

Weber State University
Biennial Report on Assessment of Student Learning

Cover Page

Department/Program: Master of Professional Communication
Academic Year of Report: 2021 and 22 (covering Summer 2020 through Spring 2022)
Date Submitted: November 15, 2022
Report author(s): Sarah Steimel

Contact Information: Sarah Steimel
Phone:801-626-6535
Email: sarahsteimel@weber.edu

Table of Contents

- [A: Mission Statement](#)
- [B: Student Learning Outcomes](#)
- [C: Curriculum Grid](#)
- [D: Program Contact Information](#)
- [E: Assessment Plan](#)
- [F: Student Achievement](#)
- [G: Evidence of Learning](#)
- Appendices
 - [A: Recommendations](#)
 - [B: Program Faculty](#)
 - [Questions](#)
- [Glossary](#)

The Institutional Effectiveness website hosts a page for each program that displays assessment reports and information. All available biennial assessment and program review reports are located at the bottom of the program's page on our site. As a part of the biennial report process, we ask that you please review your page for completeness and accuracy, and indicate below the changes that need to be made.

Program page link: <https://www.weber.edu/ie/Results/CommunicationM.html>

A. Mission Statement

Information is current; no changes required.

Update if not current:

The Master of Professional Communication program prepares working professionals with the advanced communication knowledge and skills needed to excel in a range of communication-related careers. The program trains students to utilize theoretically-grounded and creative applications of research, writing, presentation and design to lead in academic and professional organizational contexts. The Weber State Master of Professional Communication cultivates professionals who can think critically, who are grounded ethically, and who are culturally aware.

B. Student Learning Outcomes

(Please include certificate and associate credential learning outcomes)

Information is current; no changes required.

Update if not current:

The third Learning Outcome and fifth learning outcomes were updated in our 2020 Biennial report, but does not appear to have been updated on the Website. So, Learning Outcome #3 should now say "Demonstrate critical thinking and cultural competence in applied communication contexts." Learning Outcome #5 should now say "Demonstrate knowledge in one or more cognate areas – strategic communication, organizational communication and media." Those both come from our 2020 report. The other three learning outcomes remain the same.

C. Curriculum Grid

(Please review your current curriculum grid and verify that at least one course has been identified for each outcome in which you expect your students to demonstrate the desired competency of a graduating student. This could be shown in a variety of ways: classroom work, clinical or internship work, a field test, an ePortfolio, etc. You may request access to the Google Sheet on our site if that is easiest, or we can make the updates. Please reach out to oi@weber.edu if you wish to have access)

Information is current; no changes required.

We updated the curriculum grid to include two new courses (MPC 6710 and MPC 6840) and one course name change (MPC 6700) that have occurred in the last two years. Those courses are now correctly reflected on the grid.

D. Program and Contact Information

 Information is current; no changes required.

Overall the information is current, except that isn't how University addresses are listed any more (e.g. they've removed that "University Circle" address. So, I think it now needs to be:

Dr. Sarah Steimel
Weber State University
1395 Edvalson St. Dept. 1407
Elizabeth Hall, room 346
(801) 626-6535

E. Assessment Plan

We have traditionally asked programs to report on outcome achievement by students at the course level. We are encouraging programs to consider alternative assessment approaches and plans that are outcome-based as opposed to course-based, though course-based assessment can continue to be used. A complete assessment plan will include a timeline (which courses or which outcomes will be assessed each year), an overall assessment strategy (course-based, outcome-based, reviewed juries, ePortfolio, field tests, etc.), information about how you will collect and review data, and information about how the department/program faculty are engaged in the assessment review.

 Information is current; no changes required.

Assessment Plan for Master of Professional Communication:

- Persons responsible for collecting and analyzing the data: The program director will oversee data collection. The MPC faculty advisory committee, which consists of all faculty teaching the required courses in a given academic year, will serve as the Assessment Committee to oversee and implement the program's assessment plan. MPC faculty are asked to collect and report data on assignments in their classes and

may be asked to review ePortfolios for assessment purposes. The MPC advisory committee reviews curriculum, assessment data, and student success at least semiannually.

- Assessment measures to be used: The MPC assessment plan examines student outcomes using the following direct and indirect measures.

Direct Measures (DM):

- We have worked with the office of Institutional Effectiveness to develop a course-level rubric for each course that includes a criterion for each program outcome addressed by the course, as indicated in the program's curriculum grid. Each MPC course has been asked to use those course-level rubrics to assess students' mastery of program learning outcomes across key assignments in each semester the course is taught.
- We are also utilizing program-level rubrics to assess MPC student final thesis /projects in MPC 6900 and 6950. We have now created policies that students in our coursework track must submit ePortfolios using Portfolium that showcase the signature assignments in their three coursework courses. That policy change was passed last year and so will start affecting students graduating in 2023. We will use the same program-level rubric to assess theses, projects, and final portfolios.

