



# New Mexico Common Course Assessment Reports Form

Reporting Institution: Central New Mexico Community College

New Mexico Common Core Area: Communications

Competency Number Assessed: (note that *not* all competencies have to be assessed – mark all that apply to this assessment by double-clicking on the check box and choosing the •checked• option)

State Competency 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	State Competency 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	State Competency 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
State Competency 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	State Competency 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	State Competency 6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Academic Year of Assessment: 2015-2016

Submission Date: May 31, 2017

Institution Course Number: See crosswalk below

NM Common Core Number: See crosswalk below

Submitted by: Ralph Trimmell

## COMMUNICATION COURSE CROSSWALK

CNM COURSE #	NMCCNS	COURSE NAME
COMM 1130	COMM 1113	Public Speaking
ENG 1101	ENGL 1113	College Writing
JOUR 1171	ENGL 1123	Writing for the Media

## Description of Assessment Procedure:

### *Communication:*

In the Spring 2015 semester, roughly 7 instructors participated in actively assessing 531 CNM students currently taking 1000-level Communications classes. Initially, the department expected to assess more students than were assessed in the previous year. The communications department successfully met their expectation and target through the collection of data on over 500 students in 2015.

### *English:*

In the Spring 2015 semester, eight instructors participated in actively assessing 181 CNM students currently taking English 1101 classes. Initially, the department set a target to decrease the number of students scoring a zero in the assessment criteria. The English department reported that the percent of zero scores in the 2015 assessment were much lower than what was reported in the previous year's assessment thus successfully meeting their target.

### *Journalism*

*Journalism\* Results reported with Communication*

## Report of Assessment Data and Results:

### *Communication:*

See Appendices for correspondence with NMED categories

Assessment Categories & Score	2016 All Students	2015 Communications Majors	2016 Communications	2016 Communications Majors
CA1				
0	.5%	0	2.1%	
1	10.4%	5.8%	4.5%	7.7%
2	30.9%	27.5%	17.9%	36.5%
3	58.2%	42.0%	44.6%	55.8%
CA2				
0	2.7%	0	3.6%	
1	13.1%	8.7%	3.0	11.3%
2	34.4%	30.4%	19.2%	39.6%
3	49.7%	37.7%	43.9%	49.1%
CA3				

0	3.0%	0	4.9%	
1	17.0%	10.1%	3.4%	13.5%
2	38.0%	31.9%	15.6%	42.3%
3	42.0%	33.3%	45.8%	44.2%
AVG CA	2.3	2.4	2.50	2.4
DSCA1				
0		0	.4%	
1		0	.6%	
2		13%	1.7%	
3		7.2%	5.8%	
DSCA2				
0		0	.9%	
1		1.4%	.6%	
2		4.3%	3.4%	
3		14.5%	8.5%	
EC1				
0	1.9%	0	2.6%	
1	11.8%	7.2%	2.8%	9.8%
2	35.1%	24.6%	16.4%	33.3%
3	51.1%	42.0%	47.8%	56.9%
EC2				
0	2%	0	2.3%	
1	11.4%	4.3%	3.6%	5.9%
2	31.5%	9.0%	17.9%	39.2%
3	55.1%	40.6%	41.1%	54.9%
AVG EC		2.5	2.54	2.3

**English:**

Assessment Categories & Score	2016 All Students	2015 English	2016 English
CA1			
0	.5%	14.2%	
1	10.4%	19.8%	13.8%
2	30.9%	36.6%	33.7%

3	58.2%	29.4%	52.5%
CA2			
0	2.7%	12.9%	2.2%
1	13.1%	15.7%	16.0%
2	34.4%	36.2%	37.6%
3	49.7%	35.2%	44.2%
CA3			
0	3.0%	12.9%	1.1%
1	17.0%	19.9%	21.7%
2	38.0%	41.1%	38.3%
3	42.0%	26.1%	38.9%
AVG CA	2.3		2.3
DSCA1			
Not Assessed			85.9%
1			1.4%
2			.5%
3			5.5%
DSCA2			
Not Assessed			86.8%
1			1.4%
2			2.7%
3			2.7%
EC1			
0	1.9%	12.7%	1.7%
1	11.8%	19.9%	22.7%
2	35.1%	36.9%	37.0%
3	51.1%	30.4%	38.7%
EC2			
0	2%	15.7%	1.1%
1	11.4%	21.5%	26.0%
2	31.5%	33.8%	35.9%
3	55.1%	29.0%	37.0%

