

Last revised: 3/31/14

Hypothetical Assessment Report for Comedy Studies A. A. & S.

Program: **Comedy Studies A.A. & S.**

Reporting Year: 2011-2012

Calendar Year (Spring and Fall) Academic Year (Fall and Spring)

Student Learning Outcomes Summary

The Comedy Studies A.A. & S. Program has the following learning outcomes:

Graduates of the program will be able to:

1. Identify the major genres of comedy, specifically slapstick, vaudeville, and stand-up.
2. Identify the influential comedians of each genre of comedy.
3. Write a clear and persuasive argument about the influence of comedy in presidential politics. These papers should (a) contain a coherent rationale, (b) demonstrate strong organization, (c) and consist of correct grammar and sentence structure that do not detract from the quality of the argument, (d) use appropriate references that support the writer's argument.
4. Deliver a presentation that (a) engages the audience with humor, (b) effectively uses multimedia to enhance the main points, (c) contains a logical flow of ideas, and (d) uses techniques such as eye contact, hand gestures, and pacing to effectively enhance the delivery.

Comment [CO1]: Start the report by listing all of your program outcomes. You don't have to report on every outcome each year. It is generally advisable, though, to think through all of the outcomes of your program to ensure that you have accounted for all the knowledge, skills, and abilities the program should be imparting on students.

Comment [CO2]: Note how this program only has four outcomes. A good number for a two-year program may be as few as four and as many as ten. More than ten, and your outcomes may be getting too specific for the program-level. Consider examining outcomes to see if any can be combined, especially if they are specific to one course.

To help determine the extent to which courses in the program provide students with the opportunity to meet the stated outcomes, faculty examined course syllabi. Faculty produced the following grid to examine the extent of course coverage for each outcome.

0=No coverage, 1=Slight Coverage, 2=Some Coverage, 3=Strong Coverage

	COM 101	COM 125	COM 134	COM 213	COM 235
Outcome 1	1	2	2	3	1
Outcome 2	0	2	0	2	0
Outcome 3	1	0	1	2	2
Outcome 4	0	0	1	2	3

Comment [CO3]: This is a curriculum map. Strong program assessment requires faculty to identify learning experiences within the program curriculum where students learn the skills needed to accomplish an outcome. They can be as simple as a list of courses next to an outcome, although I believe this format yields more complete information.

Outcome 1:

Graduates of the program will be able to identify the major genres of comedy

List Applicable Specializations, Certificates or Career Studies Certificates:

- Comedy Studies certificate

Measure:

Outcome One is assessed with 15 multiple choice items on the final exam given in COM 235, a second-year course required of all Comedy Studies majors prior to graduating.

Target for Success:

Last year's (2011) mean score on these 15 questions was 80%. Faculty are satisfied with these results and set our target for success this year as 80% again.

Data Collection:

Students take COM 235 in their last semester of Comedy Studies. COM 235 is only offered for Comedy Studies majors and is a required course so we are guaranteed to assess all Comedy Studies majors when they are relatively close to graduating. The fifteen items are interspersed throughout their larger final exam. Although the additional test items may change year to year, the fifteen items remain the same. To ensure the security of the 15 items, students are shown their grade on the final exam and the answers are discussed in class; however, students are not allowed to take their tests with them. Copies of the secure items are kept in the Program Head's office.

Results from the past 2+ years:

2011-2012: In spring 2012, 13 students took COM 235. The average score on the 15 items was 81%, which met our target for success.

2010-2011: In spring, 2011, 11 students took the test with an average score of 80% (12/15)

Interpretation of Results (Include impact of previous improvement plans on results here):

Given the consistent student performance over the past few years for Part A items, we are gaining confidence that students are able to identify the genres of comedy to our satisfaction. *Overall, we have met this outcome.*

Target Met? Yes No

Improvement Plans Based on Results (Include as much detail as possible):

No modifications are sought at this time to improve student learning on Outcome One.

Comment [CO4]: You can follow the same format of reporting for each outcome. List the outcome, followed by the measure, target for success, data collection process, results, and action plans.

Comment [CO5]: Instead of submitting a separate report for each program, list any certificates that use and assess the same outcomes as the umbrella program. Any unique outcomes or results can be listed at the end of the report.

Comment [CO6]: For each measure, provide a brief, but detailed description of the precise way that the outcome is measured. Helpful information to include is: the type of instrument used, where in the curriculum the measure is administered, how the instrument was developed, and how long the program has used the instrument.

Comment [CO7]: Indicating a target for success provides an easy and logical way to determine whether students in the program have met an outcome. The targets shouldn't be arbitrary; an easy initial way to set a target is to look at last year's results.

Comment [CO8]: Without a strong data collection process, it is very difficult to trust your results and what they say about student learning.

A strong data collection process can be explained in a paragraph. Try to include: Where students take the assessment, whether all students in the program take the assessment at the same place in the program, and any other pertinent information that explains why the results should be trusted.

