



Annual Report on Assessment
Academic Year 2016-2017
School of Communication and Information (SC&I)

Submitted: June 29, 2017

To: Gary Gigliotti, Chair, Assessment Council on Learning Outcomes (ACLO)

From: Dafna Lemish, Associate Dean for Programs
Steve Garwood, Assistant Dean for Instructional Support and Assessment

Contents:

Overview

- pg. 2 School-wide Activities
- pg. 4 Program Highlights
- pg. 6 Summary

Academic Program Reports

Undergraduate

- pg. 7 Communication
- pg. 18 Information Technology and Informatics (ITI)
- pg. 23 Journalism and Media Studies (JMS)
- pg. 27 Digital Communication, Information, and Media (DCIM)

Graduate

- pg. 41 Master of Communication and Media (MCM)(formerly MCIS)
- pg. 51 Master of Information (MI)
- pg. 55 Ph.D. – Interdisciplinary

Administrative Reports

- pg. 64 Instructional Design and Technology Services (IDTS)
- pg. 73 Student Services – Career Services

In response to the School of Communication and Information's AY 2015-2016 Assessment Report, the Executive Council on Assessment (ECA) indicated:

“Significant efforts will need to be made to enhance assessment efforts, both direct and indirect, across all programs and to fully develop a ‘culture of assessment’, and to use evidence drawn from learning outcome assessments to direct curricular development and the student achievement of stated learning outcomes.”

In fall 2016, shortly after the arrival of our new Associate Dean for Programs, Dafna Lemish, we embarked on an information gathering process to improve SC&I's assessment efforts. This process consisted of three activities:

1. A meeting with Gary Gigliotti, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Teaching and Assessment, to seek his input and advice.
2. A review of reports from other Schools at Rutgers so we could see examples of how others have approached assessment practices.
3. Meetings with those doing assessment work at the School of Management and Labor Relations and the School of Social work.

After a review of the information and advice we received, we decided to make progress with each of our individual programs. Wherever possible we focused on direct assessment activities and the development of a process for gathering/analyzing data, including the development or refinement of rubrics. The Associate Dean for Programs and Assistant Dean for Instructional Support and Assessment met with each program director and department chair to discuss potential approaches for improvement. The Assistant Dean and Program Directors then continued to meet through the end of the spring 2017 semester to develop and implement those approaches that were discussed.

This report provides details on these efforts and consists of a summary and examples of activities and reports from each individual academic and administrative program that conduct assessment or assessment related activities. Although we know we have a lot more to do, we have made solid progress in developing approaches to assessment and furthering our culture of assessment.

School-wide Overview

At the school level there are several assessment related activities that we feel are germane to our efforts, which are reported below.

New Dean for Programs



Dafna Lemish, Associate Dean for Programs at SC&I, began her work in October 2016. In this role, Dafna is charged with program and curriculum development and will oversee assessment.

Assistant Dean for Instructional Support and Assessment

Steve Garwood, Assistant Dean for Instructional Support and Assessment, who has been working in the area of assessment at SC&I since 2013 has left Rutgers University as of 6/23/17. We are presently refining the role of the position to have an increased focus on assessment and hope to have a new person in place by early Fall 2017.

Instructional Design and Technology Services (IDTS)

The office of Instructional Design and Technology Services at SC&I consists of the Assistant Dean for Instructional Support and Assessment, a Senior Instructional Design/Technology Specialist, a Canvas Migration Coordinator (Term), an Instructional Design/Technology Assistant (PT), and student staff focused on multimedia work. IDTS continues to work with program directors and instructors across SC&I to create rigorous student-focused learning experiences. Efforts here include course design and development, new instructor orientation and on-boarding, assistance on RU Core assessment activities and general support of instructors. More details are available on the IDTS report on page 56.

Syllabus Template

SC&I continues to use and promote a syllabus template for new courses and for new instructors. The template includes key areas (Description, Learning Objectives, Schedule, etc.) as well as explanations and examples of key elements. Prior to the spring 2017 semester, the template was reviewed and adjusted to be accessible by screen readers. An instructional video was also created and implemented, guiding new faculty on steps to develop a syllabus

- Syllabus template: <https://comminfo.rutgers.edu/sites/default/files/SyllabusTemplate-Accessible.docx>.
- Instructional Video: <http://tutorials.comminfo.rutgers.edu/idts/story.html>

Syllabi Collection

All faculty and instructors submit syllabi to program directors early in each semester. Syllabi are reviewed by program directors for multiple items, including alignment of objectives and assessments. Program directors upload the syllabi to a Sakai site available to all SC&I faculty and administrators, which can also be made available to students on demand.

Curriculum/Course Review Process

Both new courses and those courses revising titles, descriptions, and/or learning objectives go through a rigorous review process. This process has been recently

updated to include new university efforts at cutting redundancies across units and encouraging sharing of information.

- Process: <https://comminfo.rutgers.edu/sites/default/files/curriculum-review-processes-at-sci-may-2017.pdf>
- New Course cover sheet:
<https://comminfo.rutgers.edu/sites/default/files/clean-course-review-cover-sheet-new-course-proposal.docx>
- Revised Course cover sheet:
<https://comminfo.rutgers.edu/sites/default/files/clean-course-eview-cover-sheet-change-to-existing-course.docx>

Career Services

The career services area in our Student Services office, in existence since May 2015, conducts data collection, management, analysis, and reporting on information about employment, industry trends, and other relevant career services information for students, faculty, and staff. This position works collaboratively with University Career Services to ensure SC&I students are offered career information. More details are available on the Student Services report on page 64.

Assessment Reporting Template

One modification we indicated in last year's assessment report was on streamlining the assessment reporting process to help manage time-on-task and focus programs on required criteria. For this assessment reporting cycle a Reporting Template was created and distributed to program directors: <http://bit.ly/2kKy9qD>. Each program utilized this template and indicated that reporting was more straight forward.

Program Highlights

Undergraduate

Communication

The undergraduate program in Communication created a direct assessment process to analyze student abilities across all of their program goals utilizing four central/core courses. Rubrics were developed for each goal and faculty teaching each course selected 1-3 of the program goals to assess. In the upcoming year the program will review their approach to ensure they acquire actionable feedback in a timely manner.

Information Technology and Informatics (ITI)

The ITI program created a direct assessment process around a major course project in the Management of Technological Organizations course. Rubrics were developed for each program learning goal and, working with the course instructors, a process was developed to directly determine student abilities. Based on this assessment, the

program will seek to increase students' knowledge and abilities in determined areas. They will also be reviewing the assessment/survey approaches from an outside organization that works with women in technology to determine if their assessment tools can be integrated in their assessment approaches.

Journalism and Media Studies (JMS)

The JMS program prioritized their direct assessment activities on a program goal focused on writing. This is something they had identified previously as an area where they wanted to see improvement. While rubrics were developed for each program goal, extra time was spent refining the rubric used to assess assignments in two courses that students generally take toward the end of their time in the program – Media Production and Design and Critical Issues in Sports Media. Based on the analysis of the results the program will be increasing time spent on various styles of writing to best prepare students for careers after they graduate.

Digital Communication, Information, and Media (DCIM)(Minor)

The DCIM program director focused her efforts on creating a more detailed, but streamlined assessment process that included defining criteria, refining assessment prompts, creating rubrics, and detailing a long term assessment plan. Assessment activities are conducted in the Capstone course for the minor. Based on feedback discovered through the assessment process, and in consideration of the migration of courses from eCollege to Canvas, the program revised the majority of courses to provide better organization and clearer directions for students.

Graduate

Master of Communication and Media (MCM) formerly - Master of Communication and Information Studies (MCIS)

In AY 2016-2017, SC&I undertook an analysis of the MCIS program to improve its competitive position and best serve present and future students. This process resulted in a name change for the program to Master of Communication and Media (MCM). In this upcoming academic year, the program will be reviewing/revising the program level learning goals based on changes that were implemented based on the analysis conducted. The program will also review and update the ePortfolio and Capstone courses.

Master of Information (MI)

The MI program continued the program revisions it began in AY 2014-2015. During this year, the program continued to build curriculum including concentration areas and individual courses in response to their initial plans and based on market needs. Additionally, faculty in the MI program, under the direction of the program director, revisited and revised their program learning goals. These will be finalized and voted on in early Fall 2017. In the next year the MI program will also be going through their re-accreditation process with the American Library Association (ALA).

Interdisciplinary Ph.D.

The Ph.D. program focused on two specific assessment areas: review of program learning goals and developing a direct assessment method for one program level learning goal. The direct assessment approach was developed using the qualifying exam process and the creation of a rubric correlated to program learning goal #1. Given the success of the direct assessment approach and the meaningful feedback received, the Ph.D. program will next review learning goal #2.

Summary

In AY 2016-2017 SC&I focused heavily on addressing direct assessment of student learning to compliment indirect assessment (survey) activities that have been well established in most programs (other than those who do their own data collection). Overall this worked well and programs were very active in developing their assessment processes.

For AY 2017-2018 there will be some adjustments to the approaches taken to improve the effectiveness of the processes that were developed and those programs that were in transition (MI and MCM) will need to develop direct assessment activities. Beyond that different programs have different priorities (see individual reports) and the new Assistant Dean for Instructional Support and Assessment, which has an increased focus on assessment activities, will need to work with each individual program to further develop the culture of assessment at SC&I.



Program Name: Undergraduate Communication Major

Program Director: Brian Householder

Department Chair: Craig Scott

Program Learning Goals:

<https://comminfo.rutgers.edu/academics/undergraduate/communication-major>

1. Understanding of fundamental communication perspectives, theories and concepts
2. Ability to use communication theories and concepts to analyze human behavior
3. Proficiency in gathering and using evidence to study and understand communication processes and consequences
4. Competency in written and oral communication in varied settings
5. Ability to apply communication theories and concepts to social and professional life

Program Learning Goals last reviewed: Fall 2013

Syllabi for Fall 2016 semester: Collected/Uploaded Syllabi Not collected

Syllabi for Spring 2017 semester: Collected/Uploaded Syllabi Not collected

Indirect Assessment Survey conducted: Yes No

- If yes, please attach executive summary of survey results
- If no, how was general feedback about the program collected?

See attached PDF.

Direct Assessment Method (of at least one program learning goal)

- If direct assessment was conducted please indicate brief summary of the approach to data collection/analysis and attach documentation/rubric(s) as needed.
- Direct assessment was conducted via a purposive sample of four class in the UG Communication program: Communication and Technology COM-354 (N-55), Interpersonal Communication COM-355(N-70), Organizational Communication COM-357 (N-63) and Persuasive Communication COM-359 (N-92). These four courses are typically taken by students that have completed at least 15 credits hours of our 33 credit hour major. Additionally, as part of the program requirements all students must take at least one of these four courses.
- During the Fall 2016 semester, department faculty in conjuncture with the SCI office of Instructional Support and Assessment worked to create generic rubrics that reflected the five program learning outcomes (see attached). Spring 2017 was our maiden attempt to apply and validate the newly designed rubric.
- Each course instructor was allowed to pick 1 to 3 of the program objectives that s/he wished to measure and felt were central to the instruction of the course. The

instructor was also given free choice to pick which assessment prompt/s would be used to measure the selected program outcome. The following table reflects the Course, Program objective/s selected and Assessment Prompt Description:

Course Number	Program Objective/s	Assessment Prompt/s
354	3, 4, 5	Technology Report
355	2	Assimilation Paper
357	4	Power Presentation
359	1,3,5	Persuasion Proposal Paper

(More detailed descriptions are in the “Assessment prompts” attachment.)

Direct Assessment Results

- Please provide a brief overview of the results (e.g. What did you discover? Did the results align with the indirect survey results?).
- The following table contains a summary of the assessment results:

Course #	Objective #	Unsatisfactory	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
354	3	11	8	16	20
354	4	0	0	35	20
354	5	0	4	35	16
355	2	6	9	36	19
357	4	9	20	23	11
359	1	10	40	22	20
359	2	7	27	37	21
359	5	10	20	26	26

- Overall, the direct assessment results strongly reflect elements of the indirect assessment efforts. Students seem to have overall satisfactory outcomes with the greatest struggles occurring with theory (student seem to not see the need), quality research integrations and oral communication.

Close the Loop Activities

- Please provide an indication of modification/refinement of pedagogy, curriculum, assessment tool, and/or learning goals based on assessment results.
- What is your plan for next year? (e.g. focus on particular goals, change assessment method/rubric)
- Due to the late point in the Spring 17 Semester that assessment data was collected, limited reflection has occurred. Most of our faculty conduct these assessment items late in the term and most began a rigorous slate of National and International conferences in May. That said, the department curriculum committee proposed the

addition of COM-380 (Public Speaking) to the Core requirement set for the major. This increases the credit count to 36 credit hours for the major. Ongoing and informal assessment had previously identified that oral communication outcomes of our majors had been lacking. Public Speaking COM-380 has been an elective option, but only 3% of our majors had been enrolling. We feel this change should cause significant gain in program objective #4.