Indirect Measures (IM)

- We collect indirect measures as well, which include student exit surveys, number of students/graduates who receive a promotion or a new job in a field related to professional communication, number of students accepted for further graduate study, individual feedback from students and graduates. We also track number of papers accepted for presentation at academic and professional conferences

Assessment Strategy:

- We are continuing to collect outcome data from key assignments at the course level and using that data to strengthen individual courses, but then also combining that data in a wholistic way across courses to assess program learning overall. We currently ask faculty to assess all courses taught each semester on all learning outcomes relevant to the course (using the assessment rubrics uploaded in Canvas). As a result, our plan is to assess all five learning outcomes each year.
- Additionally, we already assess final/capstone projects for students who complete the Master's Thesis or Master's Project track. These projects/portfolios serve as program-level outcome data.
- We will integrate ePortfolios that serve as culminating project showcases from our coursework students (starting with students graduating in 2023) to help provide additional program-level outcome data.

F. Student Achievement

F.A: For undergraduate programs only: Deleted from report as we are not an undergraduate program.

F.B: For Graduate Programs Only: Of the students that were enrolled in your program last year, what percentage of students failed to persist?

The original program review dashboard this question pointed to had some inconsistencies, so the Office of Intuitional Effectiveness provided us this summary of our data:

- Of the 30 students who began during AY22 and have NOT graduated, 22 (81.5%) are still enrolled and 5 (18.5%) are not enrolled. Three have graduated.
- Of the 32 students who began during AY21 and have NOT graduated, 9 (69.2%) are still enrolled and 4 (30.8%) are not enrolled. Nineteen have graduated.

Interpretations: Overall, these numbers are what we would expect as a program. Our average time-to-graduation in the program is right under 2 years. Thus, of the 32 students who began in AY21, 19 (about 60%) have graduated. We would expect many of the 9 still enrolled to graduate (most within the 2-year average, perhaps a few would take longer), which would give us an 87.5% graduate rate. That is pretty typical of our program, because for many reasons 10 to 15% of students might choose not to complete the program (e.g. their career path changes, their family relocates out of state, life intervenes, etc.).

From AY21 we have 4 students not currently enrolled and from AY22 we have 5 students not currently enrolled. Some of those students are only temporary pauses (e.g. two students are currently not enrolled for significant medical reasons). The program director attempts to contact each of those students each registration cycle and encourages them to re-enroll in the program. We would love to continue to improve our retention rate (and we do have students re-start), but some of those factors influencing student decision-making are beyond our program's control.

G: Evidence of Learning

There are varieties of ways in which departments can choose to show evidence of learning.

For the MPC Program:

We are committed to moving towards program-level outcome-based assessment. Our goal is to use assessment to develop a clear sense not only of what skills students are showcasing in individual classes, but to better understand how the students are gaining a key set of outcomes across our program.

To do so:

- We evaluate our relevant program outcomes in each MPC course. We have worked with the office of Institutional Effectiveness to develop a rubric for each course that includes a criterion for each program outcome addressed by the course, as indicated in the program's curriculum grid. Each MPC course has been asked to use those to assess students' mastery of program learning outcomes across key assignments in each semester the course is taught.
 - This does function to provide some course-level assessment, which is helpful in refining individual courses to better promote and address student learning on our key program outcomes.
 - This also, taken together, allows us to better understand program-level outcomes, as we can look across courses to see how a particular outcome (e.g. "Conduct academic or applied research in communication contexts" is scored across the curriculum.
- We also draw on culminating projects to provide program-level outcome assessment. Our MPC students have three paths to graduation – a Master's Thesis Track, a Professional Project Track, and a Coursework Track. We are currently utilizing program-level rubrics to assess MPC student final thesis /projects in those first two tracks. We have now created policies (passed through Curriculog last year and now in our 2022-2023 catalog) that students in our Coursework track must submit ePortfolios using Portfolium that showcase the signature assignments in their three coursework courses. That policy change was passed last year and so will start affecting students graduating in 2023. This adds a critical piece of the puzzle by providing culminating projects for the Coursework students that can be evaluated by our program. We will use the same program-level rubric to assess theses, projects, and final portfolios.
- We also use secondary data (e.g. exit surveys, reports of student job placement/promotions/additional graduate school acceptance, numbers of students who present at academic or professional conferences) as indirect measures as well.

