

Part II, Standard 9. Assessment of Learning Outcomes



Technology: Learning Outcome for Broadcasting Students

Please attach the unit's written plan for assessment of student learning outcomes. This plan must include the dates of its adoption and of implementation of its components.

Executive summary (optional).

Prior to fall 2013, the Department of Communication defined eleven learning outcomes, designated The JSU 4+7 (denoting four values and seven competencies), that its students must achieve prior to graduation. Beginning from fall 2013, we have transited from 11 to 12 values and competencies (called The JSU 5+7) as described in details below. The JSU 4+7 include writing, editing, technology, research, statistics, critical thinking, history, theory, law, ethics, and diversity, while 5+7 includes the first ten plus domestic diversity and global diversity.

The JSU 4+7 is the centerpiece of the department's 2012-2013 outcomes assessment plan, which was designed to implement/promote and assess The JSU 4+7. Our assessment plan uses four direct measures—exit exam, capstone project, course-embedded assessment, and internship—and two indirect measures—senior exit survey and alumni survey—to assess student learning.

We keep in contact with our alumni via several means, such as an annual alumni reunion, periodic surveys, alumni newsletter, and, for some of them, through our communication advisory board. We began publishing an alumni newsletter in 2006; we have held an annual alumni reunion since 2005, and have conducted a survey periodically as needed.

Our assessment program ensures the inclusion of communication professionals. Of the six assessment methods (direct and indirect) we use in the department, four involve professionals. Our capstone project involves multiple reviewers, and one must be a professional. Given the nature of course-embedded assessment, we use professionals when it is feasible; otherwise we use two instructors with expertise in the area concerned. Our internship involves a faculty member and a professional who is the employer; and our alumni survey involves our alumni who, themselves, are professionals.

Our department collects and reports data gathered via our outcomes assessment activities, and such data inform the curricular and programmatic changes we make in the department. Our most recent assessment activities revealed to us areas of strength as well as weakness. As documented in the detailed report that follows, we have recently made curricular changes in the department based on results of our outcomes assessment.

Please respond to each of the following instructions:

- 1. Provide the unit's definition of goals for learning that students must achieve. If this definition is incorporated into the plan for assessment, a page reference will suffice.**

Please see pages 1-3 of the attached Assessment Plan for the definitions of our 12 learning outcomes/objectives. Appendix II.9.1. "Assessment Plan."

- 2. Describe the involvement of journalism and mass communication professionals, including alumni, in the assessment process.**

As much as it is feasible, the department makes journalism and mass communication professionals, including alumni, an integral part of its assessment team. The department employs four direct methods of assessment—capstone project, exit exam, course-embedded assessment, and internship; and two indirect methods—senior exit survey and alumni survey. Professionals are involved in two of the four direct methods (i.e., capstone project and internship), and in a third one—course-embedded assessment—when possible. They are also involved in one of the indirect methods—the alumni survey. Detailed descriptions follow below.

DIRECT METHODS

Capstone project

The department has three capstone courses—one for each concentration (broadcasting, print journalism, which is now digital journalism, and public relations)—and each capstone course has a capstone project as a major component. Each capstone project has three phases: (a) project design, which ensures that a project is designed to measure specific and relevant objectives chosen from The JSU 4+7, now The JSU 5+7; (b) rubric design—this phase involves designing a rubric for measuring the

assigned objectives; and (c) evaluation—this phase involves the grading of completed projects.

Please note that the terms objectives and outcomes have been used interchangeably in this report as both refer to the same concept. Professionals are involved in the three phases of a capstone project. Each assessment method—direct and indirect—used by the department is designed to measure specific and relevant objectives (please see Outcome by Assessment Method matrices for the three concentrations in Standard 9, #3) showing the direct methods and the outcomes they assess). In the project design phase, a capstone instructor, with these specific objectives in mind, obtains a professional’s input while designing the capstone project for her/his course. In the rubric design phase, the assessment coordinator, who oversees the department’s outcomes assessment, works with the course instructor to develop a draft rubric for evaluating the capstone project. The draft rubric is sent to the professional for critical evaluation and feedback. Thus, the final rubric is the product of the three parties—assessment coordinator, course instructor, and a professional in the communication discipline concerned. In the evaluation stage, the completed projects are duplicated: the instructor grades one and the other copy is sent to the professional for grading. The final grade a student receives on a capstone project is the average of the instructor’s and the professional’s evaluations.

Course-embedded method

This method, similar to the capstone project, has three phases: (a) project design, (b) rubric design, and (c) evaluation. Because this method is conducted under regular class conditions and employing several class works, it is inherently more difficult to get working professionals involved in the day-to-day process of course-embedded assessment. Under such a condition, instructors identify and use either professionals working within the university or faculty members with expertise in the field concerned. This is the approach that the department has used so far. The broadcasting concentration has used Mr. Keith Thomas, coordinator of television production for Jacksonville State University’s Television Services Department, as a co-assessor with our broadcast instructor—Dr. J. Patrick McGrail. The print journalism concentration has used Mr. Mike Stedham, manager of our student media, a 23-year veteran journalist and former editor at *The Anniston Star*, who also teaches for us part-time. The public relations instructor—Dr. Augustine Ihator—uses our alternate public relations professor, Dr. Jeffrey Hedrick, as his co-assessor.

Internship

Internship is required of every communication major. Students are required to work for 350 hours with professional (Communication) organizations, and the department provides the site supervisor with an evaluation form designed to assess twelve criteria—seven of which come from The JSU 5+7. Those seven are: writing, editing, technology, critical thinking, law (First Amendment knowledge), ethics, and diversity; and the remaining five are ability to learn, initiative, judgment, attendance/punctuality, and quality of work. Because internship organizations and their functions vary, the objectives a particular internship job is able to assess may vary from job to job (see [Appendix II.2.12. “Communication Internship Policy”](#)) The internship course instructor uses the same evaluation form used by the site supervisor to evaluate the

interns. Thus, a student's final grade on internship is the average of instructor's and site supervisor's evaluations.

INDIRECT METHODS

Alumni survey

The department designs its alumni survey to be able to capture responses on all aspects of our program. For example, the survey instrument has 15 questions such as, quality of our program, beneficial courses, The JSU 4+7 (soon to become The JSU 5+7), employment status, value of a graduate education, how long one waited to get a job after graduation, and many others. We also ask them to provide comments to enable us improve the program. Since these alumni are mostly working in the communication field, their feedbacks constitute major input from professionals and they prove to be tremendously valuable in revision of curriculum, among other things.

Communication Advisory Board

Our communication advisory board members, who are all communication professionals, meet with us twice a year (every fall and spring semesters) or as needed to discuss and offer input on what we are doing. They bring current ideas to the table during each meeting, and are available to us, for consultation, via telephone and e-mail all year round. Indeed they were very helpful during our last assessment as a number of them participated in assessing projects and papers. Some of them are also our alumni.

3. Describe the collection and reporting of data from both direct and indirect assessment measures and how the unit used its analysis of the data to improve curriculum, instruction, etc.

As explained in detail under Conceptual Framework—Transition from The JSU 4+7 to The JSU 5+7—in Part I, General Information, #6 of this self-study, the narratives that follow here will be based on 11, rather than 12, values and competencies of the ACEJMC because we made a transition from 11 to 12 values and competencies in the fall of 2013.

Collection and reporting of data

As indicated earlier, we employ four direct and two indirect methods of assessment. All methods are not necessarily applicable to all 11 objectives; instead, objectives are assessed using those methods that are suitable for them. Three “Outcome by Assessment Method” matrices—corresponding to the three concentrations in the department—are shown on the next two pages.

The department conducts its learning-outcomes assessment at the concentration level. Thus, the development of assessment methods took consideration of each concentration in the department. Below is the description of each of the four direct methods under:

(a) construction of measuring instrument, and (b) data collection using constructed instrument.

DIRECT METHODS

Exit Exam (EE)

Construction of Instrument. The exit exam assesses eight of the 11 major learning outcomes/objectives we designate The JSU 4+7, fully described in the Assessment Plan. The eight objectives are research, statistics, critical thinking, history, theory, law, ethics, and diversity; and the exit exam has eight sections corresponding to the above eight outcomes. Each section comprises test questions that assess knowledge of that particular outcome/objective. Each section accounts for 100 points (for easy conversion to percentage), and all faculty members who teach courses dealing with those eight sections contribute to the exam's contents. They also participate in their grading. Contents of the exit exam are mixed—multiple choice and essay questions—depending on the nature of the outcome being tested. For instance, multiple-choice testing on subjects such as critical thinking and ethics may be less likely to produce authentic results than would essay-type questions, and hence, we assess such skills using essay questions. Most sections of the exit exam are common to all communication disciplines; however, the theory section does distinguish between broadcasting and print journalism concentrations in terms of what constitutes theory. Thus, Part I of Section 4 (the Theory section) of the exam is for print and public relations students only, while Part II is for broadcasting students only.

During the initial construction of our exit exam for our 2007-2008 self-study, our faculty reviewed senior/exit exams from other schools that use them so as to compare what we were doing before finally producing our own exam. Since after then, several revisions have been made to our exit exam based on our 2007-2008 assessment results and any other warranted changes. For example, we made the exit exam to count toward students' final grades in the capstone course under whose umbrella the exit exam is conducted. We also added, to the exit exam, a test on statistics, bringing the number of outcomes assessed by exit exam to eight. To protect the integrity of the exit exam, we did not include a copy of it in this public document, but will provide it to the team members during their visit, should they want to see it. The next section describes our data collection using exit exam.

Data Collection. As stated earlier, each of our three capstone courses serves as a forum for accomplishing a significant part of the department's data collection—especially the exit exam, capstone project, and course-embedded assessments. Thus, the exit exam is administered to all students taking the capstone courses—required of all graduating students. Exit exam is conducted during fall, spring, and summer. Preceding the exam is a refresher lecture conducted in all three capstone courses by all instructors who teach courses dealing with any of the eight outcomes measured using the exit exam. The essence of the lecture is to refresh students' memories of those subjects they had taken a while ago.

**BROADCASTING CONCENTRATION
OUTCOME BY ASSESSMENT METHOD**

DIRECT ASSESSMENT METHOD	WRITE	EDIT	TECH	RES	STAT	C-T	HIST	THEORY	LAW	ETHICS	D-DIVE	G-DIVE
CAPROJ	x	x	x	x		x		x				
EXIT EX				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
C-EMB	x (470)	x (470)	x (470)		x (415)	x (470)	x (200)		x (380)	x (390) (470)	x	x
INTERNSHIP	x	x	x			x			x	x	x	x

Legend

CAPROJ = Capstone project
 C-EMB = Course-embedded
 Exit Ex = Exit Exam
 WRITE = Writing
 (Numbers) = parenthetical numbers refer to communication course numbers where assessment takes place

CT = Critical thinking
 RES = Research
 TECH = Technology
 STAT = Statistics
 X = Outcomes/objectives assessed by the respective methods
 D-DIVE = Domestic Diversity
 G-DIVE = Global Diversity

**DIGITAL JOURNALISM CONCENTRATION
OUTCOME BY ASSESSMENT METHOD**

DIRECT ASSESSMENT METHOD	WRITE	EDIT	TECH	RES	STAT	C-T	HIST	THEORY	LAW	ETHICS	D-DIVE	G-DIVE
CAPROJ	x	x	x	x		x		x				
EXIT EX				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
C-EMB	x (420)	x (420)	x (420)	x (420)	x (415)		x (200)		x (380)	x (390)	x	x
INTERNSHIP	x	x	x			x			x	x	x	x

Legend

CAPROJ = Capstone project

C-EMB = Course-embedded

Exit Ex = Exit Exam

WRITE = Writing

(Numbers) = parenthetical numbers refer to communication course numbers where assessment takes place

CT = Critical thinking

RES = Research

TECH = Technology

STAT = Statistics

X = Outcomes/objectives assessed by the respective methods

D-DIVE = Domestic Diversity

G-DIVE = Global Diversity

**PUBLIC RELATIONS CONCENTRATION
OUTCOME BY ASSESSMENT METHOD**

DIRECT ASSESSMENT METHOD	WRITE	EDIT	TECH	RES	STAT	C-T	HIST	THEORY	LAW	ETHICS	D-DIVE	G-DIVE
CAPROJ	x	x	x	x		x		x		x	x	
EXIT EX				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
C-EMB	x (440)	x (440)	x (440)		x (415)	x (440)	x (400)	x (440)	x (380)	x (390)	x (440)	x
INTERNSHIP	x	x	x			x			x	x	x	x

Legend

CAPROJ = Capstone project
 C-EMB = Course-embedded
 Exit Ex = Exit Exam
 WRITE = Writing
 (Numbers) = parenthetical numbers refer to communication course numbers where assessment takes place

CT = Critical thinking
 RES = Research
 TECH = Technology
 STAT = Statistics
 X = Outcomes/objectives assessed by the respective methods
 D-DIVE = Domestic Diversity
 G-DIVE = Global Diversity

Capstone Project (Caproj)

Construction of measuring instrument. Capstone projects in the three concentrations assess different outcomes depending on the concentration. For instance, while capstones in broadcasting and print journalism assess the same number (7) and type of outcomes—writing, editing, technology, research, critical thinking, theory, and diversity—the Caproj in public relations assesses eight outcomes (the same seven assessed by broadcast and print, plus ethics). Capstone instructors assign projects to students that involve demonstrating the seven or eight skills stated above. Similar to what is done in the exit exam, each outcome is weighted 100 points. For details, see the three matrices (for the three concentrations), on the previous pages, titled “Outcome by Assessment Method.”

Data Collection. Similar to the exit exam, capstone projects are conducted under the umbrella of a capstone course, taught by an instructor with expertise in the concentration involved. Capstones are conducted only during regular semesters—fall and spring. Evaluation of a capstone project is done by two assessors—the capstone instructor and a professional currently active in the communication industry. This is a requirement for all our capstone projects. The following have served as professional assessors for our 2011-2013 assessment cycle: Mr. Ben Cunningham, city editor for *The Anniston Star*, an alumnus and a member of our advisory board; Mr. Lantz Croft, operations manager for *WBRC Fox-6 TV*, an alumnus and a member of our advisory board; Ms. Jessica Brown, marketing director for United Way of Etowah County, also an alumna and a member of our advisory board; and Mr. Keith Thomas, coordinator of TV production with the JSU Television Services.