- Starting Fall 17, our plan is to have a detailed assessment reflection meeting. This meeting should include a discussion of our newly developed program assessment rubrics (updates/changes), ways to collect more data at the culmination of the program (current core courses selected are more at program mid-point and thus students might have different results at the terminus of the program), the role and place of theory in the program and the importance of high quality research integration into student work.

Additional Information

- What challenges/difficulties did you face in this process?
- If there are other items related to program evaluation or student learning that you would like to share please do so
- Only a few challenges/difficulties occurred. The lateness that we collect the data makes it impossible to do meaningful close-the-loop activities in Spring. Shifting assessments, going forward, the prompts used and assessments in each of these classes might vary significantly.
- Overall, this report represents significant strides in the assessment of the Communication UG program. Previously, we had been reliant on indirect assessment and had no formal plan for assessing student work. In the last year, we have developed a common rubric, made an initial strategic pilot run with that rubric in high-density courses representative of our overall population. Going forward, we will be able to engage in longitudinal comparisons and have more detailed discussions based on richer data.

Program Learning Goal Rubrics

1. Understanding of fundamental communication perspectives, theories and concepts				
Level	Unsatisfactory	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary



Description	Incorrectly explains details of theories and concepts	Explains details of theories and concepts with minor errors.	Clearly and accurately explains details of the theories and concepts.	Synthesizes different perspectives and clearly and accurately explains details of the theories and concepts.
Tally				
Notes (1-2 Paragraphs)	What strengths/challenges do you see in this area based on the student work that you reviewed?			

2. Ability to use communication theories and concepts to analyze human behavior

Level	Unsatisfactory	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
Description (Corresponds to RU CORE SC-n)	<p>Fails to describe or apply concepts about human and social behavior to particular questions or situations.</p> <p>Demonstrates a lack of understanding and inadequate analysis. Analysis is superficial based on opinions and preferences rather than critical analysis.</p>	<p>Satisfactorily recounts the application of concepts about human and social behavior presented in the course materials. Makes some assessment of the relative strengths of the concepts applied.</p> <p>Demonstrates general understanding with limited critical analysis. Summarizes perspectives, counter-arguments, or opposing positions</p>	<p>Clearly explains and applies concepts about human and social behavior in the context of applying them to particular questions or situations. Considers the strengths and weaknesses of the concepts applied.</p> <p>Demonstrates an understanding and some critical analysis. Adequately compares/contrasts perspectives, counter-arguments, or opposing positions but broader connections and/or implications are not</p>	<p>Demonstrates an advanced understanding of a range of concepts about human and social behavior and applies them to particular questions or situations with skill. Considers the strengths and weaknesses of the concepts applied, and suggests possible extensions of the analysis in new directions.</p> <p>Demonstrates a sophisticated understanding and careful, critical analysis. Compares/contrasts perspectives,</p>



			as thoroughly explored	considers counter arguments or opposing positions, and draws original and thoughtful conclusions with future implications.
Tally				
Notes (1-2 Paragraphs)	What strengths/challenges do you see in this area based on the student work that you reviewed?			

3. Proficiency in gathering and using evidence to study and understand communication processes and consequences				
Level	Unsatisfactory	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
Description (Corresponds to RU CORE WC-v)	Fails to provide evaluation and assessment of evidence/data, arguments, and counter-arguments drawn from multiple sources.	Provides satisfactory evaluation and assessment of evidence/data, arguments, and counter-arguments drawn from multiple sources. Satisfactorily incorporates this material.	Provides strong evaluation and critical assessment of evidence/data, arguments, and counter-arguments drawn from multiple sources. Successfully uses this analysis in advancing thesis or for placing hypothesis testing in appropriate context.	Provides sophisticated evaluation and critical assessment of evidence/ data, arguments, and counter-arguments drawn from multiple sources. Artfully uses this analysis in advancing thesis or for placing hypothesis testing in appropriate context.
Tally				
Notes (1-2 Paragraphs)	What strengths/challenges do you see in this area based on the student work that you reviewed?			

4. Competency in written and oral communication in varied settings				
Level	Unsatisfactory	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
Description (Corresponds to RU CORE WC-t)	<p>Does not address topic, or does so in a way that is uninformative, inaccurate, and/or misleading. Communication is confusing and contains numerous errors.</p> <p>Language choices are sometimes unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the Presentation.</p>	<p>Addresses topic and satisfactorily adheres to the format prescribed by the course. Communication presents a coherent narrative, exposition, or argument.</p> <p>Language choices are appropriate, but generally do not add to presentation effectiveness.</p>	<p>Addresses topic soundly and effectively; communication is well-argued and largely free from word-choice, grammar, spelling or organizational errors.</p> <p>Language choices are Imaginative and compelling; choices generally enhance presentation effectiveness.</p>	<p>Addresses topic at an advanced, professional level; communication is well-argued, effectively presented, and free of word-choice, grammar, spelling or organizational errors.</p> <p>Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling; choices greatly enhance presentation effectiveness.</p>
Tally				
Notes (1-2 Paragraphs)	What strengths/challenges do you see in this area based on the student work that you reviewed?			

5. Ability to apply communication theories and concepts to social and professional life				
Level	Unsatisfactory	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
Description (Corresponds to RU CORE WC-s1)	Fails to make a cogent argument or to offer sound analysis of any but the simplest ideas. Application of theories/concepts is absent. Not able to make connection between situations or interactions in social/professional settings in terms of a communication theory or theories.	Presents a satisfactory argument and analysis following the strictures of the course. Application of theories/concepts is understandable. Connects situations or interactions in social/professional settings in terms of a communication theory or theories.	Makes a clear argument, based on plausible reasoning. Sustains an argument throughout the analysis. Application of theories/concepts is clear and consistent. . Explains situations or interactions in social/professional settings in terms of a communication theory or theories.	Presents complex ideas as a clear and compelling argument. Insightful, well-reasoned, and original analysis Application of theories/concepts is compelling, precisely applied, memorable, and strongly supported. Clearly and accurately explains situations or interactions in social/professional settings in terms of a communication theory or theories.
Tally				
Notes (1-2 Paragraphs)	What strengths/challenges do you see in this area based on the student work that you reviewed?			

Communication Assessment Prompts

354- Technology Report:

Each report should include the following three components:

- (1) ***Historical, contemporary, and future trajectory of the technology.***
Describe the history and background of the technology. When and how did it emerge and develop? What were its predecessors? When and how did it take off and become popular? Discuss of the future of the technology. How might it evolve and change over time? Will it survive much longer or will it be replaced by competitors? Why?
- (2) ***Technology and social difference: user demographics.***
Discuss the composition of the people using that technology. Are there any social or demographic groups that are particularly likely to use it? Are there any groups that are excluded from using it by choice or necessity? Find and cite data that supports your answer.
- (3) ***Communication & technology: theory application.***
Select one of the theories or themes covered in class that has a bearing on the technology you are examining. Discuss how it applies to the digital service you are writing about. For instance, you can evaluate role of that technology for self-presentation, forming and maintaining social relationships, civic and political engagement, health and well-being, news and journalism, privacy, censorship, and so on. Make sure to include key concepts and ideas we have discussed in class.

Reports should comply with the following requirements:

- (1) ***Formatting and length***
The report should be **15 pages** long, double-spaced, using a 12-point font with a 1-inch margin on all sides. You do not need a title page, but you should include a title and the names of all group members.
- (2) ***References and bibliography***
The report should cite **at least 10** relevant academic works. Additional citations may come from other types of sources (e.g. stories from reputable and credible media outlets or industry reports). The citations and bibliography should be formatted in APA style (one place where you can learn more about it is the Purdue Online Writing Lab).
- (3) ***Writing quality and organization*** All group members need to carefully proofread the final draft of the report before submitting it. You should confirm that it meets all the requirements and make sure that the text is clearly written, grammatically correct, and free of spelling errors. Poor writing will negatively affect your grade.

355-Assimilation Paper:

The assimilation paper assignment combines and examines information from three theories discussed in class to explain a phenomenon common in identity formation or close relationships. For this paper, you will choose any phenomenon that you all have witnessed or experienced in the context of personal identity or personal relationships. Some examples of topics include, but are not limited to, self-esteem, body image, narcissism, shyness, jealousy, sexual intimacy, conflict, relational abuse, aggressiveness, humor, “cold feet,” stalking, long distance relationships, power, emotion, infidelity, “hooking up,” “friends with benefits,” sexting, online dating, speed dating, and divorce, to name a few. You should pick a topic that you consider to be a fascinating aspect of relationships and human interaction. The paper should begin with a literature review about that phenomenon. Then, you must select three theories that we covered in class and use the assumptions of those theories to explain your phenomenon of choice. How would the theory account for this phenomenon in people or their relationships? To what would the theory attribute this phenomenon? What would the theory suggest as a means of addressing this phenomenon? To accomplish this task, you should first summarize the assumptions of the theory. Then, link those assumptions to aspects of your phenomenon of interest to explain how the theory accounts for the phenomenon. The goal of this paper is to move beyond summary to synthesis. How do these theories inform this phenomenon of interest? How do their assumptions differ and how are they similar?

357- Power presentations and Case Studies:

Power presentations are brief and concise oral presentations that you prepare in groups. They are presented orally by group representatives. These are meant to be high-impact, short oral presentations that deliver important information about the topic assigned and how that information is applied to a real-world organizational situation. These are content-rich but last only a few minutes (hence, their name “*power* presentations”). Each group will also hand in brief paper to report on content from the course that was used to generate the associated P^2 . Credit will only be given to those members whose names are included on a roster of participants submitted by group members via Sakai

359- Persuasion Proposal:

Paper Purpose

1. To develop your ability to design or carry out persuasion research.
2. To develop your ability to complete a major project.
3. To develop your library research skills.
4. To develop your writing skills.
5. To enhance your understanding of what is involved in doing persuasion theory based work.

Assignment:

Evaluation: This project is worth up to 100 points. It will be evaluated based on the following general criteria:

1. Completing all parts of the assignment
2. The quality of the content of each section
3. The quality of your writing
4. Properly following the APA style format (expect for executive summary)
5. Following instructions

Persuasion Research Prospectus: Produce a proposal for an applied persuasion attempt for a profit or Non-profit entity (Could be a GO or NGO). The proposal should be written as if it would be submitted to a hybrid panel (board of directors) made up of organizational leaders and academics. Your paper must be based or grounded in one of the following concepts (Central Route, Perceived Behavioral Control, Subjective Norms, Ego Involvement, or Utilitarian Function), Your Choice!

Your prospectus should include the following sections:

1. Title page (separate page)
2. Executive Summary (separate page) –Not an Abstract
3. Introduction (approximately ½ page)
 - a) attention getting opening
 - b) argument in favor of the importance of the concept and brief description of organization
 - c) brief explanation of what this proposal hopes to accomplish (thesis)
 - d) a clear preview of what is to follow
4. Literature review/Rationale (largest part of the project, probably 4 pages). It should cover the following, but not necessarily in the following order:
 - (a) describe what is known about the organization (goals, messages, audiences....) and address the market landscape (what are others doing in the segment?), describe your demographic of focus
 - (b) explain what is known about your persuasion concept
 - (c) Describe a “new” message for the organization and link what previous research has shown about your concept to your proposed organizational message. Include a mock-up, interaction script or storyboard in the appendix items.
 - (d) Make an argument that your theory and the new message strategy will improve on current message attempts (based in research)
5. Discussion: (1/2 page) Explain how the new message would impact the organization you would apply this study to.
 - (a) What are the proposals limitations?
 - (b) What are the proposals benefits?
 - (c) Where should future persuasive attempts related to this go?
6. References: should be at least 10 (using APA style). At least 8 of those sources must be academic journals.

Program Name: Information Technology and Informatics



Program Director: Sharon Stoerger
Department Chair: Ross Todd

Program Learning Goals:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CPCeHgalSPXm3Dlh48aV8zS00uGayVRvm2fNx_1y7qY/edit?usp=sharing

1. [CREATE] Develop new technological solutions to real world problems through innovative, collaborative, and computation approaches.
2. [COMMUNICATE] Communicate to professional stakeholders utilizing evolving technological platforms.
3. [CRITICAL THINKING] Analyze the ever-changing interactions of people and technology, regarding pertinent social, cultural, philosophical, ethical, legal, and economic issues.
4. [COORDINATE] Evaluate, implement, use, and manage of information technologies for a wide range of organizations and corporations.

Program Learning Goals last reviewed: __Fall 2016_____

Syllabi for Fall 2016 semester: Collected/Uploaded Syllabi Not collected

Syllabi for Spring 2017 semester: Collected/Uploaded Syllabi Not collected

Indirect Assessment Survey conducted: Yes No

- If yes, please attach executive summary of survey results
- If no, how was general feedback about the program collected?

