

Detailed Assessment Report

As of: 5/08/2015 04:42 PM EDT

2014-2015 Communication Arts BA & BS

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The mission of the communication arts faculty at IU Kokomo is to enable students to achieve communication competencies and intellectual, emotional and aesthetic insights that enhance the production, performance, reception and analysis of messages. The faculty strives to establish students as effective and ethical practitioners of various forms of communication, while providing a solid foundation in the scholarly content, history and methods of communication arts. We believe that students learn by doing and provide opportunities for students to enhance their personal and professional growth through hands-on practice, an overseas study class in Italian Culture and Communication, and concentrations in either public relations/corporate communication, journalism or public communication. The degree includes an experiential component so that students may acquire practical field experience in several areas including interviewing, radio, research methods or presentation skills. Further, the faculty seek to model and promote scholarly and creative activity as they enhance the communication competency of the community through general education classes.

Goals

G 3:#1: To employ strategic communication in varied channels and contexts of contemporary human communication

Goal #1: To employ strategic communication in varied channels and contexts of contemporary human communication

Student Learning Outcomes/Components, with Any Associations and Related Artifacts/Objects, Benchmarks, Findings, and Action Plans

S 3:5B. Students will draw on knowledge of methods to diagnose or analyze real world communication problems

5B. Outcome: Students will draw on knowledge of methods to diagnose or analyze real world communication problems

Components: Problem identification, identification of reasoning, appropriateness of application

Related Artifacts/Objects:

A 1:Organizational Culture Paper

C380 Organizational Communication

Organizational Report #1

Overview: This short paper (4-5 pages) is due on September 26, and is worth 25 points. We will watch a film together on 9/17 and 9/19, and you will discuss one of two topics-management style OR organizational culture.

Content: Using Schein's levels of culture, describe the culture of the organization

as follows, making sure to cite the text and provide examples from the film to support your conclusions.

Level 1: Artifacts and creations: Describe the "overt behavior" of the employees. Consider such things as dress, architecture, forms of address, decision-making styles, communication during meetings, etc. What do these artifacts and behaviors mean to members of the organization?

Level 2: Espoused values: What beliefs about "what ought to happen" prevail at the organization? What do the members appear to "value"? Do explicitly "espoused values" appear authentic?

Level 3: Basic assumptions: Based on Level 1 and Level 2 findings, what assumptions do the employees seem to hold about:

- a. The nature of human nature?
- b. The nature of human activity?
- c. The nature of human relationships?

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Benchmark:

For each component, the Communication Arts faculty set a benchmark success rate of 85% of the students effectively demonstrating the ability to apply the research method in question and to diagnose real world communication problems. Our benchmark translates to an 85% average.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

Action plan based on results of Outcome 5B

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

A comparison of this year's assessment with last year's assessment indicates a significant drop in the first component (proble...

A 2:Rhetorical Criticism Paper

C 393: Communication Research Methods

Rhetorical Criticism Method Project

Description: This assignment requires you to select a speech or other rhetorical artifact and analyze it using fantasy theme analysis.

Grading: This is your only solo method project. You will work on your own. The assignment is worth up to 50 points. Papers will be graded according to how well they achieve the requirements listed below, as well as how well they meet the standards of justification, reasonable inference, and coherence. (See PowerPoint notes if you have questions about these.) You will also be graded on stylistic factors and whether you follow APA style appropriately.

Artifact/Text: Since rhetorical criticism is the analysis of texts and other symbolic artifacts, your first task is to choose a subject for your analysis. This can be a speech, a film, a song or "album," a TV show, or any other communication artifact. You should consider two things when selecting your artifact: (1) is this something that interests me in some way? (2) does this text include character, setting and action themes? (Most artifacts do, but it will be easier for you to analyze a book than a painting). *Your text must be approved by me. Email is fine.*

Method: You will use fantasy theme analysis, which we discussed in class on 4/14. The overall point of fantasy theme analysis is to determine *how a "text" constructs mythic themes of good and evil*. To do this you must proceed in two steps:

1. Code the artifact for three themes

a. Setting themes

b. Character themes

c. Action themes

Notice that you are looking for *themes*-you are looking for patterns, common descriptions, etc. A good way to start is by making an initial list. For instance, who are all the characters? How is each character described? Who is evil and who is good? Then determine what common themes exist. Keep track of specific quotes and/or examples you might use as you explain these themes in the paper.

2. Identify the rhetorical vision of the artifact

This is where it may get tricky. Based on the themes you discovered, what is the artifact's "vision" of good and evil? According to the artifact, how should we look at the world, humans, relationships, or whatever? For example, a Taylor Swift song will most likely portray all boys as cheaters (character themes). All men are dogs and should never be trusted. Heartbreak is inevitable (the action theme). High school is the setting. Ultimately she makes herself the innocent victim... *women/girls are inevitably victims! No matter how decent and good you are, men will mistreat you!! A rhetorical vision of victimage!!!*

One last piece of advice here-try to come up with a name for the rhetorical vision. In the Garner and Sterk article, they call it "a rhetorical vision of containment." In my analysis above, I call it a "rhetorical vision of victimage." *Naming the vision will help you articulate your argument.*

Parts of the Paper/Requirements: Your paper should be broken down as follows. Notice that your paper will range from 1,500 to 2,000 words, including title page and works cited. You will use APA style (as you did with your Experiment Project and quizzes^[1]). Papers will be turned in via the Assignments area of the Oncourse site. **Papers are due by class time on April 30.** You may be asked to discuss your work with the class.