We developed a rubric for each capstone project to facilitate the evaluation process for both the course instructors and the professional co-assessors. We also involved the professionals in the designing of both the project and the rubrics.

Course-Embedded Assessment (C-EMB)

Construction of measuring instrument. Another major component of a capstone course is course-embedded assessment—a method of assessment which uses regular class-works (tests, assignments, papers, presentations, etc.) to assess students’ learning outcomes without necessarily calling attention to the fact that assessment is taking place. Course-embedded assessment is conducted both in the capstone courses and in other relevant courses.

Every faculty member in the department has a copy of the “Outcome by Assessment Method” matrix (at least for her/his concentration), on which the assessments done in various courses are based. This matrix serves as a roadmap for assessment in the department. Using it, the relevant course instructor knows exactly what learning outcomes are to be assessed using the different methods of assessment, and that instructor, therefore designs each course-embedded assessment in such a manner that all required outcomes are tested in that course. Course-embedded instructors and capstone instructors meet occasionally with the assessment coordinator to discuss issues so that all

parties involved will be in synch since assessment is a systemic process. Each course-embedded assessment involves at least three separate class works, which could be written papers, class tests, class assignments, presentations or other similar methods of student evaluation. The average of such class works eventually becomes the score assigned to each student. Two instructors who teach or have expertise in a particular area conduct the evaluation of the class works using a rubric developed for that purpose (for rubrics used in our assessment, please see [Appendix II.9.3A. “Communication Assessment Rubrics”](#)).

Data Collection. Course-embedded assessment is conducted not only in the three capstone courses, but also in other relevant courses such as COM 415—mass communication research, (where we assess knowledge of statistics and numbers, and research); COM 380—communication law (where we assess knowledge of law—the First Amendment); and COM 390—communication ethics (where we assess knowledge of professional ethical principles), all required courses. For each concentration, six outcomes—writing, editing, technology, critical thinking, theory, and diversity—are assessed under the umbrella of a capstone course, while the remaining five outcomes get assessed under other required courses such as COM 200, intro to mass communication; COM 380, communication law; COM 390, communication ethics; and COM 415, mass communication research. For more details, please see the “Outcome by Assessment Method” matrices above.

While class works are proctored by the instructors of the aforementioned courses, evaluation of those works are done by two assessors with expertise in the subject matter. For example, for the broadcast embedment, Dr. Patrick McGrail (the broadcast capstone course instructor) and Mr. Keith Thomas, coordinator of TV production for JSU Television Services Department, were the two co-assessors; Mr. Mike Stedham (instructor of print capstone course) and Dr. Augustine Ihator, professor of public relations and former newspaper reporter were the co-assessors for the print embedment; and for the public relations embedment, Dr. Ihator and Dr. Jeffrey Hedrick, our alternate PR instructor, serve as co-assessors. For those course embedment done outside the capstone courses, Dr. Jeffrey Hedrick (our communication law professor) and Mr. Jerry Chandler (assistant professor of journalism who taught law here for many years) cooperated to assess law in COM 380; Dr. Ihator (professor of communication ethics) and Dr. Kingsley Harbor (professor of communication ethics) assessed communication ethics in COM 390; and research was assessed in COM 415 by Dr. Harbor and Dr. Hedrick, both instructors of mass communication research.

Internship

Internship is a cooperative process between instructor and a professional in the field—the employer. Often, that process can become challenging because the intern is out in the field with the employer, and thus, the instructor/coordinator has less control over what goes on there. However, through phone calls and location visits (where feasible), the coordinator can enhance her/his level of control of the process. In addition to phone calls and possible visits, we send our evaluation instrument to both the intern and the employer as part of the employment papers at the early stage of the contract so that all parties will know what we expect our students to learn and to be assessed on in the end.

Construction of measuring instrument. Several years ago, our faculty reviewed other institutions' internship evaluation instruments, read the book, *Internships in Communications* by James P. Alexander (1995), and engaged our own experience dealing with internship over the years, to assist us in developing our internship evaluation form (see [Appendix II.9.3B, "Internship Evaluation Form"](#)).

That form consists of 12 objectives—ability to learn, initiative, judgment, attendance/punctuality, quality of work, writing, editing, technology, critical thinking, First Amendment knowledge, media ethics knowledge, and diversity knowledge—the last seven of which are part of our major departmental objectives, The JSU 4+7. These outcomes/objectives are measured on a four-level scale—poor, average, good, and excellent.

Data Collection. At the conclusion of internship, the employer completes the assessment form on the intern and returns it to the internship coordinator. The coordinator, on his part, evaluates the interns based on a combination of four factors: a time sheet showing that a student has completed the requisite 350 hours; a daily journal illustrating specific skills and life lessons learned by the student; an article critique of a published newspaper, on-line, or magazine article pertaining to something the intern has been engaged in during his or her internship. An example would be how to reflect diversity in a story written by an intern for a newscast. Finally, the coordinator looks at the work product a student creates during internship: press releases, news copy, radio commercial copy and the like.

Each intern's final grade is a composite of the employer's (50%) and the coordinator's (50%) evaluations.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT—DIRECT METHODS

For all assessment methods where we used multiple reviewers (instructors and practitioners), we employed rubrics in the evaluation of the works in order to objectivize the assessment. Thus, the three concentrations in the department utilized rubrics in assessing the capstone projects, the course-embedded assessments, and the internship. While the latter two used what is called a descriptive rubric, the internship used a simple rubric.

Design and Pilot-test of Rubrics

The rubrics used for this assessment were those originally designed for our 2007-2008 learning outcomes assessment with some minor revisions. Each rubric was designed based on the definitions of each of The JSU 4+7 in relation to each concentration we have in the department. Working with faculty in each discipline, the department head, who directed the assessment, went back and forth to faculty members defining and refining the definitions of the 11 objectives as well as the distinction between the five levels of each rubric—unacceptable (1-2); satisfactory (3); above-average (4); and exceptional (5). When we felt adequate with the definitions, the department head put the rubrics together, and they were presented to members of our Communication Advisory Board (CAB) during our spring 2005 meeting. It was discussed at length with the CAB members giving

us their feedback. With information from both faculty and CAB members, we finally designed the rubrics we began our assessment with.

The 2005-06 assessment activities provided the opportunity for us to pilot test the initial rubrics we developed and to make some revisions for our 2006-07 assessment.

Broadcasting Concentration

Results reported here are shown in the tables that follow each report segment, and the numbers in the table cells are mean scores of the students in the study cohort. These results are presented according to concentration, beginning with broadcasting.

The Capstone Method

The broadcasting concentration used capstone project to assess seven outcomes—writing, editing, technology, research, critical thinking, theory, and diversity. The two assessors used a descriptive rubric to grade the students' projects. The rubric rated student performance on a scale of 1 to 5 (unacceptable = 1-2; satisfactory = 3; above average = 4; and exceptional = 5). Please see, Appendix II.9.3A.—"Communication's Assessment Rubrics."

Upon completion of the grading, the means of the raw scores assigned by both graders were found, as were the medians, modes, and ranges. The Table of Means and Grand Means for the broadcast concentration shows this information (see standard 9, #3 for these tables).

The next section describes the results of The JSU 4+7 that were assessed using different direct methods.

Results of Capstone Method—The JSU 4+7

Assessment by capstone shows that this cohort of broadcasting students obtained an above-average mean-score ("B") in all outcomes assessed, except theory (writing = 86%; editing = 81%; technology = 80%; research = 83%; critical thinking = 80%; theory = 77%; and diversity = 83%; n=35). The range of scores varied from 40 percent to 100 percent in all outcomes. Theory, the outcome with the lowest mean-score, has equal median and modal scores of 80 percent, signifying that half of that cohort scored 80 percent or less while the other half scored above 80 percent. Further, the mode—the score obtained by most people—is 80 percent. Thus, their overall performance on "theory" is not bad despite a mean-score of 77 percent.

Results of Course-Embedded Method —The JSU 4+7

The broadcast course instructor and Mr. Keith Thomas of TV Services worked on the broadcast course-embedded assessment above (see Communication Assessment Rubrics in Appendix II.9.3A.). Average scores from the two assessors were used to produce the means shown in the Table of Means and Grand Means for broadcasting. Six outcomes were assessed by course-embedded method (C-emb) used in the broadcast capstone course, and the results were evenly split with three above-average scores and three average scores (writing = 84%; theory = 80%; diversity = 82%; editing = 79%; technology = 77%; and critical thinking = 79%). For the remaining five outcomes assessed

outside the capstone course, each had an above-average mean: research = 90%; statistics = 81%; history = 81%; law = 81%; and ethics = 84%; (n = 36).

Results of exit exam method—The JSU 4+7

Exit exam assessed eight outcomes with mixed results. These data show that of those eight, broadcast students obtained above-average scores in two—statistics and law; an average score in four—research, critical thinking, ethics, and diversity; and below-average scores in two—history and theory (statistics = 84 %; law = 80%; research = 70%; critical thinking = 70%; ethics = 79%; diversity = 79%; history = 65%; theory = 66%; n =33).

Results of Internship method—The JSU 4+7

Internship assessed seven outcomes from The JSU 4+7, and the results show excellent scores in all but one outcome—editing—which was a percentage-point short of reaching excellence (writing = 90%; editing = 89%; technology = 92%; critical thinking = 91%; law = 92%; ethics = 91%; and diversity = 92%; n = 34). This glowing result is typical of the internship reports we receive from employers. They are almost always complimentary of our students and the students themselves speak of their internship experiences as being a great addition to their career preparation here at JSU.

Results of Multiple Direct Methods—the Grand Outcome Mean

Assessment is not an exact science, but an estimate. Yet, if based on a single measure, that estimate would be less than authentic, and hence experts insist, as does ACEJMC, on the use of multiple measures.

When the above four methods of assessment are combined, they paint a more realistic picture of the situation being assessed. The Table of Means and Grand Means for broadcasting shows the grand outcome means of the 11 values and competencies (The JSU 4+7). A grand outcome mean (or grand mean) is obtained by averaging the individual means obtained using each of the four direct methods. The Grand means of the four methods show an above-average performance on all but two outcomes (writing = 86.7%; editing = 83%; technology = 83%; research = 81%; statistics = 82.5%; critical thinking = 80%; history = 73%; theory = 74.3%; law = 85.3%; ethics = 84.7%; and diversity = 84%).

Discussion of Broadcasting Results

Assessment provides a way for a program to study and discover its strengths and weaknesses, and thus it leads to program improvement. Data here suggest that this cohort of broadcasting students had its best performance in writing (with a grand mean score of 86.7 percent), followed by law, ethics, diversity, editing, and technology (with the last two tying in the fifth position at a score of 83 percent), statistics, research, critical thinking, theory, and history. Our faculty is pleased that on the average our broadcast students' performance was above average on most learning outcomes when all the four measures are considered in tandem, and there was no failing score in any of the learning outcomes. The three areas of concern are: (1) our students' performance in history and theory, (2) our students who, based on these data, seem to be falling through the cracks in a number of skills in the broadcasting concentration, and (3) the weakness shown in our exit exam as a method of assessment.

Regarding the first concern, history and theory were the two lowest-performing areas with mean scores of 73 and 74.3 percent respectively. As we reviewed the exit exam, it became clear to us that the definition of theory needed more clarity. Some of our faculty members have a different conception of what theory is. Some think of theory in terms of social scientific theory, while others understand it to be anything that is not hands-on oriented. We have agreed that theory indeed encompasses both realms. This redefinition, we believe, may hold the key to a better conceptualization of the learning outcome we designate as theory.

On the second issue—students falling through the cracks—these data suggest that despite the above-average scores obtained in a significant majority of the outcomes (9 out of 11), there are still some broadcasting students who are not doing well. For instance, a look at the range statistics in the Broadcasting Table of Means and Grand Means reveals that within the capstone method, there is at least one student with a score of 40 percent in the seven outcomes measured by the capstone project; within the course-embedded method, there is at least one student with a score of 38 percent in statistics; and within the exit exam method, there is at least one student with a score of 10 percent in history. We recognize that with majority of students doing very well, it is easy to overlook the few that are not, and this is what our faculty wants to avoid. To do so, we will adopt a learning model—the 21st Century learning model—that can facilitate the achievement of this goal. This model is characterized by collaborative learning that is student-centered, flexible and dynamic in structure, while at the same time challenging to students in terms of creativity and innovation. There is significant data that suggest its efficacy as a learning model. This is an idea that both our college and the university have willingly embraced. We expect that by the end of the spring semester of 2014, most of our classrooms will have been redesigned with the 21st Century model classroom in mind.

On the third issue—the weakness of the exit exam—a look at the Table of Means and Grand Means shows that, of the two methods—exit exam and course-embedded—employed in assessing history, exit exam by far produced a lower score; and of the three methods—capstone project, course-embedded, and exit exam—employed in assessing theory, again, exit exam by far produced the lowest mean score. Furthermore, of the eight outcomes measured by exit exam, only two had a score higher than average (a low “B”), the rest had an average score. Thus, it seems reasonable to re-examine the contents of our exit exam.

Needed Improvements in the Broadcast Sequence

1. Redefinition of theory to encompass social scientific theory, as well as non-scientific, normative concepts.
2. Review of history and implement the 2007-08 decision to do history papers.
3. Adopt a 21st Century learning model.
4. Review and revise exit exam contents especially those dealing with history and theory.
5. Revise the timeframe for taking the exit exam as suggested by exit interview survey.