G.A: Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major

G.B Evidence of Learning Worksheet: Courses within the Major

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major											
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement*	Target Performance (See Goal Column)			Actual Performance (See Perc_Mastered Column)			Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results "Closing the Loop"		
Learning Outcome 1: Write and edit at a level commensurate with a communication leader or manager in applied communication contexts.	<p>A signature project is identified in each class listed under this learning outcome on the curriculum grid.</p> <p>Faculty assess the project using the MPC learning outcome assessment rubric in Canvas.</p> <p>The Office of Institutional Effectiveness then pulls the data for analysis.</p>	LO1 Write and Edit at a level commensurate with a communication leader							<p>Per the goals established by our program, we do seem to generally be meeting the percentage of students we would expect to master skills at each assessment level (Introduced/75%; Emphasized/85% and Assessed/95%) in this metric.</p> <p>The one time we did not (MPC 6900 F 2020) may have been due to small sample size as much as anything. This is part of why we are adding portfolios for all students – to provide a more robust measure of student skills at graduation.</p>	<p>See general elaboration in additional narrative below.</p>	
		SEM	CLASS	Not Mastered	Mastered	Grand Total	Perc_Mastered	Goal			Met Goal?
		F20	6010		23	23	100.00%	75%			y
		Sp21	6010		11	11	100.00%	75%			y
		Sp22	6010	0	20	20	100.00%	75%			y
		F20	6150	1	18	19	94.74%	85%			y
		Sp21	6150		16	16	100.00%	85%			y
		F20	6450		17	17	100.00%	75%			y
		F20	6700	3	18	21	85.71%	75%			y
		Sp21	6700		10	10	100.00%	75%			y
		Sp22	6700	0	14	14	100.00%	75%			y
		F20	6900	1	6	7	85.71%	95%			n
		Sp22	6900	0	3	3	100.00%	95%			y
		Measure 2: Exit Survey of		Students were asked to evaluate the statement "My MPC Courses enhanced my ability to communicate clearly in writing" on a scale of 1-5, where 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 =							Overall students do believe that the

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major											
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement*	Target Performance (See Goal Column)	Actual Performance (See Perc_Mastered Column)				Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results "Closing the Loop"			
	Students who graduated from 2020-2022	neither agree nor disagree, 4 = disagree and 5 = strongly disagree. The mean response on this question was 1.38 (falls between strongly agree and agree). There is no specific "target" for this indirect measure, but this provides additional information from the student perspective about what the faculty are assessing in the direct measures.						program significantly enhances their writing abilities (this was our best scoring learning outcome in the student self-reports). Students do write a great deal in our program and students perceive it supports their development	scaffolded writing opportunities with lots of feedback throughout the program.		
Learning Outcome 2: Present information orally and in visual form at a level commensurate with a communication leader or manager in an applied communication context.	A signature project is identified in each class listed under this learning outcome on the curriculum grid. Faculty assess the project using the MPC learning outcome assessment rubric in Canvas. The Office of Intuitional Effectiveness	LO2 Present information orally and in visual form						Per the goals established by our program, we do seem to generally be meeting the percentage of students we would expect to master skills at each assessment level (Introduced/75%; Emphasized/85% and Assessed/95%) in this metric.	See general elaboration in additional narrative below.		
		SEM	CLASS	Not Mastered	Mastered	Grand Total	Perc_Mastered			Goal	Met Goal?
		F20	6100	1	22	23	95.65%			75%	y
		Su21	6210		17	17	100.00%			85%	y
		F20	6900		7	7	100.00%			95%	y
		Sp22	6900	0	3	3	100.00%			95%	y
		We updated our assessment rubric in 2020 in response to program review. 4=Exceeds Mastery; 3=Mastery; 2 = Near Mastery and 1=Below Mastery. This data, provided by Institutional Effectiveness, combines ratings of 3 or 4 into Mastered and 1 or 2 into Not Mastered. So, the Threshold was set at 3 for Mastery.									

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major					
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement*	Target Performance (See Goal Column)	Actual Performance (See Perc_Mastered Column)	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results "Closing the Loop"
	then pulls the data for analysis.				
	Measure 2: Exit Survey of Students who graduated from 2020-2022	<p>Students were asked to evaluate the statement "My MPC Courses Enhanced my ability to create and deliver an oral presentation" on a scale of 1-5, where 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = disagree and 5 = strongly disagree. The mean response on this question was 1.63 (falls between strongly agree and agree).</p> <p>Students were also asked to evaluate the statement "My MPC courses developed my ability to use visual communication" on a scale of 1-5, where 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = disagree and 5 = strongly disagree. The mean response on this question was 1.75 (falls between strongly agree and agree).</p> <p>There is no specific "target" for this indirect measure, but this provides additional information from the student perspective about what the faculty are assessing in the direct measures.</p>		We updated this outcome in 2020 to include Visual (in addition to oral communication). While it is going well overall, visual communication scores slightly lower in student self-reports than oral communication.	In response to our 2020 biennial assessment, we integrated more oral speaking opportunities throughout the curriculum. We need to do similarly with visual communication going forward. We have added one additional visual communication elective (6840) as well.