Summary of the Indirect Assessment Survey results:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0BzOBMQc5PteieG0xekFUSmcydVE/view?usp=sharing>

For the most part, the students reported being satisfied with the ITI program. They value the hands-on, technical, and real world application approach that has been integrated into the courses. Students report that they enjoy the course content and appreciate the balance between theory and practice. They also like the variety of technical paths and courses they can select. Further, the faculty who teach for the ITI program gained favorable recognition by the students.

There is always room for improvement, especially when it comes to adding more courses and sections each semester. This is often related to availability of classroom and computer lab space in the School of Communication and Information and on the Rutgers campus. Filling the instructor openings for the additional courses and sections is another issue. We are trying to address both as much as possible in order to meet the student demand.

In addition to requesting more classes, the students often express a desire for a greater number of programming courses. The results from the current indirect assessment report paint a similar picture. Many students want more higher-level programming courses - ones that challenge them. While the faculty members appreciate the students' desire to acquire

knowledge and skills, developing a curriculum that emphasizes programming is outside the mission of the ITI program. The ITI program is not computer science, and this can be difficult for some students to comprehend.

To address this issue, the ITI director has been meeting with faculty and administrators in Computer Science and the Rutgers Honors College to develop resources (e.g., website, marketing materials, etc.) to articulate the differences between ITI, Computer Science, and Engineering. Our goal is to make it clear to students what differences exist among the programs, why they would choose one major over the other, and what they can expect when they select one of these educational pathways.

Direct Assessment Method (of at least one program learning goal)

- If direct assessment was conducted please indicate brief summary of the approach to data collection/analysis and attach documentation/rubric(s) as needed.

Our charge was to view data beyond the results that were collected through student self-report surveys. We believed that obtaining the instructor perspective on how students were meeting the program learning goals would give us a richer understanding of the learning outcomes.

The process to collect direct assessment data involved working with instructors in the ITI program. After much discussion about which ITI course(s) might be appropriate for this type of data collection activity and give us meaningful results, the Management of Technological Organizations course (04:547:210; ITI 210) was selected. Drs. Steve Garwood (SC&I Assistant Dean for Instructional Support and Assessment) and Sharon Stoerger (Director - ITI Program) met with the instructors for ITI 210 to review the ITI program goals, their course assignments, and ways to incorporate the data collection process into their current assessment practices.

This group determined that the major project for ITI 210, which spans the semester, would be logical. A description of that group project can be found at:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1kh22uWgMEuHOKtwZcJZnQ2GsJ34tGliLfg1JVVMqeSE/edit?usp=sharing>

The rubric used to collect the direct assessment data is available at:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1GpoZpXQNmwXRJZVrHCpkjW-reFqEAfF6ZGH2A3V5Eg0/edit?usp=sharing>

This assessment process was pilot tested in Spring 2017. Based on the results and instructor feedback, we will be revising the process as needed.

Direct Assessment Results

- Please provide a brief overview of the results (e.g. What did you discover?, Did the results align with the indirect survey results?).

The findings indicate that the group project works well as part of the Management of Technological Organization (ITI 210) course. This project provides an experience that is similar to those that many of the students will have in the early stages of their careers. As with all aspects of the course, the ITI 210 instructors and the ITI director will continue to refine the group project and the course as a whole. Any modifications will be based on input from students and faculty.

A detailed description of the results can be found at:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CXeNy7d0_N6PzuTbNeBqKIL84sKjCBVSQqHDoXIvs70/edit?usp=sharing

When comparing the indirect and direct assessment results, the instructors' findings were more favorable than the students' self-reports. For the direct assessment, the students' work on this project was assessed by the instructors in terms of the program goal categories - create, think critically, communicate, and coordinate. All group projects were at the "Exemplary" or "Accomplished" levels for each of the categories. Students' performance was the strongest for the "Communicate" and "Coordinate" categories at 100% and 80%, respectively.

This is not to say that students' work when viewed through the lens of the other goals was weak. Indeed, the majority of the students performed at the "Exemplary" level for the critical thinking (around 74%) and create (a little more than 53%) categories, as well. While students were not as strong in terms of their ability to satisfy the "Create" goal, the instructors report that even the "Accomplished" work was almost at the "Exemplary" level. Specific details about the students' work and their performance on this assignment as a group are described in the [direct assessment results document](#).

In general, the students were able to identify problems, develop solutions, create a prototype, and present their approach in an effective manner.

The fact that the instructors rated the students' fulfillment of the ITI program goals higher than the students is somewhat surprising. Yet, the connection between the classroom and the workplace is not always obvious to students. To many of them, the work they do in classes is merely a way to check off a box.

One thing the ITI director has encouraged instructors to do is to highlight the way course materials and assignments are contributing to skills that can be showcased to employers.

Close the Loop Activities

- Please provide an indication of modification/refinement of pedagogy, curriculum, assessment tool, and/or learning goals based on assessment results.

- What is your plan for next year? (e.g. focus on particular goals, change assessment method/rubric)

The ITI 210 group project worked well this term as evidenced by the quality of the four projects. However, there are several modifications that the instructors will make for the Fall 2017 term. The primary change is to add lectures and assignments on basic finance in order to make sure that students understand that aspect of the project. That change will both improve the integration of the in-class work with the group project and the relevance of the course to student career requirements. A secondary change is to continue to refine the assignment descriptions for each stage of the project based on input from the class.

In preparing for next year, these assessment results will be shared with faculty in the Department of Library and Information Science (LIS). The LIS Curriculum Committee will review the results, as well, and develop a plan to work on modifications to selected courses and the curriculum as a whole.

Also, the ITI director has been working with a consultant from the National Center for Women in Information Technology (NCWIT) as part of a collaborative project with the Rutgers Honors College and the Computer Science Department to improve the recruitment and retention of underrepresented groups in technology-related fields. This work is being funded by Johnson & Johnson. NCWIT has a number of assessment tools designed to evaluate the student experience in the major (SEM). The ITI director plans to review these survey instruments to determine whether they could be modified and incorporated into the current indirect and direct assessment processes. Data that are collected that address questions included in the SEM could then be matched and evaluated based on results from other technology programs outside the Rutgers campus.

Additional Information

- What challenges/difficulties did you face in this process?
- If there are other items related to program evaluation or student learning that you would like to share please do so.

The processes to collect indirect and direct assessment data worked well. However, one challenge was simply getting instructors involved in the indirect assessment process to provide a few minutes of one class session to the survey administration and data collection. Also, 200 responses were collected from the indirect assessment process, and there was a considerable amount of data to review and analyze.

The direct assessment process was less problematic in that it was complementary to the evaluation of the identified project. Thus, there were no problems in completing the direct assessment because the instructors assess the project after each stage (1-4). That approach used is very similar to this assessment.



Program Name: Journalism and Media Studies

Program Director: Steven Miller

Department Chair: Susan Keith

Program Learning Goals:

<https://comminfo.rutgers.edu/academics/undergraduate/journalism-and-media-studies-major>

1. **Expression** Write fluently, produce content, and tell stories across evolving media platforms.
2. **Analysis** Demonstrate analytical and critical thinking, formulate research questions and use appropriate methods, evaluate and use appropriate sources. Identify and gather relevant data in journalism and media contexts.
3. **Ethics** Develop a critical understanding of the ethical standards and tensions in journalistic and media practices, and institutions, and apply this understanding to academic and professional activities.
4. **Power** Critically analyze issues of diversity, difference, social justice, and power in media in a global context.
5. **Systems** Explain social, political, cultural, and economic dimensions of media technologies, institutions, practices, policies, and regulations.
6. **Innovation** Innovate with tools and technologies appropriate for media professions.

Program Learning Goals last reviewed: _____

Syllabi for Fall 2016 semester: Collected/Uploaded Syllabi Not collected

Syllabi for Spring 2017 semester: Collected/Uploaded Syllabi Not collected

Indirect Assessment Survey conducted: Yes No

- If yes, please attach executive summary of survey results **See Attached**
- If no, how was general feedback about the program collected?

Direct Assessment Method (of at least one program learning goal)

- If direct assessment was conducted please indicate brief summary of the approach to data collection/analysis and attach documentation/rubric(s) as needed.

JMS conducted a Direct Assessment in two courses during the Spring 2017 semester, 04:567:345 Media Production and Design and 04:567:434 Critical Issues in Sports Media. The former is being taught by Rachel Kremen, the latter by Steven Miller.

The object of the assessment was to evaluate students under the JMS Learning Goal “[EXPRESSION] Write fluently, produce content and tell stories across evolving media platforms.” To accomplish this, both instructors gave the students a writing assignment. These stories and papers were reviewed based on the Learning Goal.

Direct Assessment Results

- Please provide a brief overview of the results (e.g. What did you discover?, Did the results align with the indirect survey results?).

In total, 58 submissions (20 and 38) reviewed for these two separate projects. 16 were Exemplary, 23 Accomplished, 18 Developing, and 1 Unsatisfactory. The one, consistent factor for both was a lack of student knowledge about the appropriate style in which to write and ignorance about the area in which they were working. It appeared that the students who were in the Developing and Unsatisfactory categories had blindly gone into the course/area of study based on their expectations, not reality. This had a great impact on their ability to write well in an Exemplary or Accomplished manner. Those who did perform well had a better understanding and, as such, could write more fluently, produce better content, and tell more vivid stories

Close the Loop Activities

- Please provide an indication of modification/refinement of pedagogy, curriculum, assessment tool, and/or learning goals based on assessment results.
- What is your plan for next year? (e.g. focus on particular goals, change assessment method/rubric)

Our plan for next year is to alter some of the classes at the beginning of these courses to include more detailed activities that will be utilized to increase student understanding of the material. We will also add a more intense concentration on melding appropriate writing style and better research methods earlier in the semester.

The instructors will also use the students strengths, love of the subject matter and dedication to the craft, in developing activities which will enable them to use these attributes to help them better understand the material

<u>RUBRIC FOR 04:567:434 CRITICAL ISSUES IN SPORTS MEDIA</u>				
DEPARTMENT LEARNING GOAL ASSESSED:				
[EXPRESSION] Write fluently, produce content and tell stories across evolving media platforms				
Level	Unsatisfactory	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
Description (Corresponds)	Does not address topic, or does so in a way that is	Addresses topic and satisfactorily adheres to	Addresses topic soundly and effectively;	Addresses topic at an advanced, professional



to RU CORE WC-t)	and Information	the format prescribed by the course.	communication is well- argued and largely free	level; communication is well-argued, effectively
	<p>uninformative, inaccurate, and/or misleading. Communication is confusing and contains numerous errors.</p> <p>Writing style is inappropriate for the type of writing (research paper, article) and/or platform (e.g. paper, blog).</p>	<p>Communication presents a coherent narrative, exposition, or argument.</p> <p>Writing style is somewhat appropriate for the type of writing (research paper, article) and/or platform (e.g. paper, blog).</p>	<p>from word-choice, grammar, spelling or organizational errors.</p> <p>Writing style is mostly appropriate for the type of writing (research paper, article) and/or platform (e.g. paper, blog).</p>	<p>presented, and free of word-choice, grammar, spelling or organizational errors.</p> <p>Writing style is always appropriate for the type of writing (research paper, article) and/or platform (e.g. paper, blog).</p>
Tally	0	13	13	12
Notes (1-2 paragraphs)	<p>What are the greatest strengths and common challenges displayed in student work in this area?</p> <p>The greatest strength and challenge for these students is their love and knowledge of the subject matter. Almost all of them took this course because they followed sports and knew even the most rudimentary fact about their chosen favorite. But, this also worked against them when writing the paper. Those who fell into the developing category wrote like a blogging fan, which was inappropriate, as opposed to treating this like a researcher/writer. Exemplary submissions were able to bridge that divide and provided great research, style, and writing. These were also the papers which had fewer, if any, errors in verbiage, spelling, and/or organization.</p> <p>In the future, we hope to address these problems with more preparations in previous courses and earlier in the semester in this offering. The Department is also looking to rectify the issue by building up the research writing element of our introductory Writing for Media course.</p>			



RUBRIC FOR 04:567:345 MEDIA PRODUCTION AND DESIGN

DEPARTMENT LEARNING GOAL ASSESSED:

[EXPRESSION] Write fluently, produce content and tell stories across evolving media platforms