BROADCASTING CONCENTRATION
TABLE OF MEANS AND GRAND MEANS--2013

DIRECT ASSESSMENT METHODS	Writing (%)	Editing (%)	Technology (%)	Research (%)	Statistics (%)	Critical Thinking (%)	History (%)	Theory (%)	Law (%)	Ethics (%)	Diversity (%)	Row Averages (%)	N
Capstone Project	X = 86 Md = 80 Mo = 100 R = 40-100	X = 81 Md = 80 Mo = 80 R = 40-100	X = 80 Md = 80 Mo = 80 R = 40-100	X = 83 Md = 80 Mo = 100 R = 40-100	--	X = 80 Md = 80 Mo = 80 R = 40-100	--	X = 77 Md = 80 Mo = 80 R = 40-100	--	--	X = 83 Md = 80 Mo = 80 R = 40-100	81.4	35
Course Embedded	X = 84 Md = 86 Mo = 86 R = 66-100	X = 79 Md = 80 Mo = 66 R = 53-100	X = 77 Md = 76 Mo = 66, 74, 90 R = 40-100	X = 90 Md = 85 Mo = 84, 94 R = 56-116	X = 81 Md = 81 Mo = 93, 100 R = 38-100	X = 79 Md = 80 Mo = 74, 86, 90, 90 R = 46-100	X = 81 Md = 83 Mo = 85, 100 R = 53-95	X = 80 Md = 79 Mo = 64, 90 R = 60-100	X = 84 Md = 84 Mo = 92 R = 65-98	X = 84 Md = 85 Mo = 75, 85 R = 65-97	X = 82 Md = 84 Mo = 74 R = 60-100	81.9	36
Exit Exam	--	--	--	X = 70 Md = 72 Mo = 64 R = 32-92	X = 84 Md = 90 Mo = 90 R = 40-100	X = 70 Md = 74 Mo = 63 R = 21-94	X = 65 Md = 60 Mo = 60 R = 10-100	X = 66 Md = 68 Mo = 55, 62, 66, 69 R = 30-93	X = 80 Md = 80 Mo = 80 R = 50-100	X = 79 Md = 81 Mo = 70 R = 40-100	X = 79 Md = 84 Mo = 60 R = 30-100	74.1	33
Internship	X = 90 Md = 95 Mo = 95 R = 75-95	X = 89 Md = 95 Mo = 95 R = 65-95	X = 92 Md = 95 Mo = 95 R = 75-95	--	--	X = 91 Md = 95 Mo = 95 R = 65-95	--	--	X = 92 Md = 95 Mo = 95 R = 75-95	X = 91 Md = 95 Mo = 95 R = 75-95	X = 92 Md = 95 Mo = 95 R = 75-95	91	34
GRAND OUTCOME MEAN	86.7	83	83	81	82.5	80	73	74.3	85.3	84.7	84		
CDM	85.8	84.1	85.1	78.9	81.8	82.2	73.8	79.6	84.2	82.8	85.5		

Legend

X = Mean Md = Median Mo = Mode
 Grand Outcome Mean = The mean of each column

R = Range (from lowest to highest score) -- = Unassessed Outcome N = Population size
 CDM=Cross-discipline Mean (i.e., average of all three concentrations put together)

Print Journalism Concentration

The print journalism concentration has been deleted from our program and replaced with digital journalism, which goes into effect in the fall of 2013. Since our self-study was conducted with print journalism still in place, the narratives below will focus on print journalism.

Our department is a small program, but our print journalism sequence is even smaller, and consequently produces the least number of graduates, as can be seen in the accompanying table. The small sample size may be ameliorated by the introduction of a new concentration in digital journalism as many students tend to gravitate toward digital media.

Results of Capstone Project Method

For these analyses here, please see the table of means and grand means for print journalism on the next page. Capstone method assessed seven outcomes. Results show that this cohort of print journalism students obtained above-average (“B”) mean scores in two outcomes and average mean scores in the remaining five (writing = 81%; editing = 81%; technology = 76%; research = 77%; critical thinking = 76%; theory = 78%; and diversity = 77%; n = 10). The students’ best performance was in editing. Although editing and writing have the same mean scores, editing exceeds writing with a range of 65-95 percent and a median score of 85 percent, which suggests that half of this cohort obtained a score between 85+ and 95 percent in editing, as opposed to a score between 80+ and 95 percent in writing (see Table of Means and Grand Means for print journalism next two pages). By a similar analysis, their least performance, as measured by the capstone project, was in technology, although it has the same mean-score as critical thinking.

Results of Course-Embedded Method

Course-embedded method under the capstone course assessed six outcomes, while course-embedded method in other courses assessed five outcomes. Results show that this cohort obtained above-average (“B”) mean-scores in all but one outcome—research—(writing = 84%; editing = 84%; technology = 87%; research = 78%; statistics = 87%; critical thinking = 88%; history = 83%; theory = 86%; law = 87%; ethics = 86%; and diversity = 86%; n = 10). Its highest mean-score was in critical thinking, while its lowest was in research.

Results of Exit Exam Method

Exit exam assessed eight outcomes with mixed results. Print journalism students obtained above-average scores in three; average scores in three; and below-average in two (statistics = 81%; theory = 84%; diversity = 83%; research = 73%; critical thinking = 78%; law = 73%; history = 66%; and ethics = 67%; n = 10).

Results of Internship Method

Internship assessed seven outcomes with all showing above-average performance (writing = 87%; editing = 85%; technology = 92%; critical thinking = 88%; law = 88%; ethics = 88%; and diversity = 89%; n = 9).

Results of Multiple Direct Methods—the Grand Outcome Mean

When results of the four outcomes are averaged—producing the grand outcome means—they show that print journalism students obtained an above-average score in nine outcomes, and average scores in two (writing = 84%; editing = 83.3%; technology = 85%; statistics = 84%; critical thinking = 82.5%; theory = 82.7%; law = 82.7%; ethics = 80.3%; diversity = 83.8%; research = 76%; and history = 74.5%).

Discussion of Print Journalism Results

Barring their small sample size, our print students' performance is impressive. They obtained above-average, grand-mean scores in nine of the 11 outcomes; high-average (high "C") scores in research; and mid-average in history. The ultimate aim of assessment, as recognized by the ACEJMC, is to provide evidence that, "students are learning the knowledge, values, and competencies that individual units and ACEJMC in its 'principles' define" (*A Guide to Assessment of Student Learning in Journalism and Mass Communication*, 2001, p. 2). Data here would suggest that these particular print students tested are learning these values and competencies.

Their highest performance here was on technology (85%), while their lowest was on history (74.5%). When we looked at individual contributions of each of the two assessment methods—course-embedded and exit exam—used in measuring history, it became clear that in our calculation of the grand-mean, the low score on the exit exam (66%) pulled down that on course-embedded method (83%). Once again, as in the case of the broadcasting concentration, this seems to point to the weakness in our exit exam as a measuring instrument as well as the need to re-examine how history is measured in that exam.

PRINT JOURNALISM CONCENTRATION

TABLE OF MEANS & GRAND MEANS--2013 SELF STUDY

DIRECT ASSESSMENT METHODS	Writing (%)	Editing (%)	Technology (%)	Research (%)	Statistics (%)	Critical Thinking (%)	History (%)	Theory (%)	Law (%)	Ethics (%)	Diversity (%)	Row Averages (%)	N
Capstone Project	X = 81 Md = 80 Mo = 75, 85 R = 70-95	X = 81 Md = 85 Mo = 85 R = 65-95	X = 76 Md = 70 Mo=85,75,65 R = 65-85	X = 77 Md = 75 Mo = 75 R = 65-90	--	X = 76 Md = 75 Mo = 75, 85 R = 65-85	--	X = 78 Md = 70 Mo = 85,75, 65 R= 65-95	--	--	X = 77 Md = 73 Mo = 85 R = 65-85	78	10
Course Embedded Assessment	X = 84 Md = 85 Mo = 88 R = 75-92	X = 84 Md = 82 Mo = 82 R = 75-92	X = 87 Md = 85 Mo = 85 R = 75-95	X = 78 Md = 86 Mo = 91 R = 47-98	X = 87 Md = 93 Mo = 100 R = 57-100	X = 88 Md = 88 Mo = 85,95 R = 75-95	X = 83 Md = 86 Mo = 89 R = 60-91	X = 86 Md = 87 Mo = 85,88 R = 75-95	X = 87 Md = 87 Mo = 94 R = 72-94	X = 86 Md = 85 Mo = 90 R = 75-92	X = 86 Md = 85 Mo = 85 R = 85-88	85	10
Exit Exam	--	--	--	X = 73 Md = 70 Mo = 64 R = 48-100	X = 81 Md = 80 Mo = 100 R = 57-100	X = 78 Md = 80 Mo = none R = 59-92	X = 66 Md = 60 Mo = 60 R = 30-100	X = 84 Md = 88 Mo = none R = 68-99	X = 73 Md = 70 Mo=100,60, 50 R = 50-100	X = 67 Md = 76 Mo = 86,50 R = 43-86	X = 83 Md = 84 Mo = none R = 71-96	75.6	10
Internship	X = 87 Md = 85 Mo = 85 R = 75-95	X = 85 Md = 85 Mo = 85 R = 75-95	X = 92 Md = 95 Mo = 95 R = 85-95	--	--	X = 88 Md = 85 Mo = 85, 95 R = 75-95	--	--	X = 88 Md = 85 Mo = 85 R = 85-95	X = 88 Md = 85 Mo = 85 R = 85-95	X = 89 Md = 85 Mo = 85 R = 85-95	88.1	9
GRAND OUTCOME MEAN	84	83.3	85	76	84	82.5	74.5	82.7	82.7	80.3	83.8		

Legend

X = Mean Mo = Mode Md = Median -- = Unassessed Outcome R = Range (from lowest to highest scores) N = Population size
 Grand Outcome Mean = the mean of each column

Assessment is aimed at improving programs so as to facilitate learning. Consequently, we seek ways of improving our print program, and hence the following proposed changes.

Needed Improvements in the Print Journalism Concentration

While the print journalism concentration has been discontinued, the changes suggested by this assessment will benefit the new concentration. Those changes are reported below.

1. Revise the curriculum to address low knowledge of communication history.
2. Review exit exam contents especially with respect to how history is measured in that exam.

Public Relations Concentration

Results of Capstone Project Method

Capstone project assessed eight outcomes. Results show that this cohort of public relations students obtained above average mean scores ('A's and 'B's) in all eight outcomes (writing = 85%; editing = 85%; technology = 87%; research = 84%; critical thinking = 87%; theory = 84%; ethics = 87; and diversity = 90%; n=30). See Table of Means and Grand Means for public relations next two pages.

Results of Course-Embedded Method

Eleven outcomes were assessed using course-embedded method. Six of those outcomes were assessed using course-embedded method under the umbrella of a capstone course, while five were assessed in (required) courses outside the capstone course. In 10 of the 11 outcomes, public relations students made above-average scores with an average score on one (writing = 84%; editing 84%; technology = 85%; research = 80%; critical thinking = 84%; history = 80%; theory = 82%; law = 85%; ethics = 82%; diversity = 87%; and statistics = 77%; n = 30).

Results of Exit Exam Method (EE)

Exit exam assessed eight outcomes. Results show that of those eight, public relations students performed above average only in two—statistics and diversity. They obtained average scores in five, and below average in one, although there was no failing grade (statistics = 81%; diversity = 88%; research = 75%; critical thinking = 75%; theory = 79%; law = 79%; ethics = 75%; and history = 68%; n = 30).

Results of Internship Method

We used internship to assess seven outcomes and all but one—editing—showed excellent performance by our public relations students (writing = 91%; technology = 90%; critical thinking = 90%; law = 90%; ethics = 90%; diversity = 90%; and editing = 89%; n = 24).

Results of Multiple Direct Methods—The Grand Outcome Mean (or Grand mean)

When scores from the four direct methods are averaged, it provides evidence of PR students' performance on each of the 11 outcomes. For these students, the grand means of the four methods show that of the 11 outcomes which constitute The JSU 4+7, public relations students obtained above-average scores in eight and average

scores in three (writing = 86.7%; editing = 86%; technology = 87.3%; critical thinking = 84%; theory = 81.7%; law = 84.7%; ethics = 83.5%; diversity = 88.8%; research = 79.7%; statistics = 79%; and history = 74%). Their highest performance was in diversity and their lowest was in history. While there was no excellent ('A') score, there also was no failure (see Table of Means and Grand Means below)

Discussion of Public Relations Results

Overall, public relations students performed quite well in most of the outcomes. Thus, our faculty focuses its attention here on those outcomes with lower performance, such as history (74%) and, to some extent, statistics (79%), to see how we can improve performance in those areas. Here we came up with the same solutions proposed for the broadcasting concentration:

1. Revise curriculum to address low knowledge of communication history.
2. Review and revise the contents of exit exam especially with respect to the section on history.

Assessment Benchmark

A benchmark provides a performer something to gauge her/his performance in order to know if s/he is making progress and how large or small such progress is. Since direct measures provide a more precise indicator of performance than do indirect measures, we decided to base our benchmark on results from the direct measures.

In 2008, our faculty had an extensive discussion about what to use as our assessment benchmark. Some suggested 70 percent since a "C" is the passing grade required for graduation; others suggested an arbitrary figure of 78 percent; yet others suggested copying some other programs. A fourth suggestion was to adopt our initial results as a benchmark for our next assessment. Our faculty eventually bought into this fourth idea, reasoning that instead of adopting arbitrary figures that may have little to do with our own realities here, we should base our future performance on what we have done in the past as that will suggest to us whether we are making progress or not. Thus, we decided to accept our previous performance (in 2008) as a benchmark for our subsequent performance (in 2013).

To see how our performance in 2013 compares to that of 2008, we calculated the cross-discipline means (the average of all communication students' performance on each outcome) obtained during both assessments, and the results are tabulated below.

This information not only allowed us to compare our past and present performances, but it also provides a benchmark for us to gauge our subsequent performance during our 2017 learning outcomes assessment.

Our faculty is pleased with this outcome here—observing that we have made a good progress since 2008. While some pondered that we may be setting ourselves up for a failure in the future, we believe that striving to maintain at least a "B" average should not be too much to ask of any good program. For detailed results that look at individual concentrations, please see the Tables of Mean and Grand Mean (above) for each concentration.