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major																																																																																																																																		
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement*	Target Performance (See Goal Column)			Actual Performance (See Perc_Mastered Column)			Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results "Closing the Loop"																																																																																																																									
Learning Outcome 3: Demonstrate critical thinking and cultural competence in applied communication contexts	<p>A signature project is identified in each class listed under this learning outcome on the curriculum grid.</p> <p>Faculty assess the project using the MPC learning outcome assessment rubric in Canvas.</p> <p>The Office of Institutional Effectiveness then pulls the data for analysis.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="6">LO3 Demonstrate Critical Thinking and cultural competence</th> <th>Goal</th> <th>Met Goal?</th> </tr> <tr> <th>SEM</th> <th>CLASS</th> <th>Not Mastered</th> <th>Mastered</th> <th>Grand Total</th> <th>Perc_Mastered</th> <th></th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>F20</td> <td>6010</td> <td></td> <td>23</td> <td>23</td> <td>100.00%</td> <td>75%</td> <td>y</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sp21</td> <td>6010</td> <td></td> <td>11</td> <td>11</td> <td>100.00%</td> <td>75%</td> <td>y</td> </tr> <tr> <td>F20</td> <td>6100</td> <td>4</td> <td>19</td> <td>23</td> <td>82.61%</td> <td>75%</td> <td>y</td> </tr> <tr> <td>F20</td> <td>6150</td> <td></td> <td>19</td> <td>19</td> <td>100.00%</td> <td>75%</td> <td>y</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sp21</td> <td>6150</td> <td>1</td> <td>15</td> <td>16</td> <td>93.75%</td> <td>75%</td> <td>y</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Su21</td> <td>6210</td> <td></td> <td>17</td> <td>17</td> <td>100.00%</td> <td>75%</td> <td>y</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sp21</td> <td>6400</td> <td></td> <td>21</td> <td>21</td> <td>100.00%</td> <td>85%</td> <td>y</td> </tr> <tr> <td>F20</td> <td>6450</td> <td></td> <td>17</td> <td>17</td> <td>100.00%</td> <td>85%</td> <td>y</td> </tr> <tr> <td>F20</td> <td>6700</td> <td>2</td> <td>19</td> <td>21</td> <td>90.48%</td> <td>85%</td> <td>y</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sp21</td> <td>6700</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> <td>10</td> <td>100.00%</td> <td>85%</td> <td>y</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sp22</td> <td>6700</td> <td>0</td> <td>14</td> <td>14</td> <td>100.00%</td> <td>85%</td> <td>y</td> </tr> <tr> <td>F20</td> <td>6900</td> <td></td> <td>7</td> <td>7</td> <td>100.00%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>y</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sp22</td> <td>6900</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>100.00%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>y</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						LO3 Demonstrate Critical Thinking and cultural competence						Goal	Met Goal?	SEM	CLASS	Not Mastered	Mastered	Grand Total	Perc_Mastered			F20	6010		23	23	100.00%	75%	y	Sp21	6010		11	11	100.00%	75%	y	F20	6100	4	19	23	82.61%	75%	y	F20	6150		19	19	100.00%	75%	y	Sp21	6150	1	15	16	93.75%	75%	y	Su21	6210		17	17	100.00%	75%	y	Sp21	6400		21	21	100.00%	85%	y	F20	6450		17	17	100.00%	85%	y	F20	6700	2	19	21	90.48%	85%	y	Sp21	6700		10	10	100.00%	85%	y	Sp22	6700	0	14	14	100.00%	85%	y	F20	6900		7	7	100.00%	95%	y	Sp22	6900	0	3	3	100.00%	95%	y	<p>We updated our assessment rubric in 2020 in response to program review. 4=Exceeds Mastery; 3=Mastery; 2 = Near Mastery and 1=Below Mastery. This data, provided by Institutional Effectiveness, combines ratings of 3 or 4 into Mastered and 1 or 2 into Not Mastered. So, the Threshold was set at 3 for Mastery.</p>	<p>Per the goals established by our program, we do seem to generally be meeting the percentage of students we would expect to master skills at each assessment level (Introduced/75%; Emphasized/85% and Assessed/95%) in this metric.</p>	<p>See general elaboration in additional narrative below.</p>
		LO3 Demonstrate Critical Thinking and cultural competence						Goal	Met Goal?																																																																																																																									
		SEM	CLASS	Not Mastered	Mastered	Grand Total	Perc_Mastered																																																																																																																											
		F20	6010		23	23	100.00%	75%	y																																																																																																																									
		Sp21	6010		11	11	100.00%	75%	y																																																																																																																									
		F20	6100	4	19	23	82.61%	75%	y																																																																																																																									
		F20	6150		19	19	100.00%	75%	y																																																																																																																									
		Sp21	6150	1	15	16	93.75%	75%	y																																																																																																																									
		Su21	6210		17	17	100.00%	75%	y																																																																																																																									
		Sp21	6400		21	21	100.00%	85%	y																																																																																																																									
		F20	6450		17	17	100.00%	85%	y																																																																																																																									
		F20	6700	2	19	21	90.48%	85%	y																																																																																																																									
		Sp21	6700		10	10	100.00%	85%	y																																																																																																																									
		Sp22	6700	0	14	14	100.00%	85%	y																																																																																																																									
		F20	6900		7	7	100.00%	95%	y																																																																																																																									
Sp22	6900	0	3	3	100.00%	95%	y																																																																																																																											
Measure 2: Exit Survey of Students who graduated	<p>Students were asked to evaluate the statement "My MPC Courses developed my critical, analytical thinking skills" on a scale of 1-5, where 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = disagree and 5 = strongly disagree. The mean response on this question was 1.88 (falls between strongly agree and agree).</p>	<p>We updated this learning outcome in 2020 to include cultural competence as well</p>	<p>We will add a question on cultural competence on</p>																																																																																																																															

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major					
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement*	Target Performance (See Goal Column)	Actual Performance (See Perc_Mastered Column)	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results "Closing the Loop"
	from 2020-2022	There is no specific "target" for this indirect measure, but this provides additional information from the student perspective about what the faculty are assessing in the direct measures.		as critical thinking. Our exit survey had not been updated, however, so we have no specific question on cultural competence.	our exit survey going forward. While we did okay in this area (1.88 falls between strongly agree and agree), this was our least-favorable learning outcome rating among graduates. We will engage in department conversations both as to how we support critical thinking in our courses AND also how to communicate to students that we are doing so (e.g. perhaps there needs to be more meta-cognition here on how we are working on critical thinking in the program).