Level	Unsatisfactory	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
Description (Corresponds to RU CORE WC-t)	<p>Does not address topic, or does so in a way that is uninformative, inaccurate, and/or misleading. Communication is confusing and contains numerous errors.</p> <p>Writing style is inappropriate for the type of writing (research paper, article) and/or platform (e.g. paper, blog).</p>	<p>Addresses topic and satisfactorily adheres to the format prescribed by the course. Communication presents a coherent narrative, exposition, or argument.</p> <p>Writing style is somewhat appropriate for the type of writing (research paper, article) and/or platform (e.g. paper, blog).</p>	<p>Addresses topic soundly and effectively; communication is well-argued and largely free from word-choice, grammar, spelling or organizational errors.</p> <p>Writing style is mostly appropriate for the type of writing (research paper, article) and/or platform (e.g. paper, blog).</p>	<p>Addresses topic at an advanced, professional level; communication is well-argued, effectively presented, and free of word-choice, grammar, spelling or organizational errors.</p> <p>Writing style is always appropriate for the type of writing (research paper, article) and/or platform (e.g. paper, blog).</p>
Tally	1	5	10	4
Notes (1-2 paragraphs)	<p>What are the greatest strengths and common challenges displayed in student work in this area?</p> <p>The greatest strength of my students is their persistence. They are very willing to write and rewrite their drafts, conduct additional interviews and seek out extra content. The majority of students put forth tremendous effort.</p> <p>The greatest issue is that many come with no understanding of magazine writing and what makes it different from other writing styles. While we certainly review these concepts in class, this course is largely about production and design – not writing. So the lack of prior experience, means that there is a steep learning curve for many students as they work to complete a feature magazine article. (There is oddly no prerequisite in Magazine Writing for this course.) (The one unsatisfactory grade, however, is for a student who did not submit an assignment.)</p>			

Program Name: Digital Communication, Information, and Media

Program Director: Mary Chayko

Department Chair: n/a

Program Learning Goals:

<https://comminfo.rutgers.edu/academics/undergraduate/dcim>

1. Critically read, interpret, synthesize, and evaluate online information from media sources and effectively articulate an analysis and formulate opinions on relevant topics.
2. Assess the influence of virtual environments on interpersonal and group interactions.
3. Identify communication opportunities and challenges when working with others in digital and virtual environments.
4. Successfully participate and enhance collaborative working relationships in virtual environments.
5. Select and apply appropriate digital tools and media that help design messages to communicate, persuade and build relationships with stakeholders across space, time and cultures.

Program Learning Goals last reviewed: Spring 2016

Syllabi for Fall 2016 semester: Collected/Uploaded Syllabi Not collected

Syllabi for Spring 2017 semester: Collected/Uploaded Syllabi Not collected

Indirect Assessment Survey conducted: Yes No

- If yes, please attach executive summary of survey results
- If no, how was general feedback about the program collected?

The direct assessment undertaken by the program in 2016-2017 assessed three program goals via two multi-question discussion board prompts. A great deal of feedback about the program was yielded in the process, and the indirect assessment survey was not conducted.

In early 2017, I reconfigured our direct assessment plan to focus on one goal per year (see Close-the-Loop Activities, below). With this more streamlined plan, I intend to resume the use of an indirect assessment survey for the collection of general feedback in 2017-2018.

Direct Assessment Method (of at least one program learning goal)

- If direct assessment was conducted please indicate brief summary of the approach to data collection/analysis and attach documentation/rubric(s) as needed.

Assessment for the DCIM Program Goals was conducted in one section of the DCIM Capstone course in Fall 2016 using two online (eCollege) discussion boards during the semester. Discussion boards took place during Week 11 (Networking Discussion Board) and Week 14 (Virtual Collaboration Discussion Board), and were integrated with the course materials scheduled during those weeks. Each discussion prompt, developed by the DCIM Program Director, was set up to evaluate 2-3 Program Goals (see Goals and Discussion Prompts section). The instructor for the course was Sheena Raja.

Though students were not aware that the discussions were part of the DCIM Program Assessment, the prompts represented meaningful topics addressed throughout the DCIM curriculum. They were introduced in the classroom and discussions took place in an online forum in the course learning management system eCollege. Students were asked to post a response to the discussion prompt on a Monday and asked to comment substantively on at least three other classmates' posts by Wednesday. Discussions were included in a student's overall participation grade and points were assigned based on timeliness/responsiveness.

The instructor of the course and the DCIM Program Director reviewed and discussed the posts and comments made by all 14 students enrolled in the course (see Results section). A rubric was not used. However, in the reconfiguration of the direct assessment plan to take effect in 2017 (see Close-the-Loop Activities, below), a more comprehensive process for direct assessment has been developed, with rubrics created to enable the assessment of each program goal.

Goals and Discussion Prompts

The program goals and corresponding online discussion prompts implemented in this section of DCIM Capstone course during the Fall 2016 semester are as follows:

Week	Program Goals	Online Discussion Prompts
11	<p>Program Goal #2: Assess the influence of virtual environments on interpersonal and group interactions.</p> <p>Program Goal #5: Select and apply appropriate digital tools and media and design messages to communicate, persuade and build relationships with stakeholders distributed across space, time and cultures.</p>	<p>“Networking Discussion Board”</p> <p>Imagine that you have to interview two different individuals, from two countries other than the USA and other than any other country in which you have lived, to obtain information for your capstone project. You need not select actual people, but think about the types of people that it would be useful to interview in order to learn something about your project topic.</p> <p>(A) How will you plan to locate and recruit these individuals and convince them to take part in the interview? (B) What will you need to do in order to communicate successfully with these individuals, given cultural differences? (C) What digital tools and media will you use to conduct the interview? (D) Specify three questions that you will ask this individual. (E) How will the virtual environment, and time, space, and cultural differences, influence your interactions with the individuals?</p>

14	<p>Program Goal #2: Assess the influence of virtual environments on interpersonal and group interactions.</p> <p>Program Goal #4: Successfully participate in and enhance collaborative working relationships in virtual environments.</p> <p>Program Goal #5: Select and apply appropriate digital tools and media and design messages to communicate, persuade and build relationships with stakeholders distributed across space, time and cultures.</p>	<p>“Virtual Collaboration Discussion Board”</p> <p>(A) Describe your most successful collaboration with a group in a virtual environment. (B) What role did each participant play in the collaboration? (C) What was your role? (D) How did the virtual environment influence group members’ interactions and the success of the project? (E) What digital tools and media were used, and how were they used? (F) If the project was not very successful, why was this the case?</p>
----	---	--

Results

- Please provide a brief overview of the results (e.g. What did you discover?, Did the results align with the indirect survey results?).

There was a high level of meaningful engagement in each of the discussions--students generally wrote 20-25 lines in their first posts and 5 lines in response to their classmates. Students that were more vocal in the classroom remained vocal in discussion forums. However, many students who were timid or had weaker communication skills during in-class discussions made stronger efforts to develop thoughtful responses online.

By Week 11’s Networking Discussion Board, students had completed three in-class peer-workshops fine-tuning the theses of their Capstone Digital Projects. The discussion board was also released after 1-on-1 progress meetings with the instructor, in which student’s led the agenda to share current status, outstanding issues, short-term and long-term goals for the completion of the Capstone Digital Project and social media profiles. Having established a strong sense of direction when asked to “imagine” their plans for digital networking, students reflected considerable clarity regarding the role of their projects as a stepping stone in their professional journey by this point in the term. One such case is exemplified by Alex H.’s contribution to the discussion. He is a student that has already secured an entry level data analyst position after graduation with clear long term career goals in the technology industry. His project titled “Programming Made Simple” is a tutorial blog for computer programming enthusiasts. Like his classmates, he approached the prompt with thoughtful specificity regarding his long term professional goals, while exhibiting clear competencies in cross-cultural digital exchange: “To locate these people I would definitely look into companies that I am interested in such as a tech company like Samsung. After I research the company I would look into different positions that they have and locate a specific individual on linkedin... I would explain what I was trying to accomplish, and if we do not speak the same language we can use Google Translate to communicate through email or text. Email would probably be best because of time-zone differences and the

conversation/interview can take a very long time.” Overall, this prompt reflected that DCIM students’ accumulated a working knowledge of LinkedIn, Skype, Google translate, Facebook, Twitter, Email and Instagram’s functionality for seeking relevant professionals in order to build global/local relationships, propose projects for collaboration, and expand understanding in a field.

In Week 14’s Virtual Collaboration Discussion Board, the students had an opportunity to reflect on their academic journeys, most notably the courses which encouraged digital communication. In doing so, students referred directly to a number of DCIM courses and projects, in particular, Virtual Team Dynamics and Leadership in Digital Contexts. They presented a comprehensive understanding of online tools (Google Drive-Docs-Calendar-Hangouts, Groupme, GoToMeeting and Skype) and shared successful stories of collaboration in virtual/hybrid formats. One student mentioned the virtual collaboration opportunities gained in her DCIM experience that allowed her to perform successfully during her internship at FOX that was managed and conducted entirely online. When grappling with the challenges faced in online group experiences, students were generally able to overcome setbacks and recognized the value of building necessary trust in-class to ensure success in virtual collaboration. Another student found the personality questionnaire especially useful for planning the appropriate variety of tools for virtual collaboration projects: “Throughout all of my classes for the DCIM minor, I have had to virtually communicate with my team members. Since everyone is on a different schedule and not everyone takes their school work as seriously as others, I’ve had some bad experiences. However, in my Leadership in Digital Context course, I have had a pleasantly surprising experience. During our very first class, our instructor had us fill out a questionnaire where we were able to figure out the type of personality we had...the instructor grouped us by our personality type only having one maybe two leaders per group and all the rest with different personalities.” Groupme was enthusiastically applauded by nearly every student as an effective tool for communicating among group members. The reflections of virtual collaboration during DCIM coursework reflects a DCIM student’s cultural sensitivity and problem-solving sensibility for ensuring effective communication within small groups and larger teams is maintained for successful project completion.

Overall, the online discussion method of assessment continues to allow for reflective, open-ended responses with the added benefit of collective peer-learning. Through the student-led discussion (instructor refrained from commenting) along with journals and in-class discussions, we are able to learn the value of the practical and theoretical skills developed throughout the DCIM program, as well as the invaluable opportunity the Capstone course provides to apply these skills in a nurturing academic environment. The students begin the Capstone course with accumulated tools and a complex understanding of the dynamics of digital communications; nevertheless, the course provides a unique canvas and a support system (of instructor and peers) to build “something from nothing” with the purpose “making it count.” Many students begin the Capstone course with sharpened interpersonal and intercultural digital communications skills acquired throughout the DCIM minor program--yet, many graduating students still express vague sense of personal/professional direction at the start of the term. Individual transformation in the Capstone setting is

measurable in which a student is encouraged to align academic goals with personal and professional aspirations.

An example of the rich learning and development that takes place through DCIM minor program culminating in the Capstone course is through Megan B.'s journey during the Fall 2016. In September she expressed a general interest in marketing and broadcast media without a strong inclination of potential positions she may want to apply to after graduating from SC&I. Throughout the term our individual and class workshopping sessions helped her design a digital marketing analysis comparing the way social media was used by one national entertainment radio station and one local independent radio station. Throughout the process she was able to translate interests into a focused social media analysis. Even on the Networking Discussion Board, she continues to align her skills with her interests in a "hypothetical" interview guide to a local radio station, "The types of questions I would be asking them would be: 1) Do you use social media as a part of your marketing strategy? If yes, which platform do you find to be the most useful and promotes to the largest audience possible? 2) What types of promotional events do you find to gain a wider range of listeners? Concerts? Giveaways? Does a larger formal event seem to be more successful compared to smaller more casual events? 3) When you plan an event, what is your "go-to" way of promoting it? Do you immediately turn to social media to share the event with the public? Do you air it on the radio immediately after booking this event? 4) What is the biggest issue that you find when trying to reach out to an audience? Is there a specific demographic of people that you wish you could receive attention from and are having trouble doing so?" During her presentation of her project, she proudly announced to the class that the very local radio station she chose to hypothetically interview and study in her Capstone project offered her an internship for Spring 2017 after she met them for an informational meeting! Through the rigor of proposing, designing, and building a digital project that stems from a personal drive, reflections expressed on the discussion boards and journals evince the strides towards professional-personal fulfillment a student is able to make in a 15-week period, and also provide a wealth of information about the DCIM program overall.

Close the Loop Activities

- Please provide an indication of modification/refinement of pedagogy, curriculum, assessment tool, and/or learning goals based on assessment results.
- What is your plan for next year? (e.g. focus on particular goals, change assessment method/rubric)

As part of the "close the loop" process and after consulting with others at SC&I including Associate Dean for Programs Dafna Lemish and Assistant Dean for Instructional Support and Assessment Steve Garwood, I reviewed the existing assessment plan for the DCIM and made significant changes that will streamline the process and add better defined criteria to evaluate student abilities vis-à-vis program learning goals. Rubrics were developed to assess each of the five program goals, and in some cases new discussion prompts were developed so that each goal could be assessed separately (in the prior plan, multiple goals had been assessed with single prompts). The complete plan follows. The goal to be assessed in 2017-2018, and its discussion prompt and rubric, is indicated below.