BENCHMARKS AND CROSS-DISCIPLINE MEANS (CDM)

CROSS-DISCIPLINE MEAN AND BENCHMARK FOR SUBSEQUENT ASSESSMENT											
SELF- STUDY YEAR	Writing (%)	Editing (%)	Technology (%)	Research (%)	Statistics (%)	Critical Thinking (%)	History (%)	Theory (%)	Law (%)	Ethics (%)	Diversity (%)
2008*	80.7	77.3	77	75.9	69.5	75.6	70.5	77.8	80.3	73	79.3
2013**	85.8	84.1	85.1	78.9	81.8	82.2	73.8	79.6	84.2	82.8	85.5

CDM = Cross-Discipline Mean (average score of all communication students across the three concentrations).

** 2008 outcome scores became the benchmarks for the 2013 assessment.*

*** 2013 outcome scores will become the benchmarks for the 2017 assessment.*

PUBLIC RELATIONS CONCENTRATION

TABLE OF MEANS AND GRAND MEANS--2013

DIRECT ASSESMENT METHODS	Writing (%)	Editing (%)	Technology (%)	Research (%)	Statistics (%)	Critical Thinking (%)	History (%)	Theory (%)	Law (%)	Ethics (%)	Diversity (%)	Row Average (%)	N
Capstone Project	X = 85 Md = 85 Mo = 75 R = 70-98	X = 85 Md = 88 Mo = 90 R = 70-98	X = 87 Md = 86 Mo = 94,80,85 R = 80-98	X = 84 Md = 84 Mo = 75 R = 75-100	--	X = 87 Md = 86 Mo = 85 R = 73-98	--	X = 84 Md = 84 Mo = 75 R = 71-97	--	X = 87 Md = 87 Mo = 81, 90 R = 72-99	X = 90 Md = 88 Mo = 90 R = 80-98	86.1	30
Course Embedded	X = 84 Md = 83 Mo = 81 R = 72-97	X = 84 Md = 83 Mo = 76, 88 R = 65-99	X = 85 Md = 85 Mo = 85 R = 72-95	X = 80 Md = 78 Mo = 76, 78 R = 33-114	X = 77 Md = 89 Mo = 92, 94 R = 45-100	X = 84 Md = 83 Mo = 83, 87 R = 71-98	X = 80 Md = 80 Mo = 74, 80 R = 58-100	X = 82 Md = 84 Mo = 83 R = 72-97	X = 85 Md = 85 Mo = 88 R = 67-100	X = 82 Md = 82 Mo = 77 R = 69-99	X = 87 Md = 87 Mo = 90,82, 87 R = 75-97	82.7	30
Exit Exam	--	--	--	X = 75 Md = 77 Mo = NM R = 30-99	X = 81 Md = 85 Mo = 100 R = 47-100	X = 75 Md = 77 Mo = 75, 80 R = 45-98	X = 68 Md = 75 Mo = 80 R = 20-90	X = 79 Md = 86 Mo = 93 R = 45-100	X = 79 Md = 80 Mo = 70,90 R = 50-100	X = 75 Md = 79 Mo = SM R = 35-98	X = 88 Md = 89 Mo = 84, 100 R = 57-100	77.5	30
Internship	X = 91 Md = 95 Mo = 95 R = 75-95	X = 89 Md = 85 Mo = 95 R = 75-95	X = 90 Md = 90 Mo = 95 R = 75-95			X = 90 Md = 95 Mo = 95 R = 75-95			X = 90 Md = 95 Mo = 95 R = 75-95	X = 90 Md = 95 Mo = 95 R = 75-95	X = 90 Md = 95 Mo = 95 R = 75-95	90	24
GRAND OUTCOME MEAN	86.7	86	87.3	79.7	79	84	74	81.7	84.7	83.5	88.8		

Legend

X = Mean Mo = Mode Md = Median -- = Unassessed Outcome
 NM = Nano Modal (nine modes) SM= Sextuple Mode (six modes)

R = Range (from lowest to highest scores) N = Population size
 Grand Outcome Mean = the mean of each column

The next section describes the indirect methods of assessment employed in this self-study. While the description is holistic in approach, we will provide separate description of each sequence at any point where that becomes necessary.

RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT—INDIRECT METHODS

Indirect methods of assessment do not provide information regarding the nature and amount of learning that has occurred, but they do indicate, by reflection, that some learning has or has not occurred. Thus, they serve to support or cast a doubt about results obtained by direct methods of assessment. As indicated earlier, the department used two indirect methods of assessment—graduating senior exit survey and alumni survey. These methods are discussed below.

Graduating Senior Exit Survey Results

Data provided by the Jacksonville State University Institutional
Research and Assessment, August, 2013

Seventy-seven graduating seniors who majored in Communication completed the Communication Department (COM) senior exit survey (paper version) between fall 2011 and spring 2013 (please see [Appendix II.9.3C. “Communication Senior Exit Questionnaire and Comments.”](#)) The completed survey forms were sent to the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) for analysis.

To convert the data into a usable format for analysis, the department secretary entered the data from the paper survey into an Internet version of the survey created by the Office of Planning and Research. Data then were downloaded into Excel and SPSS for analysis. The surveys were grouped into 5 different semesters based on the date provided on the survey when it was completed.

The results are presented below.

Respondents’ Distribution by Concentration and Semester (Exit Survey)

	Broadcasting		Print Journalism		Public Relations		Total	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Fa ‘11	10	58.82%	0	0.00%	7	41.18%	17	100.00%
Sp ‘12	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	100.00%	2	100.00%
Su ‘12	13	52.00%	4	16.00%	8	32.00%	25	100.00%
Fa ‘12	3	21.43%	2	14.29%	9	64.29%	14	100.00%
Sp ‘13	10	52.63%	4	21.05%	5	26.32%	19	100.00%

Quality of Department

When asked to rate the quality of the department on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being poor and 5 being outstanding, the respondents' means on the four indicators ranged from 4.0 to 4.65. On overall quality of the program, public relations students rated the department highest (4.48) and print journalism rated it lowest (4.20); on preparing you for your career, public relations rated it highest (4.35) with print journalism rating it lowest (4.0); on enhancing your intellectual growth, public relations rated the department highest (4.65) and print journalism rated it lowest (4.40); and on faculty strength, print journalism rated the department highest (4.40) while public relations students rated it lowest (4.23). For further details of the analysis, including program quality rating based on semester of graduation, please see the tables below.

By Concentration (Exit Survey)

		Broadcasting	Print Journalism	Public Relations	Total
a. Overall quality of the program	Mean	4.31	4.20	4.48	4.37
	Valid N	35	10	31	76
	Std Dev	.72	.63	.68	.69
b. Preparing you for your career	Mean	4.19	4.00	4.35	4.23
	Valid N	36	10	31	77
	Std Dev	1.04	.67	.66	.86
c. Enhancing your intellectual growth	Mean	4.44	4.40	4.65	4.52
	Valid N	36	10	31	77
	Std Dev	.91	.70	.55	.75
d. Faculty strength	Mean	4.36	4.40	4.23	4.31
	Valid N	36	10	31	77
	Std Dev	.72	.97	.76	.77

By Semester

		fa11	sp12	su12	fa12	sp13
a. Overall quality of the program	Mean	4.24	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.21
	Valid N	17	2	24	14	19
	Std Dev	.75	.71	.59	.52	.85
b. Preparing you for your career	Mean	3.82	5.00	4.48	4.36	4.11
	Valid N	17	2	25	14	19
	Std Dev	.95	.00	.77	.63	.94
c. Enhancing your intellectual growth	Mean	4.29	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.32
	Valid N	17	2	25	14	19
	Std Dev	.85	.71	.52	.50	1.00
d. Faculty strength	Mean	4.00	4.50	4.52	4.43	4.21
	Valid N	17	2	25	14	19
	Std Dev	.79	.71	.71	.65	.85

The JSU 4+7

We sought to obtain our students' perceptions of the usefulness of the training they obtained in the set of skills we designate The JSU 4+7. Respondents were asked to rate the usefulness of the skills that they gained at JSU on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being least useful and 5 most useful. The results (see table below) of the ratings, tabulated by concentration and graduation year, show that statistics and communication theory were reported as useful with means of 3.13 and 3.44, respectively; communication ethics, critical thinking, diversity, research, media law, editing, media history, and technology were considered as more useful with means ranging from 3.58 to 4.44; and writing was considered most useful with a mean of 4.51.

Perception of the Usefulness of The JSU 4+7 (Exit Survey)

		Broadcasting	Print Journalism	Public Relations	Overall Mean	Rank-order of Overall Means
1. Writing	Mean	4.36	4.60	4.67	4.51	1 st
	Valid N	36	10	30	76	
	Std Dev	.87	.70	.71	.79	
2. Editing	Mean	4.57	4.50	4.27	4.44	2 nd
	Valid N	35	10	30	75	
	Std Dev	.81	.71	.98	.87	
3. Technology	Mean	3.95	3.13	3.41	3.59	8 th
	Valid N	19	8	17	44	
	Std Dev	1.08	1.13	1.12	1.13	
4. Research	Mean	3.43	3.40	4.43	3.83	6 th
	Valid N	35	10	30	75	
	Std Dev	1.33	.97	.77	1.19	
5. Statistics	Mean	2.94	3.00	3.37	3.13	11 th
	Valid N	34	8	30	72	
	Std Dev	1.37	1.31	1.13	1.27	
6. Comm Law	Mean	3.83	4.00	3.61	3.76	7 th
	Valid N	18	6	18	42	
	Std Dev	1.15	1.26	1.04	1.10	
7. Media History	Mean	3.50	3.63	3.67	3.58	9 th
	Valid N	34	8	30	72	
	Std Dev	1.21	.74	.96	1.06	
8. Comm Theory	Mean	3.33	3.33	3.59	3.44	10 th
	Valid N	33	9	29	71	
	Std Dev	1.19	1.00	.82	1.02	
9. Comm Ethics	Mean	4.03	4.22	4.43	4.22	4 th
	Valid N	34	9	30	73	
	Std Dev	1.09	1.09	.68	.95	
10. Diversity	Mean	3.86	4.00	4.64	4.19	5 th
	Valid N	35	7	28	70	
	Std Dev	1.22	.82	.56	1.03	
	Std Dev	1.25	1.41	1.08	1.16	
11. Critical Thinking	Mean	4.17	4.56	4.43	4.32	3 rd
	Valid N	35	9	30	74	
	Std Dev	.95	.73	.77	.86	

Communication Skills Needing Strengthening (Exit Survey)

When asked to identify the skills that needed strengthening in the communication program, computer skills (29.87%), public speaking skills (20.78%), and writing skills (19.48%), as shown in the table below, were most often identified as needing strengthening.

Areas Needing Strengthening

	<i>N</i>	%
a. Analytical skills	5	6.49
b. Computer skills	23	29.87
c. Writing skills	15	19.48
d. Verbal skills	11	14.29
e. Liberal arts	1	1.30
f. Internet skills	7	9.09
g. Math skills	6	7.79
h. Public Speaking skills	16	20.78
i. None	8	10.39
j. Other	10	12.99

Needed Skills By Concentrations

Skills		Broadcasting	Print Journalism	Public Relations
a. Analytical skills	<i>N</i>	3	1	1
	%	60.00%	20.00%	20.00%
b. Computer skills	<i>N</i>	10	2	11
	%	43.48%	8.70%	47.83%
c. Writing skills	<i>N</i>	8	2	5
	%	53.33%	13.33%	33.33%
d. Verbal skills	<i>N</i>	5	0	6
	%	45.45%	0.00%	54.55%
e. Liberal arts	<i>N</i>	1	0	0
	%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
f. Internet skills	<i>N</i>	2	3	2
	%	28.57%	42.86%	28.57%
g. Math skills	<i>N</i>	1	1	4
	%	16.67%	16.67%	66.67%
h. Public Speaking skills	<i>N</i>	6	2	8
	%	37.50%	12.50%	50.00%
i. None	<i>N</i>	6	1	1
	%	75.00%	12.50%	12.50%
j. Other	<i>N</i>	5	2	3
	%	50.00%	20.00%	30.00%

Areas in General Education Program Needing Strengthening

	<i>N</i>	%
a. More math	7	9.09
b. More English	3	3.90
c. None	20	25.97
d. Other	4	5.19

Plans for graduate studies

Of those who had plans for graduate studies, 16.22% or 6 had applied for graduate schools. A majority of the respondents (82.19%) indicated that they would pursue a Master’s Degree in Communication at JSU, if it were offered.

Job Prospects upon Graduation

Students’ level of confidence about job-prospects may tell faculty members something about how their students perceive the kind of education they are receiving from a program. Generally, most of our students appear quite confident of securing a job upon graduation.

When asked if they have had a job offer they are considering or have accepted prior to graduation, nearly one-half (48.68%) of the respondents reported having job offers that they were considering or had accepted. Of those who didn't have job offers, the mean response of the likelihood of getting one in six months was 3.76, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being least likely and 5 being most likely.

One-third of the respondents who had no job offer indicated that they would like to be informed about any job announcements that the department may receive.

Comments From Exit Survey

Positives

Respondents provided numerous comments—praises, suggestions, as well as criticisms (for the full document, please see [Appendix II.9.3C. “Communication Senior Exit Questionnaire and Comments](#)).

Below is a sample of comments that respondents thought may be useful in improving programs in the department or university as a whole.

There were 36 comments, 2.78 percent of them were criticism; 38.9 percent were suggestions; 55.6 percent were praises; and 2.78 percent were mixed.

By far, the most frequently cited strengths by our graduating seniors were our faculty. The survey response was replete with comments such as: “I have enjoyed my time here at JSU. I have learned how to do things that are important to my career, such as ethics, laws, diversity, honest reporting, and how to avoid pit falls in media. I have enjoyed all of my professors because I feel as if I have learned something important from each of them. I feel good about my future and career possibilities. I want to thank JSU and the Communications Dept. for taking the time to work and train me for a career in Communication. Your truly, Bruce Beasley”; “I love the department here because the professors help their students and really care about them. The expertise and love for this field shows through every professor here in the Communications department. I'm very proud to gain a degree from this specific department.”; “I truly enjoyed my experience here. Self Hall has some of the best teachers that care about their students.” ;”I'm glad I chose to study communication at Jacksonville state. Student/teacher ratio was great. I'm glad the department is as helpful as they are.” “JSU COMM dept. are the training wheels for the ride of success.” and many more.