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major											
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement*	Target Performance (See Goal Column)				Actual Performance (See Perc_Mastered Column)			Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results "Closing the Loop"	
Learning Outcome 4: Conduct academic or applied research in communication contexts, report findings clearly and accurately, and interpret the meaning of research data.	<p>A signature project is identified in each class listed under this learning outcome on the curriculum grid.</p> <p>Faculty assess the project using the MPC learning outcome assessment rubric in Canvas.</p> <p>The Office of Intuitional Effectiveness then pulls the data for analysis.</p>	LO4 Conduct research in comm contexts								<p>Per the goals established by our program, we do seem to generally be meeting the percentage of students we would expect to master skills at each assessment level (Introduced/75%; Emphasized/85% and Assessed/95%) in this metric.</p>	<p>See general elaboration in additional narrative below.</p>
		SEM	CLASS	Not Mastered	Mastered	Grand Total	Perc_Mastered	Goal	Met Goal?		
		F20	6010	2	21	23	91.30%	75%	y		
		Sp21	6010		11	11	100.00%	75%	y		
		F20	6100	3	20	23	86.96%	75%	y		
		F20	6150		19	19	100.00%	85%	y		
		Sp21	6150	2	14	16	87.50%	85%	y		
		Sp21	6400		21	21	100.00%	85%	y		
		F20	6700	4	17	21	80.95%	85%	n		
		Sp21	6700		10	10	100.00%	85%	y		
		Sp22	6700	0	14	14	100.00%	85%	y		
		F20	6900		6	6	100.00%	95%	y		
		Sp22	6900	0	3	3	100.00%	95%	y		
				<p>We updated our assessment rubric in 2020 in response to program review. 4=Exceeds Mastery; 3=Mastery; 2 = Near Mastery and 1=Below Mastery. This data, provided by Institutional Effectiveness, combines ratings of 3 or 4 into Mastered and 1 or 2 into Not Mastered. So, the Threshold was set at 3 for Mastery.</p>							
	Measure 2: Exit Survey of Students who graduated from 2020-2022	<p>Students were asked to evaluate the statement "My MPC courses developed my ability to problem solve through research and scientific inquiry" on a scale of 1-5, where 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = disagree and 5 = strongly disagree. The mean response on this question was 1.81 (falls between strongly agree and agree).</p> <p>There is no specific "target" for this indirect measure, but this provides additional information from the student perspective about what the faculty are assessing in the direct measures.</p>					<p>Students do generally agree the program develops their abilities to problem solve through research.</p>		<p>We will continue the scaffolded connection between 6010 and methods as well as continue the split in methods (6700/6710) as</p>		

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major													
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement*	Target Performance (See Goal Column)				Actual Performance (See Perc_Mastered Column)				Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results "Closing the Loop"		
											that appears to help students develop their understanding.		
Learning Outcome 5: Demonstrate knowledge in one or more cognate areas - strategic communication, organizational communication and media.	<p>A signature project is identified in each class listed under this learning outcome on the curriculum grid.</p> <p>Faculty assess the project using the MPC learning outcome assessment rubric in Canvas.</p> <p>The Office of Intuitional Effectiveness then pulls the data for analysis.</p>	LO5 Demonstrate Knowledge in Cognate Area								<p>Per the goals established by our program, we do seem to generally be meeting the percentage of students we would expect to master skills at each assessment level (Introduced/75%; Emphasized/85% and Assessed/95%) in this metric.</p>	<p>See general elaboration in additional narrative below.</p>		
		SEM	CLASS	Not Mastered	Mastered	Grand Total	Perc_Mastered	Goal	Met Goal?				
		F20	6010	2	21	23	91.30%	75%	y				
		Sp21	6010		11	11	100.00%	75%	y				
		Sp22	6010	0	20	20	100.00%	75%	y				
		F20	6100	5	18	23	78.26%	85%	y				
		F20	6150		19	19	100.00%	75%	y				
		Sp21	6150	1	15	16	93.75%	75%	y				
		Sp21	6400		21	21	100.00%	85%	y				
		F20	6450		17	17	100.00%	85%	y				
		Sp21	6700		10	10	100.00%	85%	y				
		F20	6900		7	7	100.00%	95%	y				
		Sp22	6900	0	3	3	100.00%	95%	y				
		<p>We updated our assessment rubric in 2020 in response to program review. 4=Exceeds Mastery; 3=Mastery; 2 = Near Mastery and 1=Below Mastery. This data, provided by Institutional Effectiveness, combines ratings of 3 or 4 into Mastered and 1 or 2 into Not Mastered. So, the Threshold was set at 3 for Mastery.</p>											
		Measure 2: Exit Survey of		Students were asked to evaluate the statement "My MPC Courses enhanced my ability to communicate interpersonally and in small groups" on a scale of 1-5, where 1 = strongly								This exit survey measured two	Future surveys should include