Digital Communication, Information and Media (DCIM) Assessment Plan To be initiated in the Summer 2017 Capstone Course

In early 2017, I reconfigured the DCIM direct assessment plan so that data could be collected and assessed more efficiently and effectively. The basic structure of the plan remains the same: Students in the DCIM Capstone course will respond to discussion prompts that represent meaningful topics addressed throughout the DCIM curriculum. Students are given four days to post a response to the discussion prompt. Over the subsequent two days they are asked to comment, substantively, on at least three other classmates. Discussions will be included in a student's overall participation grade and assessed with regard to program goals.

The changes in this system are as follows: I have now assigned one goal to each prompt (previously, prompts were associated with multiple goals), which required my developing a fifth prompt, as there were previously four prompts associated with five goals, some prompts matched to multiple goals. I have connected the newly created prompt with Program Goal #1. In previous assessments, as can be seen in the assessment reported above, the instructor of the course and the DCIM Program Director reviewed the posts and comments and made a general assessment as to the degree to which the goals had been met. In the current reconfiguration, each prompt will be assessed by the course instructor by the use of a newly created rubric. Finally, in the past, multiple goals were met per year. In the current proposal, one goal will be assessed per year, during the summer session of the Capstone course.

The program goals, reviewed in 2016, have not changed.

The close-the-loop portion of the assessment will continue to be conducted at the end of each assessment cycle. In the past, this activity has resulted in the adoption of new digital

platforms used in the DCIM courses Virtual Team Dynamics and Self and Society in Virtual Contexts, the development of the course Digital Technology and Disruptive Change, and the focus on the development of student websites in the Capstone course.

The program goals and corresponding online discussion prompts and rubrics are as follows, beginning with the goal that will be assessed during the Summer 2017 section of the DCIM Capstone Course:

Year	Program Goals	Online Discussion Prompts
2017	<p>Program Goal #1: Critically read, interpret, synthesize, and evaluate online information from a variety of media sources and effectively articulate an analysis and formulate opinions on the relevant topics.</p>	<p>Read the article “Understanding Harmful Speech Online” https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2882824 and “When Will the Internet Be Safe For Women?”, https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2016/05/when-will-the-internet-be-safe-for-women/483473/; view the video “Reddit acts against online harassment” https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OG6OFYo0i4E and locate one other relevant, reputable source (text or video) on the topic of digital/online safety.</p> <p>Write a detailed two-paragraph response in which you do the following:</p> <p>(A - first paragraph) Making specific reference to these two articles, the video, and the additional source you located, discuss whether it would be possible and desirable to design a digital space that would be truly safe and free of harassment. If so, how might this be done? If not, why not? What would be lost and what would be gained in a digital space that would be completely and reliably safe?</p> <p>(B - second paragraph) Respond, also, to this question: How, in your opinion, should users of digital and social media deal with harsh rhetoric, harassment, and harm in digital spaces? Be sure to address the impacts on children, women, and members of marginalized or disenfranchised groups in society. Consider the social, ethical, and legal implications of the suggestions you make.</p>

Rubric to Assess Goal #1: Critically read, interpret, synthesize, and evaluate online information from a variety of media sources and effectively articulate an analysis and formulate opinions on the relevant topics

Level	Unsatisfactory	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
Description	<p>Evaluates or uses evidence/data incorrectly.</p> <p>Demonstrates a lack of understanding and inadequate, superficial analysis.</p> <p>Conclusions are neither original nor logical.</p>	<p>Acceptably evaluates and uses evidence/data.</p> <p>Demonstrates general understanding of concepts with limited critical analysis.</p> <p>Summarizes perspectives, counter-arguments or opposing positions.</p> <p>Conclusions reached are fairly rudimentary.</p>	<p>Provides accurate evaluation and appropriate use of evidence/data.</p> <p>Demonstrates an understanding of concepts and some critical analysis.</p> <p>Adequately compares, contrasts, synthesizes perspectives, counter-arguments or opposing positions, but conclusions reached are less than fully original and thoughtful.</p>	<p>Provides sophisticated evaluation and thoughtful use of evidence/data.</p> <p>Demonstrates an advanced understanding of concepts and ideas and careful, critical analysis.</p> <p>Compares, contrasts, and synthesizes perspectives, and considers counter-arguments or opposing positions, in depth, and draws original and thoughtful conclusions.</p>
Tally				
Notes (1-2 Paragraphs)	What strengths/challenges do you see in this area based on the student work that you reviewed?			

Year	Program Goals	Online Discussion Prompts
------	---------------	---------------------------



<p>2018</p>	<p>Program Goal #2: Assess the influence of virtual environments on interpersonal and group interactions</p>	<p>Read the following articles, both in <i>The Atlantic</i> magazine: <u>Is Facebook Making Us Lonely? By Stephen Marche</u> and <u>Social Media's Small, Positive Role in Human Relationships by Zeynep Tufekci</u>.</p> <p>Also, watch the videos "Keith Hampton on Technology and Society" <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y0STE49x7t4&t=5s</u> and Sherry Turkle's "Connected, But Alone?" <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t7Xr3AsBEK4</u></p> <p>Write a short (2-3 paragraph) response in which you do the following:</p> <p>Making specific reference to both articles and both videos throughout this response, provide a detailed analysis of the impact of internet/digital technology and virtual environments on interpersonal relationships and the interactions of people in groups. How is social connectedness, community, and closeness impacted? Why do you come to the conclusions that you do? Be sure to include a discussion of the positive and/or negative effects of technologically-mediated interaction on interpersonal relationships and groups.</p>
--------------------	---	--



Rubric to Assess Goal #2: Assess the influence of virtual environments on interpersonal and group interactions				
Level	Unsatisfactory	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
Description	Fails to explain or apply concepts about virtual environments and interpersonal and group interaction.	Explains or applies concepts about virtual environments and interpersonal and group interaction in a limited or partially incorrect fashion.	Clearly and accurately explains and applies concepts about virtual environments and interpersonal and group interaction.	Demonstrates an advanced understanding of a range of concepts about virtual environments and interpersonal and group interaction. Explains and applies these concepts with nuance.
Tally				
Notes (1-2 Paragraphs)	What strengths/challenges do you see in this area based on the student work that you reviewed?			



Year	Program Goals	Online Discussion Prompts
2019	Program Goal #3: Identify communication opportunities and challenges when working with others in digital and virtual environments.	Write a short (2-3 paragraph) response in which you respond to the following questions: (A) What, in your view, are the key opportunities and challenges that people face when communicating digitally? (B) Describe at least two opportunities and two challenges, locating and including at least two references to relevant, reputable articles found on the web. Provide the links to these articles.

Rubric to Assess Goal #3: Identify communication opportunities and challenges when working with others in digital and virtual environments.				
Level	Unsatisfactory	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
Description	Analysis is absent or largely incorrect Fails to demonstrate an understanding of communication opportunities and challenges in digital and virtual environments.	Provides limited analysis. Demonstrates a less than fully understanding of communication opportunities and challenges in digital and virtual environments.	Provides clear, plausible analysis. Demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of communication opportunities and challenges.	Provides insightful, well-reasoned, and original analysis. Demonstrates an advanced understanding of communication opportunities and challenges.
Tally				
Notes (1-2 Paragraphs)	What strengths/challenges do you see in this area based on the student work that you reviewed?			

Year	Program Goals	Online Discussion Prompts
------	---------------	---------------------------



2020	Program Goal #4: Successfully participate in and enhance collaborative working relationships in virtual environments.	Write a short (2-3 paragraph) response in which you answer the following questions: (A) Describe your most successful collaboration with a group in a virtual environment. (B) What role did each participant play in the collaboration? (C) What was your role? (D) How did the virtual environment influence group members' interactions and the success of the project? (E) What digital tools and media were used, and how were they used? (F) If the project was not very successful, why was this the case?
-------------	---	--

Rubric to Assess Goal #4: Successfully participate in and enhance collaborative working relationships in virtual environments.				
Level	Unsatisfactory	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
Description	Does not demonstrate ability to work collaboratively or effectively in virtual environments.	Demonstrates a limited ability to work collaboratively and effectively in virtual environments.	Demonstrates a solid ability to work collaboratively and effectively in virtual environments.	Demonstrates a sophisticated ability to work collaboratively and effectively in virtual environments.
Tally				
Notes (1-2 Paragraphs)	What strengths/challenges do you see in this area based on the student work that you reviewed?			



Year	Program Goals	Online Discussion Prompts
2021	<p>Program Goal #5: Select and apply appropriate digital tools and media and design messages to communicate, persuade and build relationships with stakeholders distributed across space, time and cultures.</p>	<p>Pretend that you have to interview two different individuals, from two countries other than the USA and other than any other country in which you have lived, to obtain information for your capstone project. You need not select actual people, but think about the types of people that it would be useful to interview in order to learn something about your project topic.</p> <p>Write a detailed, 2-3 paragraph response in which you address the following questions:</p> <p>(A) How would you locate and recruit these individuals and convince them to take part in the interview? (B) What would you need to do in order to communicate successfully with these individuals, given cultural differences? (C) What digital tools and media would you use to conduct the interview? (D) Specify three questions that you would ask each individual (these may be the same three questions for each). (E) How might the virtual environment, and time, space, and cultural differences, influence your interactions with the individuals?</p>



Rubric to Assess Goal #5: Select and apply appropriate digital tools and media and design messages to communicate, persuade and build relationships with stakeholders distributed across space, time and cultures.				
Level	Unsatisfactory	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
Description	<p>Does not provide evidence of understanding of selection and application of digital tools and media and in designing messages appropriate to the task.</p> <p>Demonstrates little ability to communicate, persuade, and build relationships with stakeholders distributed across space, time, and cultures. Sensitivity to cultural norms and values is not apparent.</p>	<p>Provides limited evidence of understanding of selection and application of digital tools and media and in designing messages appropriate to the task.</p> <p>Demonstrates the ability to communicate, persuade, and build relationships with stakeholders distributed across space, time, and cultures.</p> <p>Sensitivity to a range of cultural norms and values is not always apparent.</p>	<p>Provides evidence of understanding of selection and application of digital tools and media and in designing messages appropriate to the task.</p> <p>Demonstrates strong ability to communicate, persuade, and build relationships with stakeholders distributed across space, time, and cultures.</p> <p>Sensitivity to a range of cultural norms and values is apparent.</p>	<p>Provides evidence of sophisticated understanding of selection and application of digital tools and media and in designing messages appropriate to the task.</p> <p>Demonstrates advanced ability to communicate, persuade, and build relationships with stakeholders distributed across space, time, and cultures.</p> <p>Sensitivity to a range of cultural norms and values is strongly and clearly in evidence.</p>
Tally				
Notes (1-2 Paragraphs)	What strengths/challenges do you see in this area based on the student work that you reviewed?			

Program Name: Master in Communication and Media



Program Director: Richard Dool
Department Chair: Craig Scott and Susan Keith

Program Learning Goals:

In revision

Program Learning Goals last reviewed: August 2016

Syllabi for Fall 2016 semester: X Collected/Uploaded Syllabi __ Not collected

Syllabi for Spring 2017 semester: X Collected/Uploaded Syllabi __ Not collected

Indirect Assessment Survey conducted: X Yes __ No

- If yes, please attach executive summary of survey results
- If no, how was general feedback about the program collected?

Communication and Media (MCM) Program Goals Survey
Sample (n = 14)

A total of 14 students completed the online-based MCM program goals survey. Roughly one-third of survey respondents were male (29%), while the remaining two-thirds were female (71%). All respondents were aged between 22-29 years (71%) or 30-39 (29%) years.

The average student respondent had completed 23 credits towards their graduation requirements (ranging from 12 to 33) and 100% of students are “almost done” with the MCM program.

Approximately 38% of students are working in the field full time, while 15% of students are currently employed in a related field part time, and 46% are not employed in a related field. Almost 67% of students consider themselves to be primarily traditional students, while 16% are primarily online and 16% both online and traditional students. Almost 92% of students live locally and only 8% of students are out of state.

Students had the following specializations:

- 15% - General Studies
- 31% - Strategic Organizational Communication,
- 31% - Health Communication and
- 23% - Digital Media

Course surveyed: 17:194:519 (Capstone) (1 section) and 17:194:508 (ePortfolio) (2 sections)

Program Learning Goals (based on 12 responses)

Students expressed variable levels of “moderate confidence” to moderate levels of “complete confidence” in their ability to meet the learning goals of the MCM program.

Specifically on this goal:

Learning Goal 5 -

Ability to apply communication theories and concepts to social or professional life
(including issues of diversity, ethics and civic engagement)

Students in the ePortfolio course had more responses in the “complete confidence” for this goal. The capstone students expressed both “moderate” and “high.”