Suggestions and Criticisms

When asked to provide open-ended comments that would assist in improving the department, several comments emerged such as: “1. Need more real life applicable writing and media relations courses. 2. Professors need to offer real working world examples when teaching. Feel like some of my classmates will be incredibly unprepared for the working world. 3. Our department seemed extremely disorganized at times. Especially concerning some advising issues towards graduation and exit exam situation.”; “Clean house and get relevant professors.”; “I believe the Internship class was very beneficial but did not need to require 350 hours. I was not able to keep a job and was hurting financially. I think a good amount of hours would be 150-200 which gives students like myself or other non-traditional students an opportunity to gain internship experience and still be able to maintain financially.”; “I feel more emphasis needs to be put on Broadcast studies and resources as well.”; “Make announcing requirement. Make it towards TV News rather than voice acting. Voice acting is more for radio. Public Speaking training. Using the camera, more time to learn to use it. More details in editing, work more with TV Services.”; and others.

Alumni Survey Results

(Data provided by the Jacksonville State University Institutional Research and Assessment, August, 2013)

In spring 2013, the Department of Communication (COM) at Jacksonville State University administered an online survey to 341 alumni who received BA degrees in Communication in 2003 through 2012 (please see [Appendix II.9.3\(D\)](#). “[Communication Alumni Survey Questionnaire](#)” The purpose of the survey was to learn how well the department was preparing students for employment and graduate or professional schools after graduation. The population data consisting of name, email, mailing address, degree, and graduation year were provided by the Office of Alumni Relations. For alumni with email addresses (157 or 46.04%), the initial invitation and 7 subsequent reminders were sent electronically. For alumni without email addresses (184 or 53.96%), the initial invitation was sent via United State Postal Service (USPS), with 3 reminder messages posted on the Communication Face Book page to encourage participation. The survey consisted of 17 questions developed by the department.

The survey was open from February 10 through June 9. Of those invited to participate, 92 responded to the survey, 1 refused to participate, and 14 had invalid email addresses. The response rate was 28.22%.

Of the respondents, 45.24% reported having a concentration in public relations, 32.14% had a concentration in broadcasting (Radio-TV), 15.48% in print journalism, and 7.14% in new media, a concentration discontinued several years ago.

Quality of the Department

When asked to rate the quality of the department on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being poor and 5 being outstanding, the respondent means on the four indicators were between 3.46 and 4.50 out of 5. The overall mean for “*Overall quality of the program*” was 3.83, “*Preparing you for your career*” was 3.60, “*Enhancing your intellectual growth*” was 4.07, and “*Faculty strength*” was 3.93. The ratings were tabulated by concentration and graduation year with the results shown in the two tables that follow.

Alumni Survey: Quality of Department by Concentration

		Broadcasting (R-TV)	Print Journalism	New Media	Public Relations	Overall*
Overall quality of the program	Mean	3.70	3.85	3.83	3.87	3.83
	Valid N	27	13	6	38	88
Preparing you for your career	Mean	3.46	3.69	3.50	3.68	3.60
	Valid N	26	13	6	38	86
Enhancing your intellectual growth	Mean	3.96	4.15	4.50	4.03	4.07
	Valid N	26	13	6	38	87
Faculty strength	Mean	3.62	4.00	4.17	3.97	3.93
	Valid N	26	13	6	37	86

Missing values excluded; *- all who responded

Alumni Survey: Quality of Department by Graduation Year

			2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Overall quality of the program	Mean	3.44	3.43	4.10	3.86	4.50	3.44	3.29	4.40	3.88	3.60	4.00
	Valid N	9	7	10	7	2	9	7	15	8	5	9
Preparing you for your career	Mean	3.11	2.86	3.90	3.71	4.00	3.22	3.50	4.29	3.63	3.20	3.78
	Valid N	9	7	10	7	2	9	6	14	8	5	9
Enhancing your intellectual growth	Mean	3.67	3.86	4.40	4.29	5.00	3.33	3.83	4.67	4.00	3.60	4.11
	Valid N	9	7	10	7	2	9	6	15	8	5	9
Faculty strength	Mean	3.33	3.71	4.30	4.14	4.50	3.50	3.83	4.20	3.88	3.80	4.11
	Valid N	9	7	10	7	2	8	6	15	8	5	9

The JSU 4+7

As in the preceding sections, respondents were asked to rate, on a scale of 1 (least useful) to 5 (most useful), the usefulness of their JSU training in regard to The JSU 4+7—writing, editing, technology, research, statistics, media history, communication theory, communication ethics, diversity, media law, and critical thinking. Statistics was reported as least useful with a mean of 2.88. The table below shows that communication theory, media history, and diversity were considered as useful with means ranging from 3.25 to 3.38, and research, technology/production, communication ethics, media law, critical thinking, editing, and writing were considered more useful with means ranging from 3.57 to 4.34 (see table below).

Again, similar to previous findings in this study, our alumni ranked their training in writing as the most useful followed by their training in editing. Thus, the learning outcome, writing, is ranked number one among The JSU 4+7 skills.

**The Usefulness of my JSU Training
Alumni Survey**

	Mean	Valid N
Writing	4.34	88
Editing	4.20	85
Technology/Production	3.69	80
Research	3.57	81
Statistics	2.88	77
Media history	3.30	77
COM Theory	3.25	80
COM Ethics	3.76	85
Diversity	3.38	77
Media Law	3.87	84
Critical thinking	3.99	82

Employment Statistics

As shown in the table below, most respondents (86.52%) were employed within one year after graduation, and close to one-half (42.70%) were employed prior to or upon graduation. For details of employment periodicity of the respondents, see the table below.

Alumni Survey: Employment of Graduates

	N	%
Pre- or upon graduation	38	42.70
1-3 months	16	17.98
3.5-6 months	8	8.99
6.5-12 months	15	16.85
Still unemployed	12	13.48
Total	89	100.00

Eighty-three percent of those who were employed reported holding a position that required a college degree. Over three-quarters of those who were employed provided their job titles as requested. One-third reported holding positions such as anchor, editor, reporter, newspaper writer, specialist, liaison, publicist, manager, or director in the communication fields.

Graduate Education

Over two-thirds of those who attended graduate school (70.37%) were pursuing a Master's degree, 7.41% were working on a Juris Doctorate, and 3.70% on a Doctoral degree. Over one-half (55.56%) indicated that they had received a graduate degree.

When asked if the respondent's career advancement would benefit from a graduate degree in Communication, almost two-thirds (60.17%), shown in the table below, responded positively. Among the respondents, 35.53% thought their career advancement would benefit reasonably from a graduate degree, while 11.84% thought it was essential, and 13.16% thought a graduate degree would be very essential in their career advancement.

**Usefulness of Graduate Degree to Career
Alumni Survey**

	<i>N</i>	%
None	14	18.42
Slightly	16	21.05
Reasonably	27	35.53
Essential	9	11.84
Very essential	10	13.16
Total	76	100.00

Alumni Comments

Respondents provided numerous comments—praises, suggestions, and a few criticisms (for the full document, please see [Appendix II.9.3E. “Communication Alumni Survey Comments”](#)). Below is a sample of comments that respondents thought may be useful in improving programs in the department or university as a whole.

- A master’s program in Communication
- Advanced Online Media course or Internet News course focusing on the future of online news
- Better- quality practical experiences in school
- Decrease the amount of time required for Internship, better internship opportunities, and complete internship by junior year
- Add Grant writing and non-profit management workshops to courses
- Offer more broadcasting courses taught by a veteran who has been in the field
- Offer classes after hours or via distant learning
- Add development of Air Shift Skills to Audio Production course
- Media Workshops should reserve for those who are in the field
- Stress more on multitasking
- Curriculum that offers understanding of demands in today’s communication work place
- Same core classes requirements for all concentrations
- Continuous improvements in teaching methods and clearly stated course objectives would be helpful

Next are the strengths and weaknesses discovered during the study and changes made and/or to be made in an effort to improve our programs and our department.

PROGRAM STRENGTHS

We reported program strengths here under three categories: 1) learning outcomes (The JSU 4+7), 2) operational outcomes (the non-JSU 4+7), and 3) anecdotal areas of strength—those not based on systematic, self-study data.

The JSU 4+7—The Learning Outcomes

With respect to the eleven values and competencies (The JSU 4+7) that constitute the department's learning outcomes, results of this self-study suggest eight areas of strength for the Department of Communication. They include, in a descending order: writing, diversity, technology, law, editing, ethics, critical thinking, and statistics, with their cross-discipline means (the average of students in all the three concentrations) ranging from 85.8 percent (for writing) down to 81.8 percent for statistics (for findings reported in this section, please see the three "Tables of Mean and Grand Mean" in Standard 9, #3 of this self-study).

* *Writing.* Results from both direct and indirect methods of assessment suggest that our students are strongest in writing. The grand mean score from four direct methods shows that, among The JSU 4+7, broadcasting students obtained their highest score in writing; print journalism students obtained their second highest score in writing; and public relations students obtained their third highest score in writing. When the cross-discipline mean is calculated, writing again comes up as the outcome in which our students obtained their highest score.

Data from indirect measures further support this finding. The senior exit survey data show that our graduating seniors ranked writing as number one among The JSU 4+7 in terms of usefulness (see the table, "Perception of the Usefulness of The JSU 4+7" in standard 9, #3 of this self-study); and our alumni survey also shows writing as having the highest mean (see the table, "The Usefulness of my JSU Training," in standard 9, #3. of self-study under alumni survey). Thus, there seems to be a consensus, in terms of both performance (direct measures/tests) and perception (indirect measures/surveys) that writing is our program's strongest offering.

This finding also agrees with our 2007 self-study finding in which writing also ranked as number one. In support of this view, one of our alumni in 2007 wrote: "Located in Raleigh, NC and as an account supervisor at a PR firm, I interview and hire graduates of UNC-Chapel Hill. The program at JSU appears to be as comprehensive with the writing courses, and more diverse with the extent of the radio experience, as the program at UNC."

* *Diversity.* The grand mean of the direct methods shows that public relations students scored highest in diversity among the 11 values and competencies (The JSU 4+7); print students scored second highest in diversity; and broadcasting students had their fourth highest score in diversity. However when the cross-discipline mean (CDM) is calculated, communication students as a whole received their second highest score in diversity (85.5%).

* *Technology.* Our students have made a significant progress in their knowledge of technology from our previous assessment to the present. Technology has the third highest cross-discipline mean (CDM) score in this assessment. It increased from 77 percent in our 2007 assessment to 85.1 percent in the 2013 assessment.

* *Others.* A similar case can be made for each of the remaining five outcomes—law, editing, ethics, critical thinking, and statistics. Thus, without becoming repetitive by describing each of them separately, it is accurate to report that data from this study suggest that each of these eight outcomes has a strong CDM that is not less than 81.8 percent. This suggests eight areas of strength in terms of The JSU 4+7 (see the CDM row in the Broadcasting Concentration Table of Means and Grand Means--Standard 9, #3).

Non-JSU 4+7--the Operational Outcomes

These areas of strength discovered by our self-study, although not among our learning outcomes, are germane to the accomplishment of those outcomes.

* *Faculty strength and cohesiveness.* Thirty-six of the 77 graduating seniors who responded to exit survey (46.8%) provided additional comments: 2.78 percent of the comments were criticism; 38.9 percent were suggestions; 55.6 percent were praises toward the department's programs, faculty, and staff; and 2.78 percent were mixed. By far the most frequently cited program strength by our graduating seniors was our faculty—their experience, supportiveness, and concern for students.

Respondents' rating of the overall quality of our department (4.37 on a five-point scale) seems to reflect this positive perception of our faculty and staff as does their desire to continue their studies here if we had a graduate program in Communication. An overwhelming percentage of these seniors (82.19%) indicated an interest in attending graduate school here should the department develop a graduate program in Communication, a challenge we have taken seriously.

Furthermore, our faculty has moved from one that was divided in 2003—when Professor Lattimore, an ACEJMC consultant, visited us—to one that is cohesive and focused, much like a family. We attribute much of our success with our initial accreditation to faculty cohesiveness, which, according to these data, remains true today.

* *Job placement.* Results from senior exit survey suggest that our job placement is strong. Nearly half (48.68%) of the graduating seniors surveyed reported that they had accepted or were considering a job offer prior to graduation. Those without a job offer by graduation time estimated their likelihood of a job offer within six months of graduation to be 3.76 on a scale of 5 (see graduating senior results in Standard 9, #3).

* *Internship/Practical experience.* Results from our alumni survey conducted during this self-study showed that more than half of the respondents—71.9%—reported internship as being the most beneficial course during their training at JSU (see the alumni survey report—Standard 9, #3 of this self-study). Our students' performance in their internships—as shown by data from the direct method (internship)—bears out this alumni survey result (see Tables of Mean and Grand Mean in the three concentrations—Standard 9, #3).

In addition to internship, our students are exposed to extensive amount of in-house practical training prior to both internship and graduation. The student newspaper, the radio station, and JSU's Television Services—all provide in-house opportunities for students. Following our previous accreditation visit, we instituted a mandatory media workshop and all of our students

must work in at least one of the student media for at least two semesters before their internship and three semesters before their graduation. Students put in three to six credit-hour work (three hours required, another three hours optional) at the student media. Many have resorted to obtaining cross-media experience—radio, newspaper, and television—while they are still working on their degrees.

Anecdotal Areas of Strength

Some of a program’s strengths may not fall in the category of the strictly defined learning outcomes, yet those strengths are vitally important to the program’s success. For us, our facilities and administrative support are vitally important to our mission, and hence we list them here as part of our strength.

* *Facilities.* Our facilities are state of the art—computer lab, radio lab, television studios, and edit bays—all with new equipment. We also have multi-media/smart technology equipment in all our classrooms. We have a relatively new communication library for our students’ use in our building (Self Hall), although we are continuing to seek books and other materials to fill the racks in the library. See the table below for the newly purchased equipment items we have for our broadcast program.

* *Strong Administrative Support.* The university and the college are solidly in support of the Department of Communication as demonstrated by their willingness to provide resources in support of the progress of the department. As any unit administrator knows, this is an essential ingredient for success. We have a university administration that is fully committed to the notion of quality as demonstrated by its goal of having all units with accrediting agencies become accredited. Obviously our becoming accredited in 2008 has heightened the administration’s appreciation and support of our department.