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major					
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement*	Target Performance (See Goal Column)	Actual Performance (See Perc_Mastered Column)	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results "Closing the Loop"
	Students who graduated from 2020-2022	<p>agree, 2 = agree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = disagree and 5 = strongly disagree. The mean response on this question was 1.5 (falls between strongly agree and agree).</p> <p>Students were also asked to evaluate the statement "My MPC courses developed my ability to understand and use media/mediated technologies." The mean response on this question was 1.63 (falls between strongly agree and agree).</p> <p>There is no specific "target" for this indirect measure, but this provides additional information from the student perspective about what the faculty are assessing in the direct measures.</p>		<p>cognate areas (media & interpersonal/small group).</p> <p>As an indirect measure, these indicate that students generally find their abilities in interpersonal/small group and mediated communication developed over the course of the program.</p>	additional questions on other cognate areas (strategic communication and organizational communication).

*Direct and indirect: at least one measure per objective must be a direct measure.

Additional narrative:

This is the first assessment report built primarily on our new method of embedding program assessment into each MPC Canvas course and asking instructors to gather and assess signature assignments/culminating projects in each course.

In some ways this new method was incredibly successful. This is more data (collected across more courses) than we've ever had available to include on an assessment report before. This mechanism allows us to evaluate all five core learning outcomes across our curriculum by pulling data from multiple classes and multiple semesters.

However, in other ways, this new method of assessment has some limitations. First, it collapses some nuance. We updated our assessment rubric in 2020 in response to program review. 4=Exceeds Mastery; 3=Mastery; 2 = Near Mastery and 1=Below Mastery. The charts, provided as Measure 1 for each Learning Outcome, combines ratings of 3 or 4 into Mastered and 1 or 2 into Not Mastered. Given that we are a Master's program, the vast majority of our students are mastering each learning outcome (as we would expect). However, we would expect many of

our students move from a Level 3 Mastery to a Level 4 Exceeds Mastery across our curriculum. These assessment reports provided to us by Institutional Effectiveness don't allow us to see that level of movement. So, while we are thrilled that the vast majority of our students are achieving mastery, we may need to work with IE to get more detailed reports to see greater nuance at the graduate level.

Additionally, while compliance was higher than before, we are still working to fully incentivize assessment completion. Despite some reminders, remembering to do assessment did not happen in a fair number of courses. (We saw a similar pattern at the Undergraduate Level). We are adding a discussion item to our monthly faculty meetings related to assessment and completion and will be seriously exploring ways to increase data collection/compliance even further.

Second, this biennial assessment demonstrates that overall, our program's students are meeting expected learning outcome thresholds at each assessment level (Introduced/75%; Emphasized/85% and Assessed/95%) as appropriate to curriculum grid. By their final semester(s), students completing the 6900/6950 projects are generally meeting or exceeding the mastery standard on all five learning outcomes more than 95% of the time. We do sincerely believe that this is partly due to significant curriculum revisions we've made (including splitting research methods, re-designing some core assignments in the foundations courses, and integrating key skills like writing and research more systematically throughout the curriculum).

However, this report does highlight the need for next steps in requiring ALL graduating MPC students to turn in a culminating project/portfolio (as right now, the number of students each semester in MPC Thesis/Projects 6900/6950 is often only 3-7 students; the rest of our students choose to graduate on a coursework track). We passed a portfolio requirement for graduation (e.g. through Curriculog) and it is now listed as a requirement for graduation starting in the 2022-2023 Catalog. We look forward to improving our overall program assessment with the addition of those portfolios for students pursuing the coursework track to graduation.

We have made next steps/closing the loop efforts within each learning outcome to better develop our students' skills in each area (See some additional examples under the *"1) Looking back at your previous biennial report where you identified strategies for improvement, what progress has been made in implementing improvements?"* question on Page 20 Below.). We look forward to using these newly implemented ePortfolios to provide a program-level assessment lens to understand how those efforts are combining across the curriculum.

G.C Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses

We do not have any GEN ED courses in the graduate program.

Appendix A

Most departments or programs receive a number of recommendations from their Five/Seven-Year Program Review processes. This page provides a means of updating progress towards the recommendations the department/program is enacting.

