

Communication Studies

PLO Data for Communication Studies, Fa2025 - Sp2026

Learning Outcome: PLO #1: Effectively design and deliver oral and written messages.

Outcome Measure: COM 4022 "Capstone Oral Presentation"

Criteria for Success: AAC&U Value Rubric Oral Communication, Average score 3+

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas: (circle one or more but not all five)

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Number of Students	Score
2026	–	2.92

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Threshold not met.

Below is a description of the process that went into creating this assessment tool plus a rationale to explain why the Department of Communication Studies would request to not use this year's score as part of our longitudinal data:

During the 24-25 academic year Communication Studies worked on Program Learning Outcomes with the Educational Effectiveness office. Following that, Outcome Measures and Criteria for Success for each PLO were completed along with Curriculum and Assessment Maps.

This is the first year to formally assess longitudinal data in this category, providing an opportunity to assess any changes to be made in this 25-26 academic year assessment report.

As for this assessment tool specifically, this 6-8 minute presentation, given in-person to a small group of classmates, allows students to answer this question: "How I plan to contribute to my community and general society with leadership and service" based on the work you've done in COM 4022. Students are evaluated using the AAC&U Oral Communication VALUE Rubric.

However, written communication was not assessed as part of this PLO this year, so the data is not entirely complete. Additionally, as described below, calibration across the Department of

Communication Studies may be in order before finalizing these numbers due to the fact that the Oral Communication Core Competency exceeded expectations.

For these reasons, the Dept. of Com Studies requests that this data not count towards our longitudinal data but rather serve as a marker for changes to be made based on this data.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Threshold not met. Regardless:

1) this COM 4022 assessment data (which did not meet the threshold) needs to be calibrated with the COM 4085 Oral Communication tool (which did meet the threshold) in order to identify discrepancies in oral communication assessment across the department.

2) Additionally, this year we only collected data on the oral component of this PLO. Next year we will either remove the written component from the PLO or assess written assessment data.

Rubric Used:

[AAC&U Value Rubric "Oral Communication"](#)

PLO Data for Communication Studies, Fa2025 - Sp2026

Learning Outcome: PLO #2: Critically analyze the effectiveness of rhetorical texts by applying relevant communication theories and models.

Outcome Measure: COM 4060 Rhetorical Critique Paper

Criteria for Success: See rubric below. Average score 75%+

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas: (circle one or more but not all five)

- 1. Specialized Knowledge
- 2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
- 3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
- 4. Applied and Collaborative Learning
- 5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Number of students	Score
2026	--	84.25% (average 3.37 out of 4 for each category)

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Threshold met.

For this assignment, Dept. of Communication students in the Communication Studies program choose a historical or contemporary event or movement and analyze two rhetorical artifacts (e.g., a speech, song, movie, TV show, play, music video, etc.) related to that event or movement. The goal is to examine these artifacts through the lens of one or more theoretical/conceptual perspectives on rhetoric.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Since the assessment benchmark was achieved, there are no changes to make at this time. Certainly, the department will review this data in the coming school year and if changes to the assignment or rubric are determined to be in order, the rationale for doing so will be recorded at that time.