1. *Introduction*. Introduce the text and the method. Explain why it is important to analyze. State your thesis and give a preview. (Approximately 100-200 words).

2. *Briefly introduce the artifact(s) you are analyzing*. You will go into greater depth

later in the paper. For now, just give an overview. (Approximately 100-200 words).

3. *Method.* Explain the method you will be using. Since the method has been chosen for you, this shouldn't be hard. You can cite the Garner and Sterk article and your class notes. No other sources are needed. Thank me by writing a killer analysis in part 3. The most important thing about this part of the essay is that *here is where you explain how this type of criticism is done.* (Approximately 300-400 words).

4. *Analysis of the text.* Use the method to make an insightful argument about the text. This is where you apply the method to the text in order to provide some critical insight into the speech, TV show, or whatever it is you have chosen. Remember that ultimately you are making an argument about the text. See above for the appropriate steps. The structure of this section of the paper should be obvious. (Approximately 900-1,000 words).

5. *Conclusion.* Give a nice summary. What did we learn from your paper? (100-200 words).

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

[1] APA style will be graded ruthlessly. Make sure you have read previous feedback and that you are correcting errors you have made in the past. Use your textbook and/or visit the Purdue OWL site at <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/section/2/10/>

Benchmark:

For each component, the Communication Arts faculty set a benchmark success rate of 85% of the students effectively demonstrating the ability to apply the research method in question and to diagnose real world communication problems. Our benchmark translates to an 85% average.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

Action plan based on results of Outcome 5B

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

A comparison of this year's assessment with last year's assessment indicates a significant drop in the first component (proble...

S 4:1B. Students will demonstrate effective writing skills

1B. Students will demonstrate effective writing skills

Components: Awareness of audience; thesis or proposition; organizational-structural clarity; support for position; transitions; writing mechanics.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Action plan based on results of Outcome 5B

96% of students demonstrated effectiveness in the component "problem identification" while 80.67% of students demonstrated success in the components "presentation of reasoning" and "appropriateness of application."

While students were successful at identifying communication problems, they did not meet the 85% benchmark for explaining their reasoning and applying the chosen method appropriately. Only three of the items assessed were collected from S228, and given this low number, changes to the course should be undertaken with caution, and are not planned at this time.

The remainder of these items were collected in C393, so our improvements will be focused on this course. The faculty will make the following changes:

1) Presentation of reasoning. Higher student performance on this component will be facilitated through changes in the assignments. Currently, the faculty member teaching the course divides the class into four major units, focusing on four major research methods. Each unit includes the reading and discussion of sample journal articles, followed by the writing of a paper that applies the method. These assignments will be supplemented with written exercises focusing on the journal readings that specifically analyze the reasoning of these articles. This will provide students with quality examples and experience discussing reasoning. For instance, writing prompts could include questions about how the authors came to the conclusions they came to (the reasoning behind the arguments presented in the articles).

2) Appropriateness of application. This component focuses on how appropriately and effectively the chosen method is applied to the communication problem chosen by the students. These problems include phenomena, interactions and texts. The faculty believe that students are having trouble applying the correct method to the problem identified-or, more correctly given the nature of the assignments-choosing the best problem for the method assigned. This will be addressed by limiting the communication phenomena available for students to write about. This will provide the instructor the ability to make sure the application of the method is more appropriate for the phenomenon, interaction or text.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Implementation Description: See above

Responsible Person/Group: Com Arts Faculty

Additional Resources Requested: none

Action plan based on results of Outcome 5B

A comparison of this year's assessment with last year's assessment indicates a significant drop in the first component (problem identification), but significant improvements in the other two (presentation of reasoning and appropriateness of application). (Last year's averages were 96%, 80.6% and 80.6%, respectively.) Even so, student performance exceeded the benchmarks in all three categories.

Based on these results, the faculty will continue with the changes incorporated last year (namely the supplementary written exercises and writing prompts), but will make similar changes to ensure that the benchmark on component 1 (problem identification) does not fall

below the 85% benchmark. For example, writing prompts could focus specifically on the real-world problem addressed in the research papers the students read for class.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Artifact/Object | Outcomes/Components):

Artifact/Object: Rhetorical Criticism Paper | **Outcomes/Components:** 5B.

Students will draw on knowledge of methods to diagnose or analyze real world communication problems

Action plan based on results of Outcome 5B

A comparison of this year's assessment with last year's assessment indicates a significant drop in the first component (problem identification), but significant improvements in the other two (presentation of reasoning and appropriateness of application). (Last year's averages were 96%, 80.6% and 80.6%, respectively.) Even so, student performance exceeded the benchmarks in all three categories.

Based on these results, the faculty will continue with the changes incorporated last year (namely the supplementary written exercises and writing prompts), but will make similar changes to ensure that the benchmark on component 1 (problem identification) does not fall below the 85% benchmark. For example, writing prompts could focus specifically on the real-world problem addressed in the research papers the students read for class.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Artifact/Object | Outcomes/Components):

Artifact/Object: Organizational Culture Paper | **Outcomes/Components:** 5B.

Students will draw on knowledge of methods to diagnose or analyze real world communication problems