*Journalism:*

Assessment Categories & Score	2016 All Students	2016 Journalism
CA1		
0	.5%	
1	10.4%	8.3%
2	30.9%	66.7%
3	58.2%	25.0%
CA2		
0	2.7%	
1	13.1%	14.3%
2	34.4%	57.1%
3	49.7%	28.6%
CA3		
0	3.0%	
1	17.0%	
2	38.0%	50%
3	42.0%	50%
AVG CA	2.3	2.5
EC1		
0	1.9%	
1	11.8%	20.0%
2	35.1%	50.0%
3	51.1%	30.0%
EC2		
0	2%	
1	11.4%	
2	31.5%	54.5%
3	55.1%	45.5%
AVG EC	2.4	2.3
N	3443	14

## **Analysis and Interpretation/Reflection on Results or Trends:**

### ***Communication:***

Each instructor assessed students' Effective Communication and Critical Analysis skills using the LALA assessment rubric (see Appendix A). According to the Communications LALA results (p. 22), the student assessment scores show that the majority of students taking communications classes sufficiently demonstrate Critical Analysis and Effective Communication skills. The Communications faculty recognized, as a result of the 2015 LALA data, that many students demonstrate a weakness in developing and supporting argument strategies.

### ***English:***

Each instructor assessed students' Effective Communication and Critical Analysis skills using the LALA assessment rubric (see Appendix A). According to the English LALA results (p. 22), the student assessment scores reported in 2016 were higher than those reported in 2015. Most notably, fewer students assessed in 2015 received a score of zero in Critical Analysis skills and Effective Communication than in the previous year's assessment. This demonstrates student improvement in both emerging Critical Analysis and Effective Communication skills.

### ***Journalism:***

*Journalism\* Results reported with Communication*

## **Plan for Improving the Assessment Process and/or Student Learning:**

### ***Communication:***

Communications faculty agree that there is a need for the department to re-evaluate and re-norm the assessment process. With an assessment of this size, they will need to implement a norming session to standardize faculty scoring. The 2015 LALA experience revealed that norming will be key for obtaining consistent data. Faculty also agree that prior to future assessments, the assessment assignment will be designed with the assessment rubric in mind. Faculty in the Communications department are open to continuing assessment and hope to see value in the assessment data gathered through the LALA assessment process. Overall, instructors who participated in the 2016 assessment were comfortable with some of the changes made by the LALA team to the data collection process. Instructors who participated in LALA were pleased with the support that they received from their LALA coordinator. Communications faculty are open to combining the General Education and LALA assessment criteria therefore assessing numerous criteria using only one assessment process.

### ***English:***

Overall, the English faculty agree that due to clearer instructions for data entry and assessment scoring, their data was more reliable and accurate. The 2015 LALA experience revealed that the assessed courses' outcomes nicely align with the LALA outcomes. Faculty intend to continue using the

LALA assessment to also aid in measuring department student learning outcomes. Using an evaluation argument assignment, the English faculty were able to tailor the assessment to their individual classes while using the same assessment rubric across introductory courses. Faculty in the English Department are beginning to see some value in the assessment data gathered through the LALA assessment process. Overall, instructors who participated in the 2016 assessment were comfortable with some of the changes made by the LALA team to the data collection process, and some appreciated clear instructions for data entry but others are still quite dissatisfied. Furthermore, due to the very large number of students and instructors in English courses, they do not envision incorporating General Education criteria into their LALA assignment or assessment; they will likely opt to perform separate LALA and General Education student learning assessments.