Rubric Used: See

SHAPE: PLO Data_Comm Studies, 2025-2026

Rhetorical Critique Rubric					
Criteria	Ratings				Pts
Historical Context	<p>35 to >30.0 pts Excellent</p> <p>Provides comprehensive, nuanced background of the event/movement; demonstrates deep understanding of key historical figures and their significance</p>	<p>30 to >25.0 pts Good</p> <p>Provides a general background of the event/movement with some mention of key historical figures and their roles. Understanding of significance is present but may lack depth or nuance</p>	<p>25 to >15.0 pts Needs Some Improvement</p> <p>Provides basic historical information with limited depth or explanation. Mentions key figures but provides little explanation of their significance.</p>	<p>15 to >0 pts Needs Much Improvement</p> <p>Minimal or inaccurate historical context; lacks substantive details. Lacks or misinterprets the significance of the event/movement. Little to no mention of key historical figures or their roles.</p>	35 pts
Theoretical Application	<p>50 to >45.0 pts Excellent</p> <p>Masterfully applies chosen rhetorical theory/theories to explain the goals of the rhetor and the messages they aimed to communicate; demonstrates sophisticated understanding and critical insight into theoretical perspectives.</p>	<p>45 to >40.0 pts Good</p> <p>Effectively applies rhetorical theory with clear understanding of theoretical concepts to explain the goals of the rhetor and the messages they aimed to communicate.</p>	<p>40 to >30.0 pts Needs Some Improvement</p> <p>Demonstrates partial application of rhetorical theory with some conceptual misunderstandings. Shows basic understanding but with notable gaps or inaccuracies.</p>	<p>30 to >0 pts Needs Much Improvement</p> <p>Minimal or incorrect application of rhetorical theory. Shows little to no understanding of theoretical concepts.</p>	50 pts
Artifact Analysis	<p>50 to >45.0 pts Excellent</p> <p>Conducts an exceptionally detailed and critical analysis of how each artifact contributes to the movement or event's aims and messages; uses advanced rhetorical terminology from the textbook with precision</p>	<p>45 to >40.0 pts Good</p> <p>Provides a analysis of how each artifact contributes to the movement or event's aims and messages with appropriate rhetorical terminology though may lack precision or depth.</p>	<p>40 to >30.0 pts Needs Some Improvement</p> <p>Offers a surface-level analysis of one or both artifacts with limited use of rhetorical concepts and connections between artifacts and the movement/event's aims. Uses some rhetorical terminology, but application is limited or inconsistent.</p>	<p>30 to >0 pts Needs Much Improvement</p> <p>Superficial or inadequate artifact analysis Fails to connect artifacts to the movement/event in a meaningful way. Uses little to no rhetorical terminology, or misuses key concepts.</p>	50 pts
Writing Quality	<p>15 to >13.0 pts Excellent</p> <p>Exceptional academic writing; perfect grammar, sophisticated language, clear and coherent structure</p>	<p>13 to >10.0 pts Good</p> <p>Clear, professional academic writing with minimal errors that do not disrupt clarity or flow of ideas</p>	<p>10 to >5.0 pts Needs Some Improvement</p> <p>Writing contains several grammatical or structural issues Writing is somewhat unclear or difficult to follow due to lack of cohesion.</p>	<p>5 to >0 pts Needs Much Improvement</p> <p>Writing is difficult to understand with significant errors Frequent grammatical and mechanical errors that make the writing difficult to follow and inappropriate for academic context</p>	15 pts
Length and Formatting	<p>15 to >13.0 pts Excellent</p> <p>Exceeds 1,200 words; perfect adherence to citation style (APA/MLA); flawless formatting</p>	<p>13 to >10.0 pts Good</p> <p>Meets 1,200-word requirement; follows citation style with minor errors</p>	<p>10 to >5.0 pts Needs Some Improvement</p> <p>Approaches but does not fully meet length requirement; some citation inconsistencies</p>	<p>5 to >0 pts Needs Much Improvement</p> <p>Significantly below word count; major formatting/citation errors</p>	15 pts
Source Integration	<p>35 to >30.0 pts Excellent</p> <p>Exceptional use of scholarly sources; sophisticated integration of course textbook and additional references</p>	<p>30 to >25.0 pts Good</p> <p>Effective use of sources with appropriate citations</p>	<p>25 to >15.0 pts Needs Some Improvement</p> <p>Limited or inconsistent use of sources or inaccurate citations.</p>	<p>15 to >0 pts Needs Much Improvement</p> <p>Minimal or inappropriate source usage</p>	35 pts
Total Points: 200					

PLO Data for Communication Studies, Fa2025 - Sp2026

Learning Outcome: PLO #3: Apply ethical communication principles to a real-world context.

Outcome Measure: COM 4085: "Wonderfully Made" Manifesto

Criteria for Success: Use the AAC&U Written Communication Rubric, Average Score of 75%

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas: (circle one or more but not all five)

- 1. Specialized Knowledge
- 2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
- 3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
- 4. Applied and Collaborative Learning
- 5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Number of students	Score
2026	--	87.5% (average 3.583 out of 4 for each category)

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Threshold met.

Student's final writing assignment in COM 4085 is a "Wonderfully Made" Manifesto (2-3 pages, single spaced) that draws all the way back to an early discussion of Psalm 139:13-14 at the outset of the class: "For you created my inmost being; you knit me together in my mother's womb. I praise you because I am fearfully and wonderfully made." Students write about what they are "wonderfully made" to do. They are directed to be bold, honoring, and humble as they proclaim this in their manifesto.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Since the assessment benchmark was achieved, there are no changes to make at this time. Certainly, the department will review this data in the coming school year and if changes to the assignment or rubric are determined to be in order, the rationale for doing so will be recorded at that time.