Direct Assessment Method (of at least one program learning goal)

- If no direct assessment was conducted please provide rationale (e.g. Program Learning Goals revised during Academic year; Program participating in accreditation process; Methodology in development (please indicate status).

The reasons we chose to use an indirect method were two:

(1) We are in the middle of a significant MCM program transition (2017/2018). This includes:

- a. A program name change.
- b. Enhancements to current specializations.
- c. Two new specializations being added.
- d. A review of all MCM courses in the portfolio:
 - i. Some courses will be archived.
 - ii. New courses will be added.
 - iii. Some courses are being updated.
- e. Changes in admittance criteria
- f. Changes in Degree requirements:
 - i. Experiential learning moved to ‘elective’ status
 - ii. Accelerated degree option being added
 - iii. Clarity on transfer credits.

See three attached documents which highlight the extensive program and market assessment we conducted in 2016/17.

- (2) We specifically wanted to assess our two “Capstone” course options: ePortfolio & Capstone Research.
- a. These are the final courses taken in the MCM curriculum, usually in the last semester.
 - b. They are specifically designed as synthesis experiences where MCM students are expected to bring all their MCM learning and experiences together. The courses are also targeted specifically to Learning Goal 5 (noted above).

Direct Assessment Results

- Please provide a brief overview of the results (e.g. What did you discover? Did the results align with the indirect survey results?).

- We did not do a formal “direct” assessment as noted above. However, the MCM Director did conduct some informal direct assessment activities:
 - Met with and discussed the ePortfolio classes with the two Faculty members who taught the class in Fall 2016 & Spring 2016.
 - Discussed class structure, learning expectations, challenges, opportunities for improvement, and student feedback.
 - Agreed on changes to be implemented for the Fall 2017 classes.
 - More focus on synthesis activities
 - More connections to MCM course work
 - More application of theory
 - Reviewed the 3 Capstone Research papers and presentations.
 - Reviewed the Capstone Night Presentations.
 - Solicited informal feedback from current students.

Close the Loop Activities

- Please provide an indication of modification/refinement of pedagogy, curriculum, assessment tool, and/or learning goals based on assessment results.

We are going to do a more formal review of the ePortfolio class this Summer with the intention to modify the classes for Fall 2017.

We are focusing on three key areas:

- A stronger connection to the content of the MCM courses
 - More focus on synthesis activities
 - More evidence of appropriate application of theories
-
- What is your plan for next year? (e.g. focus on particular goals, change assessment method/rubric).

We are going to do the following:

- (1) Review the MCM Learning Goals to align with the Program changes we have been implementing.
- (2) Specifically, to update the ePortfolio and Capstone courses.
- (3) To fully implement the Program changes that have been approved



January 23, 2017

Master in Communication and Information Studies (MCIS) Name Change

For the last six months, we have conducted an extensive review of the MCIS program. This review included surveys with 19 SC&I Faculty and Staff members, 39 MCIS alumni as well as a review of 39 comparable Master programs. We also reviewed the findings of a previous consultant's report (Eduvantis).

The intent of the review was to assess the MCIS program in terms of our students' experience, learning effectiveness, program competitiveness and perceptions of quality. We also assessed the trends in the market and how well positioned MCIS is to adapt to these trends or take advantage of emerging opportunities.

The results of this assessment process yielded a series of recommendations, which have been subsequently approved and are being implemented. These included:

- Revisions in our MCIS Admittance Criteria
- Revisions in our MCIS Credit Transfer policy
- Re-naming and re-positioning of the MCIS Specializations
- An increased emphasis on our Communication and Media Research specialization
- Enhancements and additions to our MCIS courseware
- Increased rigor in our Specialization requirements
- Changes in the MCIS "experiential learning" requirements

We also conducted a review of how MCIS is positioned and marketed. This review included a deep analysis of the marketing activities of 10 comparable programs. This review found that MCIS:

- Does not enjoy much market visibility. "MCIS" rarely comes up in a search
- Most applicants find MCIS within a "Rutgers" search
- MCIS is being outspent in terms of marketing by 10:1+ by comparable programs
- The MCIS current marketing materials fail to differentiate MCIS in any meaningful manner
- MCIS has little social media presence

As a result of this assessment, these activities are being implemented:

- We have revised and updated our current MCIS marketing materials
- We have created new MCIS infographics
- We have updated the MCIS information on the SC&I website
- We are developing a new social media plan which will be implemented in March 2017
- We will increase the MCIS marketing spend in a series of targeted activities
- We will “relaunch” MCIS in the Fall 2017 to take advantage of the program changes

We are already seeing some benefit from the results of these assessments and subsequent actions. MCIS applications and enrollment are trending upwards. We have seen an increase of 15% year over year from 2015 to 2016.

A critical element of the MCIS evolution will be to change our degree name. During the assessment process, it became clear that our *Communication and Information Studies* name was not resonating with current students or the market in general. We received a lot of feedback from current students as well as alumna that the name was “confusing” and “hard to describe.” Students were listing the degree name on their CVs in a variety of self-selected terms including “Master in Communication,” “Master in Communication and Information” or Master in Communication with a specialization in Information Studies.”

Additionally, a review of 50+ other program names did not find a comparable degree title. You could conclude that this may be a market advantage, but the search analysis demonstrates the opposite effect – MCIS comes up in less than 1% of general search results.

To compound the situation, the recent shift in the name of our *Master in Information (MI)* degree within SC&I has created more confusion.

We decided for these reasons to consider a name change for MCIS. This process included:

- A review of 50+ other program or specialization names at 39 comparable schools
- Solicitation of suggestions from Faculty, alumna and current students
- Tests with a series of faculty and students on 3 potential names from an initial list of 12 alternatives

The associated objectives for a MCIS name change include:

- A name that is more reflective of the breadth and depth of the program
- A name that is differentiated from the SC&I MI program
- A name broad enough to encompass the program changes that are being implemented
- A name that will honor the needs of both our Communication and JMS Departments
- A name that is also flexible enough to accommodate a program pivot if there are SC&I strategic shifts

The three finalists for the name change were:

Master in Communication and Media Studies (MCMS)
Master in Communication and Digital Media (MCDM)
Master in Communication and Media (MCAM)

After extensive review and consultations, it was recommended that we change from *Communication and Information Studies* to ***Communication and Media***.

This name met the objectives listed above and also has the benefit of market differentiation. There are few comparable programs with similar names. The other names were discarded for a variety of reasons, mostly around the vague use of the terms “studies” and “digital.”

The name change has been reviewed and approved so far:

- The Chairs of the Departments of Communication and Journalism and Media Studies (November 17, 2016)
- The MCIS Executive Committee (December 14, 2017)
- The Communication Department (January 18, 2017)
- Endorsed by the Department of Library and Information Science (January 25, 2017)
- The Journalism and Media Studies Department (January 25, 2017)

We are therefore submitting this proposal to the full SC&I faculty for endorsement at the February 1, 2017 meeting.

Dr. Richard Dool



TO: Barbara Lee, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

FROM: Jonathan Potter, Dean, School of Communication and Information

DATE: February 20, 2017

RE: Proposed name change for the Master of Communication and Information Studies degree to Master of Communication and Media

During the past year, the School of Communication and Information has undertaken an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of its Master of Communication and Information Studies program, with the intent to improve its competitive position in the marketplace. Our analysis included data that resulted from: a survey of alumni; input from current students and admitted students who chose to attend another program; a review of 39 comparable master's programs nation-wide; and competitive intelligence provided to us by a marketing consulting firm, Eduvantis, in 2015-16.

The intent of the review was to assess the existing program in terms of our students' experience and learning, perceptions of quality of the program in the market, and competitiveness of the program. We also looked at trends in the market and how well positioned we are to adapt to these trends or take advantage of emerging opportunities.

The assessment led to a series of actions taken by the faculty with regard to the program itself, including some admissions policy changes, adjustments to the specializations within the program, and changes in graduation requirements.

The Master of Communication and Information Studies program was established in the 1980s, and its curriculum was launched with a unique interdisciplinary mix of communication, information, and media studies. ***MCIS is a shared Master program between our Departments of Communication and Department of Journalism and Media Studies. There are few programs, if any, that bring together these disciplines in a single Master program. The program was launched with the current name (MCIS) and has not changed since its inception.***

Enrollments in the program have never been as strong as we believed they could be, with the student body mostly remaining between 70 and 100 students. What we have believed to be an innovative interdisciplinary program has sometimes been perceived by prospective students as a program lacking enough focus. Over time, our other master's program in the school progressed from a traditional Master of Library Service to the twenty-first century Master of Information. Parallel with that progression, the MCIS program has focused on the communication and media areas and allowed students with additional interests in information to take courses from our other program as electives.

During our assessment process, it became clear that the *Communication and Information Studies* name was not resonating with current students, alumni, or in the marketplace. Prospective students find the name confusing and hard to describe, and alumni list their degree on their resumes and LinkedIn profiles in a variety of self-selected terms, but rarely as Master of Communication and Information Studies because they believe that name will be misunderstood by potential employers.

As part of our analysis, we also reviewed 40+ other communications and journalism/media studies programs names. Because MCIS is a somewhat unique construct, shared by our two Departments, there are not many comparables. We found many Communication and Journalism/Media Studies programs, but they were typically either standalone Master degrees, or degree programs within a larger Department or School. Some examples include:

Syracuse University: Master in Communication, Master in Communication Management and Master in Media Studies.

USC: Master in Communication Management, Master in Journalism

San Diego State: Master in Mass Communication and Media Studies

Boston University: Master in Communication Studies

NYU: Master in Media, Culture and Society

Kean: Master in Communication Studies

University of Wisconsin: Master in Communication Sciences and Master in Media and Cultural Studies

We wanted a name that demonstrated our uniqueness, while also allowing the flexibility to leverage future opportunities.

The objectives for a new name for the degree include: a name that is more reflective of the breadth and depth of the program; a name that is differentiated from the Master of Information program; and a name that is flexible enough to accommodate further evolution of the program ***and one that would honor the expertise and disciplines of our two Departments. MCIS has five specializations offered our Departments and we needed specifically to ensure the revised name supported them more fully, particularly the Journalism and Media Study offerings (e.g. Digital Media). We also reviewed other program names on the New Brunswick campus to ensure we would not create any conflicts or confusion with a new proposed program name.***

As a result, several possible new names were considered and discussed with the variety of constituent groups. *Master of Communication and Media* emerged as the strongest candidate. ***It reflects our Communication and Journalism & Media Studies origins, while also allowing us to progress the program as needed into the future. The Journalism and Media Studies faculty unanimously supported this change.***

Each of the three departments at SC&I were consulted, and each endorsed this degree name change. At the February 1, 2017, school-wide faculty meeting, the name change was

discussed and unanimously endorsed by the entire faculty. I strongly agree that this is the right action to take at this time.

As we move forward with this program, we expect the new name to resonate more strongly with the base of students who are looking for a professional graduate program in communication, and to enable us to better attract a wider pool of students who are interested in exploring the new media landscape.

I am therefore forwarding to you this request for a change of name for the Master of Communication and Information Studies program, to become the Master of Communication and Media.

Following your endorsement, we understand the change must be presented to the Rutgers Board of Governors for approval, and then presented for information to the New Jersey Council of Presidents and the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this request and whether you will endorse it.

Program Name: Master of Information
Program Director: Lilia Pavlovsky
Department Chair: Ross Todd

Program Learning Goals: Still in **draft** form, but evolving:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1bX9d3kZkBXLOWiowaLZ6lXLxzmjyF4T24LOqpH9pd_Q/edit?usp=sharing

1. Analyze, identify, and describe the information needs, problems, challenges and goals of individuals, groups, communities, & organizations;
2. Design, develop, and implement innovative and interactive information systems, services, technologies, instruction, policies and organizational structures that address identified needs, problems, challenges and goals;
3. Use measurable criteria to evaluate effectiveness of systems, programs and services
4. Represent, include and advocate for the interests of diverse colleagues, professionals, clients, patrons, user groups, and citizens, to ensure equitable intellectual and physical access and use.
5. Lead, innovate and serve as agents of change in the information professions and respective communities;
6. Enact and uphold ethically-grounded policies and practices that demonstrate knowledge relating to privacy, access, copyright intellectual property, intellectual freedom, diversity and security;
7. Consider and deploy information solutions as cultural, social, intellectual and technological goods serving human actors in local, national and global societal contexts.
8. Uphold professional and academic community standards for ethical information practices, accessibility, uses, and user-centered systems design, in support of tenets;

Program Learning Goals last reviewed: June 2017: ongoing until we are satisfied

Syllabi for Fall 2016 semester: Collected/Uploaded Syllabi Not collected

Syllabi for Spring 2017 semester: Collected/Uploaded Syllabi Not collected

Indirect Assessment Survey conducted: Yes No

- If yes, please attach executive summary of survey results
- If no, how was general feedback about the program collected?