Field Equipment				Studio Equipment			
Number	Maker	Model	Type	Number	Maker	Model	Type
6	Sony	HXR-NX5U	Video camera	3	JVC	GY-HM790U	Studio camera
6	Varizoom	VZ-TK75A	Tripod	3	Prompter People	Flex D17	Teleprompter
6	Pearstone	DVC-777	Digital Video Camera Bag	1	Tricaster	855 (upgradeable to 860)	Production video switcher
4 (licenses)	Adobe	Production Premium CS6	Video Editing Software	1	Blackmagic	Hyper Deck	Disk recorder
				2	Blackmagic	(attached to Hyperdeck)	480 Gb Hard drive

PROGRAM WEAKNESSES

An effective assessment discovers both strengths and weaknesses, and in turn corrects those weaknesses. Our self-study was able to reveal the weaknesses listed below.

The JSU 4+7

For the results and interpretations that follow, please see the Tables of Mean and Grand Mean in for the three concentrations in our program (found in this section of this report).

* *Broadcast deficiency in theory—understanding concepts and applying theories.* Results from four direct measures showed a low knowledge of theory among broadcasting students (see the grand outcome mean in the table of means). While print journalism and public relations students scored 82.7 percent and 81.7 percent respectively in theory, broadcasting students scored 74.3 percent which is significantly lower than any of the former two. Secondly, a review of our assessment process showed that the definition of theory was ambiguous and needed some clarity, and that the score on knowledge of theory, in the exit exam alone, was quite low within the broadcast sequence (a score of 66%).

* *Print and PR deficiency in research—conduct research and evaluate information.* While broadcasting students scored above average (81%) in research, print and public relations students scored 76 percent and 79.7 percent respectively. While these are no failing grades, we believe that they could be better, and hence we consider it a deficiency. A review of the data suggests that the less-than-average score (78.9%) obtained in research, as shown by the cross-discipline mean (CDM) of 78.9 percent, is traceable to the exit exam scores in all three concentrations (see the Broadcasting Table of Means and Grand Means, Standard 9, #3).

* *Deficiency in history—demonstrate an understanding of history.* Direct measures show that although no concentration obtained a failing or below-average (“F” or “D”) score in communication history, our students showed low-average knowledge of communication history across the three concentrations. History was one of two outcomes, among The JSU 4+7 elements tested, that students obtained a consistently low mean score (below 75%) in all three concentrations (see Tables of Mean and Grand Mean for the three sequences).

* *Inability to reach students of all learning styles.* Data from this study suggest that despite the above-average scores obtained in a significant majority of the outcomes (9 out of 11), there are still some broadcasting students who are not doing well. For instance, a look at the range statistics (see the Broadcasting Table of Means and Grand Means—Standard 9, #3) reveals that within the capstone method, there is at least one student with a score of 40 percent in the seven outcomes measured by the capstone project; within the course-embedded method, there is at least one student with a score of 38 percent in statistics; and within the exit exam method, there is at least one student with a score of 10 percent in history. We recognize that with majority of students doing very well, it is easy to overlook the few that are not, and our faculty wants to avoid that.

* *Deficiency of exit exam.* We recognize that exit exam is not one of our learning outcomes, but we also know that learning cannot be effectively managed if it cannot be measured or measured accurately. This is why we include exit exam deficiency here as a program weakness. Based on the row averages (average of all outcomes measured by each direct method), our

students consistently made the lowest score in the exit exam as compared to the other three direct methods, and this is true for all three concentrations in the department (see Tables of Mean and Grand Mean for the three concentrations).

Additionally, senior exit survey result revealed that students feel that the time for exit exam preparation was inadequate, and should be extended to allow them to put their best efforts into the exam.

* *High number of internship hours.* Both our senior exit survey and our alumni survey contained comments, albeit by a minority of respondents, asking for a reduction in the number of hours we require for internship. Currently that stands at 350 hours.

* *Student knowledge of graduation requirements.* The student advisement survey we conducted during this self-study revealed that some students are still having problem with information on graduation requirements despite our inclusion of such information in every syllabus and our requirement that all faculty review that information along with their course syllabi at the start of every class each semester.

Closing the Loop: Data-driven Departmental Improvements

As stated earlier, our faculty is pleased with the overall results of our self-study but will not be complacent as long as there is still room for improvement.

Seven changes, listed below, were identified in response to seven weaknesses revealed above by our self-study. We have implemented some changes, while others await implementation in 2014-2015. Because these changes were discussed in detail in Part II: Supplementary Information Section, #6 of this self-study, their narratives here will be abbreviated.

Needed Improvements in the Department

- I. *Improving students' knowledge of theory.* We redefined theory to encompass social scientific theory, as well as theoretical concepts found in theory classes such as law, ethics, history, introduction to mass communication, and others. The new definition will also be applied to our measuring instruments including the exit exam.
- II. *Improving Print and PR deficiency in research.* A review of the data suggests that Print and PR low scores in research may be tied to a deficiency in our exit-exam, which consistently registered the lowest scores in research among all three methods used to measure research and across all three concentrations in the department. Thus improving the exit exam (as proposed here in closing the loop) might hold the key to improving performance in research.
- III. *Improving students' knowledge of JMC history.* Our faculty has agreed that three history research papers have to be fully implemented henceforth, and that the respective course instructors will take the responsibility to do so. The head of department will monitor the implementation of this. For the courses where history research paper will be required, see the table of "Post-Assessment Emphasis on History" in Part II, Supplementary Information, #6.

- IV. *Improving teaching to reach students of all learning styles.* We will adopt a 21st Century learning model so as to be able to reach as many students enrolled in our courses as possible, irrespective of their learning styles. This should improve students' overall average performance. By the end of the spring semester of 2014, most of our classrooms are expected to be redesigned with the 21st Century model classroom in mind, and we expect that this concept will become operational within the 2014-2015 academic year.
- V. *Improving teaching by improving our measuring instrument (the exit exam).* Based on self-study findings, we will review and revise—in 2014-2015—our exit exam contents, especially those dealing with history, theory, and research. We will also extend the student preparation time for taking the exit exam from one week to three weeks following the refresher lectures. Furthermore, we will administer the exam earlier, rather than later, in the semester.
- VI. *Improving students' knowledge of graduation requirements.* Our 2013 self-study data suggest that some students are still unaware of the content of the Graduation Requirement form we appended to every syllabus in the department (see a sample of this form in Part II. Supplementary Information, #6). So, we developed and have adopted, with immediate effect, the following measures to improve students' knowledge of graduation requirements.
- (a) Have students bring the Graduation Requirements form to each advisement session.
 - (b) Discuss with them what they think about the form. "Is it clear? How could we improve it so that you know more about graduation requirements?"
 - (c) On the column for "Expected Completion," have the student indicate the semester during which he or she plans to fulfill that requirement. That will give the student a realistic estimate of when he or she will be able to graduate.
 - (d) Place a copy of the Graduation Requirements form on department's website so that students will have another way to access the form.
 - (e) Record each advisement meeting in the regular advisement form which you and the student normally sign at the end of each meeting.
 - (f) Include Graduation Requirements form in the department's Student Handbook.
- VII. *Improving curriculum by reducing internship hours.* In response to (graduating students' and alumni's) survey data, indicating the desire to reduce the number of internship hours required by the department, our faculty has deliberated and decided to reduce our internship hours from 350 to 250, and this will go into effect beginning in summer, 2014.

4. If campus media operations are under unit control, discuss awards they have won in local, regional or national competitions in the past six years.

Our student media serve as one of the vehicles for dispensing knowledge to our students. They provide students with hands-on experience that is invaluable as they get ready to go into the workforce. One of the strongest testaments to the strength and usefulness of our student media is the patronage of our student media by the alumni, who attribute their present success to the initial experience they gained through our student media. For instance, their sense of gratitude is exemplified in their establishment of Project 92. This project was organized by our radio station advisory board, recently formed by our alumni themselves and composed of 100 percent radio alumni, for the sole purpose of raising funds for the station. Their ultimate aim is to enhance the station's capacity to offer professional training to communication students.

Furthermore, the student media also provide useful service to our community at large. For instance, our National Public Radio programming provides useful information to members of our listening area, some of who depend on the station to keep their (clock) time, and others who frequently call in to make requests.

During its annual communication week luncheon, the Department of Communication acknowledges the performance and usefulness of its student media by presenting our outstanding (student) media staff with several awards. In the past six years, for example, several students have received outstanding performance awards given by both the department and student leaders of the two media—*The Chanticleer* (student newspaper), and WLJS FM-91.9 (student radio). The department gives out awards to successful media leaders—the chief editor of the newspaper and the program director of the radio station—and those student leaders themselves select their best staff members who also receive awards for their work.

Similarly the student media have won several external awards over the past six years. Details of both internal and external (regional or national) awards received by the student media and their staff are respectively shown in the two tables that follow below.

Student Media Staff Six-Year Awards—Local Competitions				
Year of Award	The Chanticleer (Newspaper)	WLJS (Radio Station)	The Mimosa (The yearbook)	
2008	Zach Childree Julie Skinner Brandon Hollingsworth Kevin Jeffers Bethany Harbison	Natalie Dempster John Nickolson Matthew Reese Donnie Wells Jesse Wiggins Jared Gravette	Jason Wright Lacee Nisbett	
2009	Julie Skinner Anthony Staubs Zach Childree Jared Gravette Mariajose Ortiz-Morales	Nathan Jones John Nickolson Billy Ramsey James Burton Natalie Dempster Matthew Reese	Diandra Baeza Josh Bullock Jacob Cummings Lauren Herring Jason Wright	
2010	Zach Childree Haley Gregg Mariajose Ortiz-Morales	James Burton Natalie Dempster Nathan Jones John Nickolson Billy Ramsey Matthew Reese	Michael Brown Alicia Warren	
2011	Kevin Brant Mariajose Ortiz-Morales Maurice Winsell	Thad Burton Natalie Dempster Billy Ramsey Scott Simpson Billy Ramsey	N/A	
2012	Mariajose Ortiz-Morales Maurice Winsell Kara Coleman Emily Hayes	Thad Burton Andrew Holderfield Billy Ramsey Scott Simpson Josh Singer	N/A	
2013	Zach Tyler Kara Coleman Maurice Winsell Daniel Porter	Carly Stokes Haleigh Tibbs Curtis Holman Billy Dunn Billy Ramsey	N/A	

Student Media Six-Year Awards—Regional or National Competitions

Year of Award	Detail of Award
2008	<p><i>The Chanticleer</i>—our student newspaper—took First Place in Newspaper Design at the Southeast Journalism Conference.</p> <p>WLJS—our radio station—won First Place in Radio Newscast at the Southeast Journalism Conference.</p> <p>Both of these were received in February 2008 at the SEJC Conference at the University of Mississippi</p>
2009	<p><i>The Chanticleer</i> took Second Place in Newspaper Design at the Southeast Journalism Conference.</p> <p>This award was given in February 2009 at the SEJC Conference at Belmont University in Nashville.</p>
2011	<p>WLJS was named Most Improved Station by the College Music Journal.</p> <p>WLJS was named Number One Rock Station in Alabama by plugrooster.com</p> <p>Both awards were announced on line.</p>
2013	<p><i>The Chanticleer</i> took Third Place in the Region Three Best All-Around Non-Daily Student Newspaper division at the Society of Professional Journalist's Mark of Excellence Award.</p> <p><i>The Chanticleer's</i> Features Editor, Zach Tyler, took First Place in the Region Three General Column Writing division at the Society of Professional Journalist's Mark of Excellence Award.</p> <p>Both of these awards were given at the SPJ Region Three Conference in Atlanta in March 2013.</p>

5. Discuss awards won by the unit's students in local, regional or national competitions in the past six years. If campus media operations are not under unit control, please list only awards won by the unit's majors.

Communication students—graduates and current students—have won numerous awards over the years, although many of them went unnoticed because some students do not notify the department. Below is a list of awards, over a six-year period, that the department is aware of.