Rubric Used

<https://www.aacu.org/initiatives/value-initiative/value-rubrics/value-rubrics-oral-communication>

PLO Data for Communication Studies, Fa2025 - Sp2026

Learning Outcome: PLO #4: Examine how diverse perspectives and backgrounds influence communication.

Outcome Measure: COM 3010 Cultural Infographic/Presentation

Criteria for Success: Cultural Infographic Rubric (See below), Average score 75%+

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas: (circle one or more but not all five)

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data: (here is where you have a table that you add to every year)

	Number of students	Score
2026	--	95% (average 3.8 out of 4 for each category)

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Threshold met.

Infographic/Presentation: For this assignment, students have the opportunity to deepen their understanding of nonverbal communication by selecting, researching, and presenting upon the nonverbal behaviors of a foreign country of their choice. In doing so, each group selects a country of interest to them, and conducts research on how this culture nonverbally communicates. Specifically, each group researches how this culture utilizes at least five of the nonverbal codes covered throughout the class in order to broaden their understanding of how these codes are implemented in a different culture. Students are required to cite a minimum of 5-10 outside sources in APA 7 format. Each group compiles their findings into a professional infographic (50 points) using a platform such as Canva, as well as shares them with their classmates in a 7–8-minute speech (50 points). Each group member will receive the same grade for this assignment and submissions will be graded using the rubric below.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

The high score for this assessment demonstrates a program strength to maintain. At the same time, since the assessment score is so high, the department certainly re-evaluate the assessment tool as well.

Rubric Used: next page

COM 3010 Cultural Infographic Rubric

	Great	Good	Average	Needs Improvement
Course Content (15 pts)	Infographic accurately identifies, and describes at least five nonverbal codes with little to no error.	Infographic identifies, and describes at least five nonverbal codes with some error.	Infographic identifies, and describes fewer than five nonverbal codes with considerable error.	Infographic fails to identify or describe at least five of the nonverbal codes accurately.
Analysis (15 pts)	Infographic accurately applies 5 or more different nonverbal codes to their chosen countries nonverbal behaviors and provides a detailed understanding of how cultural influences may impact nonverbal communication.	Infographic applies 5 or more different nonverbal codes to their chosen countries nonverbal behaviors and provides a somewhat clear understanding of how cultural influences may impact nonverbal communication.	Infographic applies fewer than five nonverbal codes to their chosen countries nonverbal behaviors and provides an unclear understanding of how cultural influences may impact nonverbal communication.	Infographic fails to apply 5 or more different nonverbal codes to their chosen countries nonverbal behaviors and provides little to no understanding of how cultural influences may impact nonverbal communication.
Mechanics (10 pts)	The text meets a reader's expectations for college-level writing in the areas of spelling, grammar, punctuation, and citation rules. Intentional departures from conventions are signaled in the text. One or two sentences may demonstrate mechanical or structural difficulties, but not in a manner which distracts from the meaning of the text.	The text meets a reader's expectations for college writing in the areas of spelling, grammar, punctuation, and citation rules. Intentional departures from conventions may not always be signaled in the text. Some sentences may demonstrate mechanical or structural difficulties, but usually not in a manner which distracts from the meaning of the text.	The text falls short of reader's expectations for college writing in the areas of spelling, grammar, punctuation, and citation rules. Departures from conventions are not signaled. Sentences with mechanical or structural difficulties are confusing.	The text does not meet reader's expectations for college writing. Some problems with mechanics leave the reader wondering. Errors are frequent. Departures from conventions are not signaled.
Citations (5 pts)	5 to 10 credible outside sources are identifiable within the text. Sources are utilized to help strengthen ideas and support claims accurately. Sources are utilized in diverse ways, including direct quotations, summaries, and paraphrasing of material.	5 to 10 somewhat credible outside sources are identifiable within the text. Sources are utilized to help strengthen ideas and support claims. Sources are utilized in somewhat diverse ways, however some repetition may be present.	Fewer than 5 to 10 outside sources are identifiable within the text. Sources strengthen ideas and support claims at times. Sources are not utilized in diverse ways.	No outside sources are identifiable within the text.
Style/ Formatting (5 pts)	Infographic is of professional quality and correctly formatted in accordance with APA seven standards with few to no errors present.	Infographic is of considerable quality and correctly formatted in accordance with APA seven standards with some errors present.	Infographic style is inconsistent and formatting often deviates from APA seven standards.	Infographic is not of professional quality, and little to no APA 7 formatting is utilized.