How: Every student must register and complete the ePortfolio capstone (17:610:503). In this class they are asked to fill out a form/rubric that lists 6 curricular criteria/outcomes defined by our accrediting institution, The American Libraries Association. This is a zero credit course that a student must earn a “pass” grade in order to graduate so response rate is 100%. Students reflect on their learning experiences in relation to the criteria presented and submit artifacts, documents and experiences (internships, etc) that support their



reflection on how (and where within the program) they acquired the competencies. Most recently, after the revision of the Program Learning Goals began, it was recommended that we link the program learning goals to the accreditation competencies (see this [document](#) -- still a work in progress but used in this past evaluation).

Survey results: This is not a survey but a separate document that each student fills out. I have 48 assessment portfolio documents and the data is then transferred to a spreadsheet. For more information and examples of results:

See report

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fW4gLbLHmVAkn8AY7oR8MPuPfiX0zUB1Q8vYba0Kqpg/edit>

Direct Assessment Method (of at least one program learning goal)

- If direct assessment was conducted please indicate brief summary of the approach to data collection/analysis and attach documentation/rubric(s) as needed.
- If no direct assessment was conducted please provide rationale (e.g. Program Learning Goals revised during Academic year; Program participating in accreditation process; Methodology in development (please indicate status)).

Since the Program Director (me) also happens to be the instructor for this course, I used the [rubric](#) to examine and evaluate the student work as it was presented in relation to the respective Program Goals and ALA standards. In almost 100% of the cases where evidence was presented there was a direct correlation. In some cases no evidence was available (e.g. the response was “internship” or other experiential learning process) the student typically explained “why” that experience was relevant to the standard or goal. The student was not able to see the learning goal for this iteration, only the ALA standard because the learning goals were not inserted until after the semester began. For future courses the learning goals and standards will be aligned.

See report:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fW4gLbLHmVAkn8AY7oR8MPuPfiX0zUB1Q8vYba0Kqpg/edit>

Direct Assessment Results

- Please provide a brief overview of the results (e.g. What did you discover? Did the results align with the indirect survey results?).

Mostly I discovered that students’ vision of a standard or goal is directly related to their pathway in the program. And yes, the results aligned with the indirect responses. An LIS student might have selected a digital story or an accomplishment in 550 to show that they

have mastered a secondary technology (production of digital stories) or a basic website created from scratch. A much more technologically savvy Data Science student project would be very different in that it would entail much more complex coding, retrieval and analysis of data. Both objectives and outcomes correlate not only to the program goals but to the student’s career goals: One might be headed for reference work at a public library or wanting to become a school media specialist while the other is looking for positions in data analytics and programming (more back end operational/analytical). The program was able to be flexible enough to fulfill both student’s goals in terms of their work and accomplishments.

As an “aside” note, one of the most interesting responses in many of the categories (esp. Category 6) was that students typically wrote “all courses did x” but these 2 courses are the ones I want to highlight. Interpretively speaking this means that the standards; criteria and goals permeate a large portion of the curriculum and the results are not as “siloed” as they once were. So, for instance, 550 (Information technologies) is a course that was always referenced in the 3rd standard related to technology competency. This year, it was also mentioned but students would also list their reference; searching; social informatics; and other classes. More information can be found in the report.

See report:
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fW4gLbLHmVAkn8AY7oR8MPuPfiX0zUB1Q8vYba0Kgpg/edit?usp=sharing>

Close the Loop Activities

- Please provide an indication of modification/refinement of pedagogy, curriculum, assessment tool, and/or learning goals based on assessment results.

I discuss this in the report but the last 2 questions have been critical in our recent program transition from MLIS to MI:

- | |
|---|
| b. List and discuss 3 things that you feel our program does best. |
| c. List and discuss 3 things that you feel our program could improve upon |

Most of the time, there are issue “cluster” in the responses to the second query related to program improvement. And, when I hear something mentioned more than 5 or 6 times then it’s time to think about what is going on and what we can do to fix something. There are basically 3 burning issues right now:

- 1) Quality of online courses
- 2) Consistency in online teaching
- 3) Development of stronger online professional/networking communities.

More discussion of this is located on the report:

See report:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fW4gLbLHmVAkn8AY7oR8MPuPfiX0zUB1Q8vYba0Kqpg/edit?usp=sharing>

- What is your plan for next year? (e.g. focus on particular goals, change assessment method/rubric).

My plan is to continue to improve this instrument because it is a very useful tool for decision making and will be invaluable for the reaccreditation process. I need to pull the information together longitudinally because it will show a 7 year record of program evaluation and response. These data are catalysts for change.

Additional Information

- What challenges/difficulties did you face in this process?
 - Staffing. There is no support for this process and one person cannot do it all.
- If there are other items related to program evaluation or student learning that you would like to share please do so.
 - If this is important then there should be some visible indication of support for the process.



Program Name: Ph.D. Program in Communication, Information, and Library Studies (CILS)

Program Director: Marie L. Radford

Program Learning Goals:

<https://comminfo.rutgers.edu/academics/graduate/Ph.D.-program/degree-learning-goals-and-assessment>

1. Attain and maintain an advanced level of knowledge in key content areas of communication, information and library science, and media studies: on the nature and function of communication, information, and media institutions, policies, processes, and systems, and their impact on individuals as well as social, organizational, national, and international affairs.
2. Demonstrate the ability to design and defend an original scholarly project to advance the fields of communication, information and library science, or media studies.
3. Develop professional level oral and written communication skills designed to disseminate research findings in the fields of communication, information and library science, or media studies.
4. Demonstrate critical thinking and the ability to critically evaluate current research and proposals in specific areas related to communication, information and library science, or media studies.
5. Understand the relationship between multiple and interdisciplinary approaches of communication, information and library science, and media studies, and understand the interaction of these fields with new information and communication technologies, the individuals who use them, and the social, cultural, and political systems in which they are embedded, recognize their social and ethical implications, and apply critical analysis to these settings.
6. Conduct research independently and prepare for a successful transition into academic, industry or government related jobs

Program Learning Goals last reviewed: 2016-2017

A review of the Program Learning Goals was conducted with the Area Coordinators at the meeting on 11/30/16. Following this, the Ph.D. Director met with Steve Garwood, Assistant Dean for Instructional Support and Assessment to discuss the assessment process. A plan was discussed that would focus on Learning Goal 1 for this year with the Area Coordinators at their meeting on 2/28/17. The review of Learning Goals and the focus to evaluate Learning Goal 1 for this year was conducted at the Ph.D. faculty meeting on 3/1/17. Learning goals were affirmed with no revisions and the specific plan for focus on Learning Goal 1 was approved. The review and evaluation of Learning Goal 2 will be the focus for 2017-2018.

Syllabi for Fall 2016 semester: x Collected/Uploaded Syllabi Not collected

Syllabi for Spring 2017 semester: x Collected/Uploaded Syllabi Not collected

Indirect Assessment Survey conducted: Yes No

- If yes, please attach executive summary of survey results
- If no, how was general feedback about the program collected?

The Assessment Survey was launched on March 22, 2017 and closed on March 29, 2017. Approximately 33% (32 of approximately 95) Ph.D. students participated in the survey. See attached executive summary of survey results.

Direct Assessment Method (of at least one program learning goal)

- If direct assessment was conducted please indicate brief summary of the approach to data collection/analysis and attach documentation/rubric(s) as needed.

The direct assessment involved adding criteria rubric to the evaluation form for qualifying examinations which specifically addressed Program Learning Goal 1. Means were computed for each of the five Likert-type questions that faculty used to evaluate oral qualification exams. (See attached form). Results for all 11 students who took qualifying exams in 2016-2017 were evaluated in this way. The one student who failed her qualifying exams for the second time had had a long break between course work and exams, especially the second time. She was advised to continue to write, perhaps to produce a book on her topic of research interest.

Additionally, qualitative faculty input was collected on particular strengths, weaknesses, and additional comments. Strengths include: strong interdisciplinary connections, excellent students, close-knit doctoral student community, curriculum flexibility, and orientation activities. Weaknesses include: need for more financial support for students, need to schedule more courses, and need to provide even greater opportunities for student involvement in research at earliest stages of the program.

Direct Assessment Results

- Please provide a brief overview of the results (e.g. What did you discover?, Did the results align with the indirect survey results?).

All but one of the 11 students (91%) who took qualifying exams this year were successful, with averages that ranged from 3.6 to 4.4 across the five, five point likert-style scores that the faculty assigned. Almost all of evaluation forms were collected from the faculty, with only a few outstanding (which we are endeavoring to collect). Faculty indicated scores that ranged from 5 (excellent) to 1 (poor). Means for the 10 successful students are as follows: 1) Understanding of the subject area - mean 4.37; 2) Understanding of the relevant literature - mean 4.28; 3) Critical analysis of subject discussed - mean 3.56; 4) Demonstrated ability to develop and present a meaningful point -of-view – mean 3.69; and 5) Organization and presentation of material- mean 4.12. These results indicate that students have done well in all the areas, with evidence that some improvement is needed in critical analysis of subject and in the ability to develop and present a meaningful point of view (items 3 and 4). The one student who did not pass the qualifying exams for the second time had had a lengthy break between course work and qualifying exams, particularly for



the second time. She has been advised to continue to write with perhaps publishing a book on her chosen research area for a professional, rather than research audience.

Additionally, review of qualitative responses found that faculty gave appropriate feedback via the qualitative responses as well, most comments focusing on any deficiencies in written answers having being addressed in the oral exam. Also, faculty wrote that deficiencies could be addressed in the proposal stage.

Close the Loop Activities

- Please provide an indication of modification/refinement of pedagogy, curriculum, assessment tool, and/or learning goals based on assessment results.
- What is your plan for next year? (e.g. focus on particular goals, change assessment method/rubric)

This year we worked on adding the rubric for the qualifying exam evaluation form and on collecting benchmarking data. The rubric seemed to work well, and may be tweaked next year. It is recommended that the new Ph.D. Director review the indirect assessment results to see what items could be addressed in the coming year. It is recommended that this same evaluation tool be also used next year, so that a comparison in scores can be made. The indirect assessment through the Assessment Survey only achieved approximately 33% return rate (32 out of approximately 95 students) and next year greater efforts should be made to increase this rate of return. It was gratifying to see that 75% of the students were satisfied or very satisfied with the Ph.D. program, although it is evident that work needs to be done to increase this percentage.

The plan going forward in general is to review one learning goal per year. The intention and recommendation is to work on assessment activities for Learning Goal 2 next year.

Additional Information

- What challenges/difficulties did you face in this process?
- If there are other items related to program evaluation or student learning that you would like to share please do so

There will be a new Ph.D. Director beginning on July 1, 2017, for 3 years, so the program is about to undergo a transition period. This report will be shared with the incoming director, and a recommendation will be made to formulate a plan for Learning Goal 2 assessment early in the fall 2017 semester.



Executive Summary Ph.D. Program Goals Survey

Sample (n = 32)

A total of 32 students completed the online Ph.D. program goals survey. All survey respondents were aged as follows: between 30-39 years (37.50%), 20-29 years (28%) years, 40-49 years (19%), 50-59 years (9%), 17-21 years (3%), and 60 years and over (3%). The average student respondent completed 39 credits towards their program requirements (ranging from 0 to all courses completed). Ph.D. students reported their current status in the program as follows: first year (41%), six or more years (25%), fourth year (16%), fifth year (9%), third year (6%), and second year (3%).

Program Learning Goals (based on 32 responses)

Students expressed variable levels from “moderate confidence” to “complete confidence” in their ability to meet the learning goals of the Ph.D. Program.

Question	No Confidence 0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	Moderate Confidence 50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	Complete Confidence 100%	Not Applicable at this time	Total
Attain and maintain an advanced level of knowledge in key content areas of communication, information and library science, and media studies: on the nature and function of communication, information, and media institutions, policies, processes, and systems, and their impact on individuals as well as social, organizational, national, and international affairs.	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	9	6	12	0	32



Demonstrate the ability to design and defend an original scholarly project to advance the fields of	0	0	1	0	2	0	4	2	8	7	7	1	32
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----



communication, information and library science, or media studies.														
Develop professional level oral and written communication skills designed to disseminate research findings in the fields of communication, information and library science, or media studies.	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	13	9	0	32	
Demonstrate critical thinking and the ability to critically evaluate current research and proposals in specific areas related to communication, information and library science, or media studies.	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	3	12	10	0	32	
Understand the relationship between multiple and interdisciplinary approaches of communication, information and library science, and media studies, and understand the interaction of these fields with new information and communication technologies, the individuals who use them, and the social, cultural, and political systems in which	0	0	2	1	0	3	3	2	2	11	8	0	32	



they are embedded, recognize their social and ethical implications, and apply critical analysis to these settings.														
Conduct research independently and prepare for a successful transition into academic, industry or government related jobs.	0	1	2	0	2	5	1	1	3	9	7	1	32	

Ph.D. students also shared one thing that they like about the Ph.D. program and/or courses.