Comment [CO9]: It's important to include more than one year of results in order to track progress, especially if action plans were implemented to improve performance. You can see that you don't have to include a lot of information about the results, but try to include: the number of students who completed the assessment and the results as they relate back to the target for success and the outcome. You can see here that it is easy to compare student achievement in 2010-2011 to 2011-2012 and can quickly make a determination that students met the outcome.

Comment [CO10]: Finally, it's important to provide an interpretation of the results. A solid interpretation demonstrates that program faculty consider how the results illustrate student learning, why the results were what they were, and what if any action is needed to improve performance in ...

Comment [CO11]: State whether or not students are meeting the outcome. This becomes much easier when the target for success has been clearly defined.

Comment [CO12]: The last component to include is details regarding any action plan your program will implement in the following year to improve results. It is important to note that you don't need to change your program every year o ...

Last revised: 3/31/14

If additional resources are needed to implement this improvement plan, please describe below:

Outcome 2:

Graduates will be able to identify the influential comedians of each comedic genre

List Applicable Specializations, Certificates or Career Studies Certificates:

Measure:

Outcome Two is assessed with 15 multiple choice items on the final exam given in COM 235, a second-year course required of all Comedy Studies majors prior to graduating.

Target for Success:

Last year's (2011) mean score on the 15 items was 65%. Over the past year, more emphasis has been placed on teaching the influential comedians of the older genres of comedy and therefore, we expect average student scores to improve to 70% this year (2012).

Data Collection:

Students take COM 235 in their last semester of Comedy Studies. The fifteen items are interspersed throughout the final exam. Although the additional test items may change year to year, the thirty items remain the same. To ensure the security of the 30 items, students are not allowed to take their tests with them. Copies of the secure items are kept in the Program Head's office. The course is taught via compressed video, but otherwise, no difference exists between the modes of instruction. A proctor monitors students taking the test at the RRC.

Comment [CO13]: Note that this section is simply cut and paste from earlier. Although the report should be organized according to outcome, there are times when the same process is used to assess different outcomes.

Comment [CO14]: For courses taught via Collaborate or Compressed Video, it is important to note that the results are split and state whether or not there are any differences in instruction.

Results from the past 2+ years:

2011-2012: 13 students took the exam with an average score of 75%. Eight students took the course face-to-face and five took it via compressed video. Scores were not substantially different (73% vs. 77%).

2010-2011: 11 students took the exam with an average score of 65% on the fifteen items. Six of these students took the course face-to-face whereas the other five took the course via compressed video at RRC. Scores for the face-to-face students were not substantially different than those students who took the course via compressed video (67% vs. 63%).

Comment [CO15]: For this outcome, I've provided an example of how to report results if your course is taught via compressed video.

Interpretation of Results (Include impact of previous improvement plans on results here):

This outcome was met. This average score exceeded our expectations and indicates that the additional emphasis we've placed on influential comedians from the earlier periods of comedy may be working. Scores

3

Adapted from resources developed at James Madison University's Center for Assessment and Research Studies:
<http://www.jmu.edu/assessment> (pdf)

Last revised: 3/31/14

were not substantially different between the students who took the course on-campus versus those who took it at the RRC, which would be expected.

Target Met? Yes No

Improvement Plans Based on Results (Provide as much detail as possible) :

During the 2011-2012 academic year, we incorporated additional reading materials and lectures in COM 125 and 213 which helped emphasize and reinforce material about influential comedians. This change appears to have improved student achievement on the outcome and we will continue to incorporate these changes during the 2012-2013 academic year to see if this improvement continues with a new group of students.

If additional resources are needed to implement this improvement plan, please describe below:

We do not believe that this action plan will require any additional resources.

Outcome 3:

Graduates will be able to write a clear and persuasive argument about the influence of comedy in presidential politics. These papers should (a) contain a coherent rationale, (b) demonstrate strong organization, (c) and consist of correct grammar and sentence structure that do not detract from the quality of the argument, and (d) use appropriate references that support the writer's argument.

Measure:

To assess students on Outcome Two, we use a writing rubric. The rubric contains four elements, each one corresponding to a different component of the outcome (a, b, c, and d). Students are graded on a 1-4 scale with 1 – Beginning, 2 – Developing, 3 – Good, 4 – Exemplary.

Target for Success:

Given that students are completing this assignment as second year students, we expect that they should at least be able to score a two on each component of the rubric.

Data Collection:

The rubric is applied to an assigned research paper in COM 215, which all majors must take in their second year of the program. There is only one section of the course offered and to date, the faculty member who instructs this course is the most qualified to assess the papers using the rubric. Because it is important that a rubric be applied consistently among multiple people, we will be working with the other full-time faculty member and the four part-time faculty instructors to use the rubric and determine how consistently it can be applied to student papers.

Results from the past 2+ years:

Comment [CO16]: Here, it's appropriate to include a simple sentence about any differences that exist between students taking the course face-to-face or compressed video.

Comment [CO17]: It is important to provide information about previous action plans and their potential impact on student achievement. Make a reference back to the outcome and state whether you will continue with the modifications to the program or if a new action plan is needed (base this in part on the results).