Date of Program Review: Spring 2020	Recommendation	Progress Description
Recommendation 1 - Mission Statement	It is suggested that a line be added that addresses the goal of cultivating professionals who can think critically, who are grounded ethically, and who are culturally aware.	We met as a faculty in 2020-2021 and agreed to update the missing statement. We began draft language.
		2022- Draft language was created and added to mission statement (see new line in statement on p. 2)
		2022-forward: We will continue to monitor the mission & update as needed to best reflect the program and learning outcomes.
Recommendation 2 - Curriculum	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider reviewing course titles, descriptions, and content to better reflect and represents what appears to be already happening in courses, specifically around ethics. 2. Continue to respond to changing curricular design base upon student feedback for flexibility. 3. Be sure expectations of the split research methods courses are very clear and distinct for both students and instructors. 4. Consider comparing syllabi among MPC faculty to ensure consistent and balanced rigor across courses, including a standard for providing feedback to students in a timely manner. 	<p>We continue the process of updating curriculum (recommendations #1,2). Since program review, we split the methods course (#3) into Qual and Quant classes with positive feedback from students. We added the 6840 Data Visualization & Storytelling course due to student and industry demand (and that class is now required of the MSDS and is an elective in the MSSE, demonstrating cross-industry demand). We added a Portfolio requirement for students on the Coursework track to provide a stronger culminating experience.</p> <p>We agreed with the other recommendations and have held conversations about common expectations (#4). For example, We set a</p>

		<p>department policy of returning 1st block class grades to students within 2 weeks of block ending (even though they aren't "officially" due to the university until the end of the 15 week semester).</p> <p>We plan to focus more specifically on updating course titles/descriptions in 2022-2023 (#1).</p> <p>2022-forward. We will finish any needed curriculum updates (#1) as well as develop template syllabi language about expectations (#4)</p>
Recommendation 3 - Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider creating a database with student publications, presentations, and industry feedback of student projects and career accomplishments. 	<p>We started with a Google Doc to help gather this information. However, several admin switches/turnover mean that this hasn't yet been put on our Website in a public facing form.</p>
		<p>In the meantime, we have more intensively focused on sharing these stories on MPC social media pages. We have a long list of alumni spotlights with publications, presentations, career accomplishments, etc.</p> <p>Also, in Spring 2022 we hosted a 10-year celebration for the MPC program and invited all of our alumni back to a presentation and reception. We gathered alumni stories in advance & at that event and have been sharing them both at that event and on Social Media.</p>
		<p>2022-forward: We continue to redesign our website and plan to add that</p>

		Student/Alumni Accomplishments page. We are in process on print collateral redesigns that will also emphasize student success.
Recommendation 4 - Support	1. Put a process in place to ease communication and time-sensitive decisions on applications. Consider using a file sharing application (Box) for the distribution and evaluation of applications, with clear expectations for use.	2019-2020. The MPC director and administrative staff met Spring 2020. A new BOX process was created to review applications. Upon reflection, staff said it streamlined process.
		2020-2022. We've had four admins since then, and each has found the process to be clear and relatively easy to manage. We typically turn around decisions for applications within a 7-10 day timeline, which is reasonable given that folks need time to review materials before the admission committee meets.
		2022-forward. Continue monitoring new process of using Box and update as needed.
Recommendation 5- Relationships with External Communities	Consider forming an advisory board comprised of industry experts representative of popular career paths who could serve as mentors and/or provide internship opportunities.	2020 – Research We considered the Communication Department advisory board as our advisory board as well. Based on conversation at Graduate council, it appears some departments do this (same board for undergrad and grad programs) while some programs have a split board.
		2021 We discussed this in Spring 2021. At that time, the department felt the Communication Advisory Board (which includes many leading professionals in the communication field, including some of our MPC alumni) felt that they could

		productively function as advisory for both programs (Undergrad & Grad)
		2022 – Planned check in. We will meet with Communication Advisory Board and re-confirm their comfort with providing feedback and advice on both Undergrad & Grad programs.
		2023-forward. Once all coursework students are completing ePortfolios, we hope to have our Board review ePortfolios and provide feedback.

Appendix B

This table below reflects faculty for the ENTIRE Department of Communication (not just the MPC) as we do not have any faculty who are unique/wholly housed in the MPC. However, not all of the folks listed below teach in the MPC program.

****The one exception is adjunct. We only included adjunct numbers for adjuncts that teach in MPC.**

Faculty Headcount	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
With Doctoral Degrees (Including MFA and other terminal degrees, as specified by the institution)				
Full-time Tenured	7	9	9	9
Full-time Non-Tenured (includes tenure-track)	8	9	8	9
Part-time and adjunct				
With Master's Degrees				
Full-time Tenured				
Full-time Non-Tenured	8	6	7	6
Part-time and adjunct **	2	1	1	2
With Bachelor's Degrees				
Full-time Tenured				
Full-time Non-tenured				
Part-time and adjunct				
Other				
Full-time Tenured				
Full-time Non-tenured				
Part-time				
Total Headcount Faculty	27	25	25	26
Full-time Tenured	9	9	9	9
Full-time Non-tenured	16	15	15	15
Part-time	2	1	1	2

Please respond to the following questions.

- 1) Looking back at your previous biennial report where you identified strategies for improvement, what progress has been made in implementing improvements?