Departmental & External Awards to COM Students in Six Years

Departmental Student Awards

<u>STUDENT</u>	<u>AREA</u>	<u>AWARD</u>	<u>YEAR</u>
Rebekah Holley	BRO	Broadcasting Student of the Year - Academic	2008
Jared Gravette	PJ	Print Journalism Student of the Year - Academic	2008
Christina Cheatwood	PR	Public Relations Student of the Year - Academic	2008
Leslie Gober	PR	Character Award	2008
Leslie Gober	PR	Leadership Award	2008
Chris Pittman	PJ	Character Award	2008
Chris Pittman	PJ	Professional Skills Award - PJ	2008
David Jennings	BRO	Character Award	2008
Whitney Kilpatrick		Character Award	2008
Brandon Hollingsworth	BRO	Professional Skills Award - TV Production	2008
Martha Wako	BRO	Professional Skills Award - Radio Production	2008
Jessica Driggers	PR	Professional Skills Award - PR Capstone	2008
Cristina Cheatwood		Professional Skills Award - Internet/Web Production	2008
Cristina Cheatwood		John C. Turner Student of the Year	2008
David Jennings	BRO	Broadcasting Student of the Year - Academic	2009
		Character	2009
Jared Gravette	PJ	Print Journalism Student of the Year - Academic	2009
Ashley Gaither	PR	Public Relations Student of the Year - Academic	2009
Whitney Jackson		Character	2009
Julie Skinner	PJ	Character	2009
Martha Wako	BRO	Character	2009
James Whit McGhee	BRO	Professional Skills Award - Print Journalism	2009
Adam Roebuck	BRO	Professional Skills Award - Television Production	2009
Derek Smith	BRO	Professional Skills Award - Radio Production	2009
Lindsey Mathis	PR	Professional Skills Award - Public Relations Capstone	2009
William Boykins		Professional Skills Award - Internet/Web Production	2009
Bethany Harbison		John C. Turner Student of the Year	2009
Martha Wako	BRO	Broadcasting Student of the Year - Academic	2010
		Character	2010
		John C. Turner	2010

<u>STUDENT</u>	<u>AREA</u>	<u>AWARD</u>	<u>YEAR</u>
Julie Skinner	PJ	Print Journalism Student of the Year - Academic	2010
		Character	2010
		John C. Turner	2010
Ashley Gaither	PR	Public Relations Student of the Year - Academic	2010
Kira Reeves		Character	2010
William Boykins		Character	2010
Logan Huggins	BRO	Professional Skills Award - Radio Production	2010
Stephanie Howell	BRO	Professional Skills Award - Radio Production	2010
Amber Cannon	PR	Professional Skills Award - Public Relations Capstone	2010
Audra Magaw	PR	Professional Skills Award - Internet/Web Production	2010
Steven Daniel Beck	BRO	Broadcasting Student of the Year - Academic	2011
		Price - Montgomery Scholarship	
Stephanie Lama	PJ	Print Journalism Student of the Year - Academic	2011
Chelsea Pelletier	PR	Public Relations Student of the Year - Academic	2011
		Professional Skills Award - Public Relations Capstone	2011
Alexis Tyson	BRO	Character Award	2011
James Isaac Godwin	PJ	Character Award	2011
Joshua Singer	BRO	Character Award	2011
		Professional Skills Award - Internet/Web Production	2011
Logan Huggins	BRO	Character Award	2011
		Professional Skills Award - Television Production	2011
Kelsey Butler	BRO	Professional Skills Award - Television Production	2011
Hilary Crist	BRO	Professional Skills Award - Television Production	2011
Gordon Hengeveld	BRO	Professional Skills Award - Radio Production	2011
Karie Gottwald	PR	Professional Skills Award - Public Relations Capstone	2011
		John C. Turner	2011
		Price - Montgomery Scholarship	2011
Emily Glaser			2011
Victoria Reaves	BRO	Broadcasting Student of the Year - Academic	2012
		Character Award	2012
		Professional Skills Award - Television Production	2012
Emily Glaser	PJ	Print Journalism Student of the Year - Academic	2012
Noelle Millirons	PR	Public Relations Student of the Year - Academic	2012
		Professional Skills Award - Print Journalism	2012
Logan Huggins	BRO	John C. Turner	2012
		Leadership Award	2012
Audra Magaw	PR	Character Award	2012
		Leadership Award	2012
Emil Loeken	PR	Character Award	2012
James Esco		Character Award	2012
Taylor Nicolle	BRO	Professional Skills Award - Television Production	2012

<u>STUDENT</u>	<u>AREA</u>	<u>AWARD</u>	<u>YEAR</u>
Curtis Holman	BRO	Professional Skills Award - Television Production	2012
Araceli Macias	BRO	Professional Skills Award - Radio Production	2012
Eva Leigha Riveria	PR	Professional Skills Award - Public Relations Capstone	2012
LaCretia Willis	PR	Professional Skills Award - Public Relations Capstone	2012
		Professional Skills Award - Internet / Web	
Ben Borrello	PJ	Production	2012
Victoria Reaves	BRO	Broadcasting Student of the Year - Academic	2013
Benjamin Nunnally	PJ	Print Journalism Student of the Year - Academic	2013
Kaitlin Manns	PR	Public Relations Student of the Year - Academic	2013
Austin Faulkner		John C. Turner	2013
		Character Award	2013
Patrick Paul	BRO	Professional Skills Award - Radio Production	2013
Mara Mattison	PR	Professional Skills Award - Public Relations	2013
Curtis Holman	BRO	Character Award	2013
		WLJS Leadership Award	2013
Antuan Brown		Character Award	2013
Kara Coleman		Character Award	2013
		Chanticleer Leadership Award	2013
John Morton	BRO	Leadership Award	2013

EXTERNAL AWARDS

Cory Yilmaz	PR	The Excelsiors Cup / Carlson Leadership Academy	2012
		Vice President / Sigma Phi Epsilon	2012
		Communications Chair / Sigma Phi Epsilon	2011
		Chapter Home of the Year / Carlson Leadership Academy	2013
Laura Babb	PR	Resident Assistant of the Month / Housing	2012
Meghan King	PR	President's List	2012
Ferras Rimpsey	BRO	WLJS 91.9	2011-13
Hillarie Poole	PR	Dean's List	
		Delta Zeta / Social Chair	2013
		Delta Zeta / New Member VP	2012
		Circle C International / Secretary	2011-13
		Delta Zeta / Scholarship	2013
		Circle K International Running for President	2013
Antuan Brown	BRO	Dean's List	2010-11
		President's List	2012
		Resident Assistant of the Year / Housing	2011-12
		Resident Assistant of the Month / Housing	2012
		Best GPA of Fraternities / JSU	2012
		Treasurer of Phi Beta Sigma / Pi Kappa Chapter	2012

<u>STUDENT</u>	<u>AREA</u>	<u>AWARD</u>	<u>YEAR</u>
Antuan Brown	BRO	Fraternity Inc. / Pi Kappa Chapter	2012-13
		Best Audio in COM 302	Pending
		Audio Production	Pending
Addison Eskins	PR	Ballerenna Member / JSU Ken Bodiford	2012
		Pledge Member Alpha Xi Delta / Kaci Ogle	2012-13
		Dean's List	2012
Kaitlyn Short	PR	Dean's List	2012
		Faculty Scholarship	2011
		Member of Alpha Xi Delta	2013
Alex Smith	BRO	President's List	2012-13
		Freshman Forum Treasurer	2012-13
		Leadership Scholarship	2012-13
		Alumni Scholarship	2012-13
		Choral Scholarship	2012-13
Ashley Edmondson	DJ	Delta Zeta	
		SPJ	
Mary Fowler	DJ	Dean's List	
Gabrielle Ferrell	BRO	Delta Zeta Publicity	
		Road 2 Riches Radio	
Brandon Windham	BRO	Dean's List	2012
Casey Crush	PR	Faculty Scholarship	
Steve Dorsey	BRO	Dean's List	2011-12
Natalie Brown	BRO	Member of Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority Inc.	2010
Christopher Smith	BRO	Award of Excellence / US Army	2011
Morgan Ingram	PR	Leadership Scholarship / JSU Cheerleader	
		2011-13 JSU Cheerleader	
		Alpha Omicron	
		Miss Jax State Candidate	
Jesse Wheelles	BRO	Dean's List	2012
		Gem of Hills Scholarship / JSU	
John Aldridge	PR	Dean's List	2012
		Faculty Scholarship	2012-13
Alexandra Black	PR	Dean's List	2012
Marie McBurnett	PJ	Gamecock Scholarship	2012
		Dean's List	2012
Kayla Burns	Minor	GPA Based Scholarship / JSU	2006-07
		GPA Based Scholarship / Kiwanis Club	2006-07
Andrew Long	BRO	Eagle Scout Rank / Boy Scouts of America	2012
		Faculty Scholarship	2012
Alex Teeter	BRO	Minton Amerson Scholarship / JSU	2012-13
		Dean's List	2012-13
		Faculty Scholarship	2012-13

<u>STUDENT</u>	<u>AREA</u>	<u>AWARD</u>	<u>YEAR</u>
Aaron Perkins	BRO	JSU Ambassador / President Meehan	2012
		Resident Assistant of the Month / Housing	2012
Emily Bell	PR	Dean's List	2011
Carly McKnight	PR	Scholarship / BB& T Bank	2011
Susan G. Catrett	BRO	Alabama Junior Miss Scholarship / AL Jr. Miss	2010
		Group Leader Scholarship / Marching Southerner	2012
		Head Ballerina Scholarship / Marching Southerner	2013
Sarah Blair	PR	Gem of Hills Scholarship / JSU	2010
Karli Estock	PR	Gem of Hills Scholarship / JSU	2011
Kenneth Smith	PR	President's List	2012
		Senator of the Month / SGA	2012
		SGA Scholarship / SGA	2013
Brett Johnson	PR	Dean's List	2012
		Leadership Scholarship	2011-13
		New Senator of the Year / SGA	2011-12
		SGA Scholarship / SGA	2013
Jesse Hall	BRO	Show of the Year / Mike Stedham	2009
		Show of the Year / Mike Stedham	2010
Chelsea Slaughter	PR	ODK National Honors Leadership Society / ODK	2012
Kelly Cole	PR	Commissioners Honor Roll / Athletic Dept.	2010-13
		President's List	2010-13
		Dean's List	2010-11
		Academic Medal of Honor	2010
		Scholarship / Athletic Dept.	2010-14
Alex Rainwater	PR	ZTA Scholarship / ZTA	2012
		Foxy Freshman / ZTA	2011
		Jazzy Junior / ZTA	2013
		Senator of the Month / SGA	2011
		Faculty Scholarship	2010-14
		Best Family GPA / ZTA	2013
Laura Nash	PR	Mimosa Scholarship / JSU	2009
		Greek Scholarship / AOTT	2011
		Rose Award / AOTT	2013
Casey Baird	PR	Highest New Member GPA / Alpha Omicron Pi	2012
		Transfer Scholarship / JSU	2011
		Agnes Maine Scholarship / Agnes Maine Foundation	2012
Brooke McCurdy	PR	Leadership Scholarship / JSU	2010
Shelby Truitt	PR	Faculty Scholarship	2009
		Dean's List	2009-10
Dan Plotnick	PR	Dean's List	2012
Adam Buchanan	BRO	Best Commercial for COM 302	Pending

<u>STUDENT</u>	<u>AREA</u>	<u>AWARD</u>	<u>YEAR</u>
Courtney Ray	BRO	Best Commercial for COM 302	Pending
Samuel Ogden	BRO	Video Coordinator of Year / CSVA	Pending
Robert Pearson, Jr.	BRO	Joseph Elliot Walker Memorial Scholarship	2012-13
Angela Malino	PR	President's List	
		Dean's List	
		Gamecock Orientation Leader	2012-13
		JSU Ambassador / President Meehan	2012
Dalana Parker	BRO	3rd Place R.U.M. Short fiction / JSU Writing Club	2012
Beth Milam	PR	Dean's List	2011
		Duke of Edinburgh Bronze Medal / D.O.E.	2012
		Miss Congeniality of Miss AL / Miss AL	2012
		IMPACT award / Miss AL	2012
		Miss JSU / JSU	2012
		Miss Congeniality	2012
		Miss Congeniality	2012
		ZTA Scholarship / ZTA	2013
Erik Green	BRO	Academic Achievement / JSU	2012
Justin Crawford	BRO	President's List	2012
		Dean's List	2012
Ferras Rimpsey	BRO	WLJS Disc Jockey	2011-13
Kalina Durr	PR	Supplemental Educational Grant	2010-11
		AL State Grant	2010-11
Tori Wheelles	PJ	Dean's List	2012
Meredith Speciale	PR	Dean's List	2011
		Dean's List	2012
Stephanie Simpson	BRO	Leadership Scholarship / JSU	2010-11
		Award	2011-12
		Most Improvement Academic / ZTA	2013
Steffany Means	BRO	Leadership Scholarship	2010
		Finalist in Amateur Poetry / Eper & Wein Publisher	2013

6. List by specialty each member of the graduating class of three years ago and those graduates' current jobs. If practical, please give a total number of "unknowns" rather than including them in the list.

The University's Alumni Office conducts a survey of graduates within five years after their graduation. Within this period, graduates would have acquired relevant experiences on their jobs that would enable them to reflect and report accurately on the usefulness of their college education and its relationship to their performance/progress on their jobs. As a consequence, the Alumni Office does not have much employment information listed for the class of three years ago (2010-2011) this early after their graduation. Despite this, however, the department, through a combination of methods—exit interviews, e-mail communication, faculty members, and

others—does gather some (limited) information about our alumni. The Table below, compiled through such methods, displays our 2010-2011 graduates' current jobs. The unknowns are also indicated. We had 33 graduates in 2010-2011. Twenty-five had known jobs, and there were eight that we have not heard from. Those eight are listed below as unknowns. The table below reports the jobs of those that the department is aware of.

Job Placement of Communication Graduates of 2010-2011

Sequence	Name	Grad. Year	Employer	Job Title / Position
PR	Yuto Asai	2010	TANDANO Co.	PR Division
PR	James Birdsong	2010	Southern Bracing Systems	
BRO	William Boykins	2010	AT & T	Technician
BRO	Rachel Bruer	2010	Electrical Company	Marketing
BRO	James C. Burton	2010	Thunder 92.7	On-air talent
PR	Miranda Garner	2010	Anniston Army Depot	Public Affairs
PR	Andraya Harris	2010	Unemployed	
PR	Tomasa Hughes	2010	Star Super Market	Pricing & Events Coordinator
PR	Shayna Mackey	2010	Quality of Life Healthcare	healthcare
PR	Robert Shell	2010	Arthrex Orthopedic	Sales Rep.
BRO	Brian Stephenson	2010	Rome Radio Partners LLC	Production / Continuity director
BRO	Stephen Whitecloud	2010	TV 24	Camera Operator
BRO	Jazmine Blacmon	2011	CBS Radio of Atlanta	On-air talent
BRO	Kelsey Butler	2011	WAFF – 48 News	Producer
PR	Amber Cannon	2011	Oil & Gas Company	
PR	Cherelle Colvin	2011	Strayer University	
PR	Chelsea Denson	2011	Ola High School, Georgia	Broadcasting teacher
BRO	Keri Geier	2011	Force Marketing	Production Coordinator
PR	Jasmine George	2011	Atlanta Braves Baseball	Promotions
PR	Carin Whitney	2011	Comfort Suites of Gadsden	Director
PR	Amber Derricho	2011	Graduate School	Graduate student
BRO	John Nickolson	2011	Wal-Mart	Meat Dept.
PR	Andrew Pankey	2011	Lake Guntersville Real Estate	Real Estate
PR	Fran Popovic	2011	Istratimit d.o.o. / Croutia	PR
PR	Courtney Rogers	2011	Wells Fargo Home Mortgage	
<i>There are 8 whose employments are unknown at this time</i>				