Comment [CO18]: For this measure, the program uses a rubric. Note that the description of the measure does not focus on the writing prompt or performance task students are expected to complete. Rather, the description focuses on the rubric, how it was developed, and what it looks like.

Comment [CO19]: When using a rubric, establishing inter-rater consistency is very important. Given the size of many of our programs, it may not be possible. However, when it is possible to have multiple people consistently apply the rubric to the same piece of writing, your ability to infer something about student learning from the results improves.

Comment [CO20]: Note how results are broken down by rubric element. Because elements of the rubric each correspond to a different part of the outcome, breaking them down yields much more meaningful results than if you were to only look at the overall score.

Last revised: 3/31/14

2011-2012: 12 students were assessed. The average score was a 2.5. Elements B and A were both 2.7, element C improved to 2.1 and element D scored 2.5.

2010-2011: 13 students were assessed. The average score for all elements was a 2.4. Element B was the highest (2.7) and C was still the lowest (1.9). Element D improved to a 2.4 whereas element A was improved to a 2.6.

2009-2010: 15 students were assessed with the rubric. The average score across elements was a 2.2. The element on which students scored the best was B) demonstrating strong organization (2.8) whereas the element with the lowest average was C) the use of appropriate grammar (1.7). Element D was also below a 2.0 (1.9). Element A was above the 2.0 threshold (2.4.)

Interpretation of Results (Include impact of previous improvement plans on results here):

This outcome was met. As you can see from the results, scores have improved each year since the rubric was first used in 2009-2010. Students were initially weak in their use of grammar as well as their ability to cite references appropriately. In 2010-2011, we incorporated visits to the library into COM 101 to help introduce students to the librarians and expose them to material about proper referencing. In 2011-2012, we devoted three shorter paper assignments into COM 213 and spent a class period after each assignment devoted to analyzing grammar and sentence structure. We believe the extra time and assignments have helped strengthen student achievement in this component of the outcome.

Target Met? Yes No

Improvement Plans Based on Results (Provide as much detail as possible) :

At this point in time, no action plan is needed to improve student learning on this outcome. Students have demonstrated growth in the various aspects of this outcome over the past three years and we are satisfied with their achievement. We will continue to implement the changes that we believe have helped lead to the improvements over the past three years.

If additional resources are needed to implement this improvement plan, please describe below:

Outcome Four:

Deliver a presentation that (a) engages the audience with humor, (b) effectively uses multimedia to enhance the main points, (c) contains a logical flow of ideas, and (d) uses techniques such as eye contact, hand gestures, and pacing to effectively enhance the delivery.

5

Adapted from resources developed at James Madison University's Center for Assessment and Research Studies:

<http://www.jmu.edu/assessment> (pdf)

Last revised: 3/31/14

Measure:

This outcome is assessed in COM 235 using a rubric. Much like the writing rubric, the presentation instrument contains four elements, each of which corresponds with a component of the outcome. There are four scale points (1 – Beginning, 2 – Developing, 3 – Good, 4 – Exemplary).

Target for Success:

We expect students to score at least a two on each element, given that they are second year students.

Data Collection:

As a midterm project, students present to their class. The criteria are shared with the students so that they know the elements on which they will be graded. The faculty instructor of the course evaluates the student on the presentation using the rubric

Results from at least 2+ years:

2011-2012: 13 students were assessed. The average score was a 2.2. Element A was still the highest with an average of 2.7. Performance on element B improved to a 2.3, but elements C and D remained unsatisfactory, at 1.9 and 1.9 respectively.

2010-2011: 11 students presented. Average score was a 2.1. Element A was the highest with an average of 2.8. However, elements B, C, and D all averaged below a 2.0 (1.9, 1.9, and 1.8).

Interpretation of Results (Include impact of previous improvement plans on results here):

This outcome was partially met. After the 2010-2011 school year, the curriculum was reviewed and it was determined that little attention was provided to oral communication skills prior to COM 235. Therefore, we attempted to incorporate additional opportunities for students to present earlier in the program. This curricular change was implemented during the 2011-2012 academic year. After reviewing the 2011-2012 results, we are pleased with improvement in students' use of multimedia, but their presentations still lack a logical flow and they still struggle with eye contact, hand gestures and general presenting skills. However, we enjoy the fact that students are still able to engage the audience with humor, which continues to prove itself a strength of the students.

Target Met? Yes No

Improvement Plan Based on Results (Provide as much detail as possible) :

To continue improving on this outcome, we will incorporate oral presentations into every course of the COM major. We believe that the more practice students receive, the more comfortable they will feel presenting. Faculty have identified places in their curricula where presentations will be added and these assignments will be incorporated beginning fall 2012. These changes will be fully implemented in two years after the entering cohort of students in the fall has a chance to experience the entire program.

If additional resources are needed to implement this improvement plan, please describe below:

We do not believe that this action plan will require any additional resources.

Comment [CO21]: Note here that this outcome was not fully met, even after implementing an action plan. The information included here provides a justification, details about what changes will be made and why they are being made, when the action plan will go into effect, how long it will last, and whether or not the change will require additional resources.