet easy for each instructor to implement regardless of their teaching style.	The assessment tool used was too subjective, in my opinion. It is important to take concepts and assign numbers that can be measured easily.	2017

4. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

5.

III. Attached Files

[COM 225 Rubric sample](#)
[COM 225 Summary data](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Jennifer Jackson **Date:** 06/20/2017
Department Chair: Allison Fournier **Date:** 06/20/2017
Dean: Kristin Good **Date:** 07/11/2017
Assessment Committee Chair: Michelle Garey **Date:** 09/28/2017