7. List graduates who have established distinguished careers in journalism and mass communications.

Our graduates work in different jobs—public and private enterprises—both as paid personnel and as business owners. Many have also excelled in their professions. Below is a list of our known graduates who have established outstanding records.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Grad Year</u>	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Title/Position</u>
Mr. James Raymond Hudson, Jr.	1985	Gulf Power Co.	Energy Consultant
Ms. Robin Boneeta Buchanan	1985	Empire Blue Cross/Blue Shield	Manager
Ms. Renee Lupa Lanham	1985	MCI Telecommunications	Manager
Lisa Carol Thompson Roussel	1986	Tracer Protection Services, Inc.	Accounting Mgr.
Deanna Bailey Foldenauer	1986	Atlanta Auto Auction	Marketing Manager
Ms. Penny Renee Williams	1986	WGST/WPCH	Continuity Director
Ms. Mary Elizabeth Burch	1986	WBRC TV Channel 6	Production Asst.
Mr. Willie Gene Bauman, Jr.	1987	US Army Safety Center	Chief/Video Svs
Phillip Harlin South	1987	CNN	Technical Director
Lauri Burns Donahoo	1987	Florascope Communications	Sales
Kimberly Garris Legore	1987	WHTM-TV	Anchor/Reporter
Donna Laurent Gregg	1987	Ritz Carlton Hotel Co.	Pr Director
Laura Jean Creque	1987	Attitude Advertising Specialties	Owner
Ms. Anna Clayton Patterson	1987	WAAY TV	News Anchor/Reporter
Ms. Kathy Sowell Klump	1987	The Clayton Record	Advertising Manager
Dianna Blount Michaels	1987	Cottaquilla Council of Girl Scouts	Mkt./PR Director
Dennis Edward Dempsey	1987	Ewtn	Chief Engineer
Mickey Ray Shadrix	1987	Heritage Communications WJXS TV-24	CEO/Partner owner
Kathryn McLeod Barber	1987	WTTO-TV	Operational Director
Mark A. Hopper	1987	WHNT-TV Huntsville	Account Executive
Ms. Vonda Barbour White	1988	Collegiate Risk Management Inc.	President

<u>Name</u>	<u>Grad Year</u>	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Title/Position</u>
Karen Cole Swann	1988	WABM TV 68 WTTO TV 21	Marketing Dir.
Ladonna Blevins Morrow	1988	Reynolds & Reynolds	Sr Software Spec
Tommy Brian Houston	1988	WBRC-tv	Prod Addist/Dir
Jeffery W. Brickhouse	1988	Integrity Inc.	Events Coordinator
Mr. Alan Renfroe	1988	JSU	Asst. Alumni Dir.
Caroline S. Armstrong	1988	Business First	Sales
Carla B. Patterson	1989	Floyd College	English Instructor
David Patrick Farmer	1989	WBRC TV	Prod Assoc.
Julie Elizabeth Durbin	1989	Disney World/dreamland Prod	Hostess/Singer
Tommy Wayne Wood	1989	Wellborn Cabinet Inc.	Producer
Kimberly Williams Gibson	1989	Calhoun Co. Chamberof Commerce	Pr/Commun Mgr.
Lisa Evans Harris	1989	Cableone	Advertising Sales
Jeff Webb	1990	Jeffersons Restaurant	Owner
Ward Bradford Welch	1990	Calhoun County Appraisal Department	Appraiser
Joryi Richard Ivanoff	1990	Morgan Stanley	Financial Advisor
Ms. Gina Darlene Womack	1990	WBMA/WJSU/WCFT TV (ABC 33/40)	Sr Promo Producer
Mr. James Alan Whitley	1990	J Walter Thompson	Creative Director
Ms. Dawna Black Daniel	1990	CNN Headline News	Technical Director
Kelley Helton Ozley	1990	Calhoun Co. Chamber of Commerce	Asst. Comm Mgr.
Bruce Glen Parris, Jr.	1990	Perkins Technical Services, Inc.	Program Analyst
Philycia F. Foster	1990	YWCA	Accountant
Roban Smith Johnson	1990		Executive Director of Communication

<u>Name</u>	<u>Grad Year</u>	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Title/Position</u>
Richard Alton Daniel	1990	CNN (cable News Network)	Tech Director
David Edric Crenshaw	1991	Selt Test Software Inc.	Software Developer
Steven Anthony Gordon	1991	JVC Disc America Co.	Sr Quality Inspector
Ms. Laura Weber Steele	1991	Robert Orr Sysco	Marketing Associate
Tracey Paul Tucker	1991	Heavy Joe Media	owner/self employed
Jon Mark Holder	1991	WGRW Radio	General Mngr
Craig Ward Hess	1991	Blue Cross Blue Shield of AL	Mgr.
Mr. Larry Shane McGriff	1991	Gazelle Consulting, Inc.	Consultant
Patrick Doug Hulett	1991	Alabama's ABC 33/40	Editor / Photographer
Mr. Theodore Enoch Bridges	1991	Vercor	Dir., Client Development
Gregory Neal Glenn	1991	Gadsden/Etowah Emergency Mgt Agency	Deputy Planning Dir.
John Stephan Spillman	1992	Computer Support Systems	Job Supervisor
Sherry Greenwood Ford	1992	University of Montevallo	Asst. Prof.
Sherri Bodine Burgess	1992	Calhoun County Chamber of Commerce	Public Relations
Terina Allen Stewart	1992	Kelly Temporary Services	Supervisor Human Res
Stephen Dale Hubbard	1993	CBN	Senior Producer, 700 Club
Jason Craig Thompson	1993	Homecom Communications	Editor
Laura Griffith Dotson	1993	Max Communications Inc.	Owner
Steven Philander Thomas	1993	Lockheed Martin	Org Dev Consultant
William J. Dobilas	1993	Fox 61	Asst. News Dir.
James Ellis Graydon	1993	CNN	Producer
David Bradley Hood	1994	WJSU TV	Chief Photographer

<u>Name</u>	<u>Grad Year</u>	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Title/Position</u>
Ms. Melanie Lynn Jones	1994	The Mountain Press	News Editor
Tracy Morris	1994	Colonial Mall	Marketing Dir.
Ms. Christina Dobbs Lee	1994	The Child Development Center of Polk County	Development Director
Amy Ledford Morgan	1994	Internet Security Systems Inc.	Mktg Comm Mgr.
Jennifer Gaydon Davis	1994	Scharbo & Company	Media Supervisor
Mr. Keith Ryan Jones	1994	Superior Bank	Electronic Banking Coordinator
Shala Anne Spruell	1995	Greater Atlanta Home Builders Assoc.	Marketing / Communication
Ms. Kari Smith Parker	1995	Tapscan Inc.	Adv Tv Consultant
Jennifer Leigh Borek	1995	CNN	Floor Director
Kristy Ann Oliver	1995	Hiredynamics	Sr. Account Manager
Ms. Jennifer Lynn Matthews	1995	Builders Assn. of Georgia	Field Service Rep.
Danny Jim Hattaway, Jr.	1995	Exotic Aquatics	Owner
Mr. Jeffrey Thomas Randolph	1995	Turner Sports	Associate Dir.
Mr. Jermelle L. Pruitt	1995	WBRC Fox 6 News	Sports Reporter
James Thomas Cole, II	1995	Southern Progress Corp.	Creative Editor
Mrs. Kaci Smith Ogle	1995	JSU	Alumni Director
Mr. James Paul Matthews	1995	Sparta, Inc.	Computer Programmer
Ms. Michelle Dunn Williams	1996	Personnel Staffing	Acct. Executive
Mr. Roger Alan Johnson	1996	CBS TV	Production Coord.
Patrick Wade Thornton	1996	The Coca Cola Co.	National Account Manager
Cari Powers Crosby	1996	Self employed	Sales Rep.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Grad Year</u>	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Title/Position</u>
Mr. Mark Joseph Poillucci	1996	GE Capital	Sales Rep.
Dana Rebecca Williams	1996	WAAY TV	News Producer
Michael Todd Mote	1996	WHMA AM Radio	Program Director
Mai Phuong Martinez	1997	WBRC Fox 6 News	Video Editor
Stephen Leon Claborn	1997	Cornerstone Detention Products	Sales Manager
Mr. Clavius Kebir Gresham	1998	Icerims.com	owner/designer
Marjorie A. Boshell	1998	JM Family/DFS	Operations Supervisor
Ms. Jeana Kay Miller	1998	Maples Industries, Inc.	Optical Systems Coordinator
Richard Lantz Croft	1998	WBRC Fox 6	Nightside Editor
Timothy Joel Hanby	1998	Teledyne Brown Engineering	Photo/Tv Oper Mgr.
Kristie Lynn Bush	1998	Ivan Allen	Account Executive
Caryn Paula Pearson	1999	Gibbs & Soell Inc.	Account Executive
Philip F. Attinger	1999	American Red Cross Polk Co. Ch	Public Relations Director
Elizabeth W. Stewart	1999	Boaz Printing	Sales Rep.
Elizabeth Taylor Loehr	1999	Cobb Chamber of Commerce	Area Council Mgr.
Richard David Sharp	2000	Birmingham Post-Herald	Copy Editor/Designer
Chad Wesley Cofield	2000	Alabama Poultry & Edd Association	Membership Director
Amber Moody Stuart	2000	WHNT News Channel 19	anchor/reporter
Elizabeth Paige Faulkner	2000	The Donoho School	Director
Elizabeth G. Chandler-Hood	2000	Fox 5 News	Producer
Stephen Vincent Sims	2000	US Investigation Services	
Amy McElroy Cole	2000	Haverty's Furniture Companies, Inc.	Copy Director / Advertising

<u>Name</u>	<u>Grad Year</u>	<u>Employer</u>	<u>Title/Position</u>
Grace Rebecca Murphy	2001	High Museum of Art	Pr Coordinator
Joel Steven Lamp	2001	LPGA	Media Relations Coor.
Amy Broadway Dore	2001	Executive Learning, Inc.	Development Coordinator
Malcolm Darrell Abernathy	2001	Jacksonville City Bd. of Ed.	Teacher
Nancy Jeanette Sharp	2002	Girl Scouts of Middle Georgia	Field Executive
Jocelyn E. Connell	2002	Fox47	weekend anchor/reporter
Erin Jackson Pirkle	2002	Anniston Army Depot	Public Affairs Specialist
Lindsey Passler Dossey	2002	Cullman Area Chamber of Commerce	Dir/Bus Dev
Pamela Pierce Hill	2002	Gadsden Business College	Instructor
Jillian C. Dick	2003	Kennedy Space Center Visitor Complex	Public Relations Rep
Jamie Eubanks Watts	2003	The Anniston Star	Editor / Page Designer
Benjamin B. Cunningham, Jr.	2003	The Anniston Star	Business Editor
Kimberley T. Barden	2003	Oakstone Publishing	Supervisor of Client Services & Sales
Mr. Andrew Bradley Symonds	2003	Middle Tenn State Univ	Asst Admissions Director
Stephen Ray Benefield	2004	Charter Media	Client Svs. Coordinator II
Ashley Leanne Wheeler	2004	Golf Media, Inc. / Fore Georgia	Director of Sales & Promotion
Natalie Geer Barton	2004	WJXS TV24	news director and evening anchor
David Chong Farmer	2004	NBC 13	production assistant
Jennifer Rhea Curren	2005	The Anniston Star	Sales Executive
Suzanna Bennett Morton	2005	US Space & Rocket Center	

8. Describe the program used to track graduates to assess their experience in the professions and to improve curriculum and instruction. Discuss measures used to determine graduates' satisfaction with the educational experiences provided by the unit. Describe maintenance of records of alumni employment histories and other alumni records.

Tracking alumni and maintenance of their records of employment

While the department frequently maintains its own record on its alumni, it does rely on the JSU Alumni Office for more up-to-date and comprehensive information on communication alumni. That office has a more sophisticated system for tracking and maintaining alumni records than any one else on campus.

The Alumni Office (AO) sends all its mails with “address service requested” so that the postal service returns undeliverable mails and provides it with current addresses where possible. At the alumni website, there is a “get-involved” area that allows alumni to update their personal and family information (weddings, births, deaths, employment), and send it to the AO electronically. The AO continually publishes its website connection in its magazines, thank-you notes, information packets to graduating seniors, and at alumni events—encouraging alum to use the alumni website for updates.

That office also surveys JSU's alumni periodically to obtain employment as well as other relevant alumni information. Currently, it does not have a set, standard tracking system in place. It gathers alumni information through alumni contact, media releases, social media, and other employment information avenues. Upon receipt of such information, the Alumni Office then updates its alumni database system. To enhance its capacity to obtain more alumni employment information, the AO is currently planning to use an outside vendor to do an employee append. The append would involve searching for employment information on those alumni on file who do not have any information available. This system is expected to be in place by Dec. 2014.

Measures of Graduates' Satisfaction

The department utilizes several avenues—targeted and non-targeted—to determine graduates' satisfaction with their educational experience. Chief among the targeted approaches are alumni reunion and alumni survey, which specifically ask alumni to provide information on their educational experience. Other methods—advisory board membership, serving as guest speaker and/or lecturer, serving on our learning outcomes assessment team, and when possible, joining our faculty on full or part-time basis—are non-targeted. While we may glean from them ideas about alumni educational experience, they do not directly ask them to provide such information.

As indicated earlier, our alumni reunion is an annual activity held during the university's Homecoming. Each year, our alumni reunion is well attended by our alumni, our current students, and faculty. It provides an opportunity for the department to acquaint its alumni with the progress the department has made since they left school, the future plans of the department,

as well as any challenges that the department may be facing. It allows our current students the chance to meet our alumni and to establish networking between them and the alums. The alumni themselves get an opportunity to fill us in on their own experiences since they left school and

how effective or less effective the education they obtained here has been toward their career advancement. It is always a rewarding experience because we come away from that meeting having a sense of what works and what does not.

Another major source of feedback from alumni is the alumni survey, which provides us with the most detailed information about our alumni. The Department of Communication, in collaboration with JSU's Office of Planning and Research, conducts a survey of communication alumni at four to five-year intervals or as needed. The survey is detailed, asking questions on current positions held by an alum, perception of the quality of the Department of Communication, usefulness of courses, salary, and recommendation for improvement, among others.

Such a survey was last conducted in spring of 2013. Its results were reported in great detail under Indirect Methods, in question #3 above. If interested in further details, please refer to that section.