***Journalism:***

*Journalism\* Results reported with Communication*

Appendix A: **LIBERAL ARTS SCORING RUBRIC: CRITICAL ANALYSIS (NMED ,1)**

<b><i>Given new information, situation, and/or application, the student will:</i></b>	<i>Did it awesomely</i> Score = 3	<i>Did it</i> Score = 2	<i>Kind of did it</i> Score = 1	<i>Didn't do it:</i> <i>Non-attempt or Emerging</i> Score = 0
<b>Identify and critically consider the main issues, concepts, problems, and/or techniques.</b>	Student explicitly, critically, and comprehensively considers all relevant material. Student identifies all relevant information necessary for mastery of the subject matter.	Student identifies, describes, applies, and/or clarifies relevant material to demonstrate a proficient understanding.	Student identifies relevant material but may struggle to describe, apply, or clarify the content.	Student uncritically identifies relevant material, offering no clarification, application, or description.
<b>Incorporate more than one perspective (e.g. source, method, technique, and/or approach)</b>	Student incorporates many diverse perspectives to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Student clearly justifies her/his own view or approach. Analysis/application of other perspectives is consistently accurate and respectful. Student provides ample evidence of reflection and self-assessment.	Student incorporates some diverse perspectives, but the approach is limited. Student somewhat justifies her/his own view or approach. Analysis/application of other positions is usually accurate and respectful. Student provides some evidence of reflection and self-assessment.	Student incorporates a singular or very few perspective(s). Student begins to relate alternative views but the integration of multiple viewpoints lacks development. Student investigates or applies ideas in a limited way. Analysis/application of other views lacks accuracy in some areas. Student provides little evidence of self-assessment.	Student fails to incorporate or engage others' perspectives or discusses an incorrect perspective. Student adopts a single idea with little question and does not integrate alternatives. Student presents obvious ideas, avoids discomfoting ideas, and or treats other positions superficially. Student provides no evidence of self-assessment.
<b>Demonstrate mastery by evaluating, analyzing, interpreting and/or synthesizing</b>	Student demonstrates a comprehensive evaluation, analysis, interpretation, or synthesis. Student thoroughly examines and/or applies the viewpoints of experts.	Student develops a coherent evaluation, analysis, interpretation, or synthesis. Student accurately examines and/or applies the viewpoints of experts, but not comprehensively.	Student struggles to develop a coherent evaluation, analysis, interpretation, or synthesis. Student inaccurately or inconsistently examines and/or applies the viewpoints of experts.	Student offers little or no evaluation, analysis, interpretation, or synthesis. Student fails to examine and/or apply the viewpoints of experts.





Appendix B: **LIBERAL ARTS SCORING RUBRIC: EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION (NMED, 1,2,3,4)**

<p><i>In written, oral, numeric or visual formats, the student will:</i></p>	<p><i>Did it awesomely</i> Score = 3</p>	<p><i>Did it</i> Score = 2</p>	<p><i>Kind of did it</i> Score = 1</p>	<p><i>Didn't do it:</i> <i>Non-attempt or Emerging</i> Score = 0</p>
<p><b>Demonstrate organization and/or coherence of ideas, content, and/or formulas</b></p>	<p>Material is sharply focused and organized. The student presents a logical organization of ideas around a common theme that demonstrates an advanced understanding of the subject matter.</p>	<p>Material is mostly focused and organized. The student presents logical constructions around a common theme that reflects meaning and purpose.</p>	<p>The student's ideas and organizational patterns reflect a common theme that demonstrates a basic understanding of the subject matter. Ideas are disorganized or may lack development in some places.</p>	<p>The material lacks focus and organization with few or no ideas around common theme. Student struggles to demonstrate her/his understanding of the subject matter.</p>
	<p><b>Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses on all elements of the work.</b></p>	<p><b>Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).</b></p>	<p><b>Demonstrates a basic awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).</b></p>	<p><b>Struggles to demonstrate attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).</b></p>

**Appendix C: Crosswalk of CNM Learning Outcomes to NMHED Competencies**

<b>CNM Outcomes (below) and NMHED Area 1: Communications Competencies (right)</b>	1. Analyze and evaluate oral and written communication in terms of situation, audience, purpose, aesthetics, and diverse points of view	2. Express a primary purpose in a compelling statement and order supporting points logically and convincingly	3. Use effective rhetorical strategies to persuade, inform, and engage	4. Employ writing and/or speaking processes such as planning, collaborating, organizing, composing, revising, and editing to create presentations using correct diction, syntax, grammar, and mechanics	5. Integrate research correctly and ethically from credible sources to support the primary purpose of a communication	6. Engage in reasoned civic discourse while recognizing the distinctions among opinions, fact, and inferences
Identify main issues, concepts, problems, and/or techniques	X	X	X	X	X	X
Incorporate more than one perspective, source, method, technique, and/or approach	X		X		X	X
Demonstrate mastery by evaluating, analyzing, interpreting and/or synthesizing	X			X	X	X
Demonstrate organization and/or coherence of ideas, content, and/or formulas	X	X	X	X	X	X
Produce communication appropriate to audience, situation, venue, and/or context	X		X	X	X	X