As a program, we believe assessment data is useful to the extent that we use it to consistently refine, clarify and modify our curriculum to ensure our students are succeeding in our program mission to “prepar[e] working professionals with the advanced communication knowledge and skills needed to excel in a range of communication-related careers.” We believe our assessment efforts demonstrate ways in which we use that feedback loop on a regular basis.

Our biggest major change is that we started using the new Canvas rubrics developed for our program learning outcome assessment starting in Fall 2020. As mentioned above, this resulted in more data (collected across more courses) than we’ve ever had available to include on an assessment report before. This mechanism allows us to evaluate all five core learning outcomes across our curriculum by pulling data from multiple classes and multiple semesters. This is a significant improvement.

Then, of course, we have worked to use the data to inform decisions. For instance, before our last biennial review (based on data from 4-5 years ago), we had reorganized the 6010 (Intro to Grad Studies) and 6700 (Mixed Methods) sequence to allow students to build on a single project across two classes – giving them more depth and continuity in understanding the research process. Then, in the last biennial review, we saw some evidence that Learning Outcome 4 (Conduct Academic or Applied Research in Communication Contexts) was still a struggle point for our students. After analysis, we split our single methods course (6700 – Mixed methods) into two separate methods courses (6700 Qualitative Methods and 6710 Survey Methods). This split allows for more clarity and focus in the methods courses. Our assessment data in this report shows that Learning Outcome 4 is being met at the threshold level by our students overall and we also have qualitative feedback from students that the separate classes better support their learning.

As an example of a more granular curriculum adjustment, when we saw that oral & visual presentational skills were still a challenge for some of our students in the last biennial report, so we integrated more low-stakes practice presentation opportunities into our courses and added an additional Data Visualization (visual presentation skills) elective (taught as Special Topics 6500 in 2021, and now as an approved elective 6840 in 2022).

In our 2020 biennial report, we discussed the need for better culminating assessment of Coursework Students (who all take three different electives rather than a single culminating class). We added an ePortfolio/Portfolium graduation requirement to our Coursework track (it passed through all levels of curriculum review last year and “started” in the 2022-2023 catalog year). We look forward to using our same assessment rubrics currently applied to our other culminating assessments (MPC 6900 Projects/Theses) to our ePortfolios starting in 2023 to provide better wholistic assessment of students’ skills at the end of the program.

2) Please take a few minutes to review the new DFWI dashboard in the Report Gallery. This dashboard allows you to see the percentage of students in each course who earn a D+, D, D-, E, W, UW, or NC grade. The data can be filtered by several parameters. Reflect on the DFWI rates overall and of your underserved minority students versus your Caucasian students:

a. We confirmed with Institutional Effectiveness that this is currently an undergraduate-only dashboard. But we are very interested in these conversations and would be happy to continue to explore in this area.

3) We have invited you to re-think your program assessment. What strategies are you considering? What support or help would you like?

Our biggest current project is getting the ePortfolios/Portfolium assessment off and running (now that it is officially a requirement for our coursework students to graduate starting in Catalog year 2022-2023. We've met with the MHA program and the DNP program directors (Darcy Carter & Melissa Neville Norton) to understand how those programs use and assess ePortfolios in meaningful ways. We have built a Canvas class to support students in ePortfolio building (modeled on the Canvas class the DNP program uses – thank you to them for sharing!!). As we begin collecting and assessing these Portfolios, any additional feedback on best practices in ePortfolio use and assessment would be very welcome.

In addition, as we reflected on above, while we are overall very happy with our Canvas outcomes-rubric based assessment for many reasons, this new method of assessment has some limitations. First, it collapses some nuance. We updated our assessment rubric in 2020 in response to program review. 4=Exceeds Mastery; 3=Mastery; 2 = Near Mastery and 1=Below Mastery. The charts, provided as Measure 1 for each Learning Outcome, combines ratings of 3 or 4 into Mastered and 1 or 2 into Not Mastered (e.g. the Threshold is set at 3). This is appropriate for our students, as we do want to assess mastery in the program. We do not expect all students to exceed mastery. So, it would not be appropriate to set our threshold at “exceeds mastery”.

Given that we are a Master's program, the vast majority of our students are mastering each learning outcome (as we would expect). However, we would expect many (though not all) of our students move from a Level 3 Mastery to a Level 4 Exceeds Mastery across our curriculum. These assessment reports provided to us by Institutional Effectiveness don't allow us to see that level of movement. So, while we are thrilled that the vast majority of our students are achieving mastery, we may need to work with IE to get more detailed reports to see greater nuance at the graduate level. If we can not only track the percentage of students at/above threshold (which is a measure we would like to keep) but if we could ALSO track percentages of students moving from a “3” to a “4” Level across the program, that would

give us a lot more nuance in our understanding of the curriculum. So, the data we have now is helpful, but even more nuance might be ideal.

Finally, despite some regular reminders, remembering to do assessment did not happen in a fair number of courses. (We saw a similar pattern at the Undergraduate Level). We are adding a discussion item to our monthly faculty meetings related to assessment and completion and will be seriously exploring ways to increase data collection/compliance even further. Any ideas on how to improve assessment completion would be helpful!