Students positively commented on interdisciplinary approach, quality and helpfulness of the faculty, support from cohorts, and the diversity in the program. Students made the following selected comments (comments copied as collected):

- The interdisciplinary is excellent. Dean Potter seems to be doing a good job encouraging that as well.
- I felt that the faculty, staff, and other students were very supportive of me and my work.
- Quality of advisement and mentoring from faculty.
- The instruction and support provided by the faculty and the cutting-edge content.
- Cohort is very collaborative-minded and supportive.
- I love the approach to teaching: it is challenging, but realistic, practical, and real. It would be easy for things to be too abstract or theoretical and they are not. You do get that, but in a way that is accessible and useable. Also, things related across disciplines, so I don't feel in a silo because I am in one area. The expertise in teaching is outstanding--both in how to teach, and in content.
- Strong and supportive community among professors and students.
- I enjoy the ability to speak with professors from the other fields (outside my concentration) about their work and that they are willing to have that conversation even though I am not a part of their field or their class. It allows for exploration of topics without the constraint of focus.
- The staff is very supportive and clearly sees its success is my success.
- Professor and cohort are very encouraging and supportive
- The vast majority of the faculty are caring, approachable, and seem truly dedicated to the success of the students in the program.
- Quality of faculty and independent opportunities for research
- I enjoy my professors and admire the work they do in teaching and research



Students made many suggestions for improving this program. Students expressed the need for more funding, more methods courses, streamlining of the requirements, balance of student to faculty ratio, and the need for more structure after course work is completed. Students made the following selected comments (comments copied as collected):

- Expand full-time funding for continuing students.
- More funding for later years in the program. More opportunities for interdisciplinary work across the departments
- More courses that meet the requirements aspects of varying methods courses and specific courses required for Media Studies.
- SC&I needs more methods courses. Badly.
- It's confusing to keep track of requirements when course numbers are frequently changing, but the program requirements aren't reflecting the changes.
- Improve student to faculty ratio for one to one consultation in depth. Some faculty has a lot of students while some faculty has none. I don't think such imbalance helps anyone.
- More structure from program after courses finished.
- Clarification of policies and requirements - the handbook contains a slew of information that is necessary for success but there are moments throughout the program where information is relayed with multiple meanings. Not everyone who explains the same thing says the same thing which sometimes makes it difficult to fully grasp the true information.
- Better selection of courses - sometimes the lack of courses available makes it difficult for me to schedule classes and requirements and has me looking to other departments and schools to find something that relates to my field of study or topic of choice.
- The methods courses may not always be relevant to student research purposes, there shouldn't be a required number of methods courses It would be good to hear about research conducted in other iSchools, guest lectures by faculty from other schools would be interesting.
- Need more core faculty members
- Financial support to students
- Improve the qualitative methods course. Actually support interdisciplinary research and collaboration between the departments.
- I would be interested in crossover classes between, say, media studies and LIS; and I would like to see a hybrid class or two
- Invest in organizational communication faculty and research opportunities. Especially given the popularity of the sub-discipline in other regions of the country and the general lack of Ph.D. programs in this area, Rutgers is well positioned to be an attractive site for students with an interest in organizational communication and leadership.
- The advisers should give more feedback to their advisees.
- There should be a cap on the number of Ph.D. students a particular faculty member accepts.



19 students made additional comments that addressed a variety of topics and program aspects, such as appreciation of the high level of faculty, issues with teaching as PTLs, adequate preparation for the academic job market but not enough for industry or government related jobs, effects of the high turnover among faculty and students, and Ph.D. culture within the program. Students made the following selected comments (comments copied as collected)

- If it weren't for the lack of funding for continuing students, I would be 100% satisfied with the program. The SC&I community is great!
- I am very excited to be here and to be involved with such a distinguished program.
- Thanks to the administration for their commitment to graduate education, and to Marie Radford, in particular, for her genuine and enthusiastic support of both full-time and part-time students
- I think the quality of the classes, faculty and advising are all excellent. More funding opportunities are always going to be needed, but that's common across the board. I think encouraging more partnerships with other RU schools & the library around digital humanities topics could be really helpful, and could help promote interdisciplinary scholarship across multiple fields of inquiry.
- I'm sure I'll feel more confident in my abilities the further I progress in the program. It seems presumptuous to claim complete confidence when I'm not even ABD.
- High turnover among faculty and students negatively affect students' intellectual growth, moral, and collaborative atmosphere.
- More focus on critical race theory, gender studies, sociotechnical approach, information practices.
- There is a visible lack of a Ph.D. culture that defines the program and connects Ph.D. students. It feels like the Ph.D. program is just an afterthought to the SC&I Administration and compared to other the SC&I programs. The faculty has been increasingly remote over the last 2 years. There is too much faculty turnover.
- When any professors are leaving the program, students want to know in advance so our progress and committee plan dont get interrupted.
- It is very frustrating to see good professors leaving. Good for them, but what about us?



THE Ph.D. PROGRAM COMMUNICATION, INFORMATION AND LIBRARY STUDIES EVALUATION FORM FOR QUALIFYING EXAMINATIONS

Student: _____

Reader: _____

Date Read: _____

Please: Complete this form after you read the exam. Bring the form to the oral. Give this form to the Committee Chair when the oral is completed.

Recommendation (circle one):

PASS

REVISE

FAIL

Evaluation Criteria

Please rate the student's performance on each item using the following 1-5 scale.

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| 1. Understanding of the subject area. | Excellent | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Poor |
| 2. Understanding of the relevant literature. | Excellent | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Poor |
| 3. Critical analysis of subject discussed. | Excellent | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Poor |
| 4. Demonstrated ability to develop and present a meaningful point-of-view. | Excellent | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Poor |
| 5. Organization and presentation of material. | Excellent | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Poor |
| 6. Particular strengths in the student's response. | | | | | | | |
| 7. Significant weaknesses in the student's response: | | | | | | | |



8. Additional comments or recommendations:

Signature of Reader: _____ **Date:** _____

Description of Criteria for Weighting			
Level	Excellent (5)	Satisfactory (3)	Poor (1)
Description	Demonstrates a sophisticated understanding and careful, critical analysis. Compares/contrasts perspectives, considers counter arguments or opposing positions, and draws original and thoughtful conclusions with future implications.	Demonstrates an understanding and some critical analysis. Adequately compares/contrasts perspectives, counter-arguments, or opposing positions but broader connections and/or implications are not as thoroughly explored.	Demonstrates a lack of understanding and inadequate analysis. Analysis is superficial based on opinions and preferences rather than critical analysis.

Program Name: Instructional Design and Technology Services

Program Director: Steve Garwood, Assistant Dean for Instructional Support and Assessment

Overview

The 2016-2017 academic year has been quite busy for Instructional Design and Technology Services (IDTS). Our support of teaching and learning has been conducted through various approaches including:

- Curriculum and instruction
 - Working with deans, department chairs, program directors, curriculum committee chairs, and course coordinators on projects that support teaching and learning at SC&I (e.g. program level learning goal assessment activities, RU Core alignment, course review processes)
 - Consulting on and/or designing curriculum (e.g. concentrations, tracks, specializations) with departments (chairs, curriculum committees, program directors, and/or instructors)
 - Designing and developing courses and course materials with individual instructors or course developers
 - Participating in university-wide efforts to support and improve instruction and learning (e.g. establishment of Rutgers University and Quality Matters (QM) course review processes, universal design/accessibility of instructional materials)
- Training and Development
 - Orienting and onboarding instructors who are new to SC&I and/or are teaching a different course and/or using a different course management system
 - Developing and broadly distributing instructional videos as well as other support materials (e.g. @5min videos, “Preparing Your Syllabus” tutorial, mid-term course evaluation templates, pre-semester checklists)
 - Developing, delivering, and/or supporting workshops and symposia on instructional topics
- Instructional technology
 - Analyzing technology and pedagogical support needs for instructional practices and developing and implementing solutions
 - Troubleshooting systems and services used for instruction and implementing solutions (e.g. course management systems, podiums, classroom response systems, lecture capture systems, etc.)
 - Coordinating instructional technology procurement, account management, maintenance, and evaluation (e.g. Panopto, GoToMeeting, lyndaCampus)
 - Audio/video recording, post-production, equipment loans, and course

integration support (e.g. capturing and processing video clips from television, movies, and commercials, livestream of Library and Information Science department colloquium series, recording of guest lecturers, speakers, job talks, Ph.D. presentations)

Denise Kreiger, entering her sixth year at SC&I as the Senior Instructional Design and Technology Specialist, has increased her responsibilities to manage the onboarding of new/returning SC&I instructors each semester, as well as continues to support SC&I instructors in course design and development (including course transitions and redesigns) particularly for the MI, ITI, JMS, and DCIM programs, using (3) learning management systems at SC&I (Sakai, eCollege, & Canvas), and integrating instructional technology for face-to-face/web-enhanced, hybrid, and fully online courses. Additionally, she has done a large volume of work in areas such as new hire orientation each semester, group orientations for instructors teaching multi-section courses, and creating self-directed interactive tutorials for faculty professional development. Also notable this past year, Denise has been instrumental in supporting IDTS's launching (with COHLIT) of the Canvas learning management system at SC&I, which involves converting and re-working courses from eCollege and selected Sakai courses into Canvas and orienting instructors to the new system. Outside of SC&I, she continues to participate in the Rutgers Instructional Technology Services (ITS) group with other IT/ID staff throughout Rutgers and frequently presents at the Rutgers Online Learning Conference and other Rutgers conferences, as well as at regional and national professional conferences (e.g., Quality Matters) and is a certified Quality Matters Peer-Reviewer and has conducted official QM course design reviews.

Erica Lucci, Ph.D. candidate (Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University), started part-time in November 2016 and went full-time in February 2017. She is the Canvas Migration Coordinator for SC&I. This is a 1-year full-time contract position charged specifically with assisting IDTS/SC&I with the migration from the eCollege LearningStudio course management system to the Canvas course management system. Erica is the primary contact for instructors who are/will be utilizing Canvas and is the lead coordinator working with COHLIT, program directors, and SC&I dean's office staff during this CMS transition period. While initially tasked specifically with migrating those programs which extensively/exclusively used the eCollege system (the DCIM and MI courses, respectively), she also currently works with many individual instructors who were previously using eCollege and/or who have wanted to migrate from the Sakai course management system to Canvas.

Part-time staff remained fairly consistent over the last year. Natalia Kouraeva, Ed.D. (Rutgers), who replaced pt/t instructional designer, John Obenchain, continued to support IDTS in various areas. Natalia has been working primarily on the development of professional development (PDS) courses and processing of assessment materials. She has also started the migration of PDS courses to the Canvas course management system.

In the student audio/video/lecture capture (AVLC) position, Tia Lanette has been the sole person and has been working 8-12 hours per week supporting various multimedia projects.

Other significant statistics of our work over academic year 2016-2017:

<p>Onboarding of SC&I Instructors/ Courses</p>	<p>Onboarding of SC&I instructors (new instructors and/or returning instructors teaching a different course or different LMS) providing instructional design and technology support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fall '16 semester: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Total # of unique SC&I Instructors supported by IDTS: 60 (new and returning) ○ Total # of unique SC&I courses supported by IDTS: 42 (face-to-face, hybrid, & fully online in 3 course management systems) ● Spring '17 semester: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Total # of unique SC&I Instructors supported by IDTS: 61 (new and returning) ○ Total # of unique SC&I courses supported by IDTS: 67 (face-to-face, hybrid, & fully online in 3 course management systems) ● Summer '17 semester: (in-progress) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Total # of unique SC&I Instructors supported by IDTS: 22 (new and returning) ○ Total # of unique SC&I courses supported by IDTS: 21 (face-to-face, hybrid, & fully online in 3 course management systems) ● Group Instructor Orientation Sessions for Multi-Section courses: (in-progress for Fall '17) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 04:547:220 Retrieving & Evaluating Electronic Information Sources Canvas course (multi-section hybrid course; ITI program); held on 5/17/17 ○ 04:547:201 Introduction to Computer Concepts Sakai course (multi-section FTF course; ITI program; held on 6/1/17) ○ 04:547:200 Writing for Media Canvas course (multi-section FTF course; JMS program; to be held in Summer' 17) ○ 04:189 DCIM courses (multi-section hybrid courses; to be held in Summer '17) <p>IDTS has provided assistance to instructors as part of onboarding in one or more of the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Syllabus and Course Schedule preparation ● Creating and/or copying course sites in the (3) course management systems (CMS: Sakai, eCollege, Canvas) ● 1:1 or small-group orientation to a course management system (eCollege, Sakai, and/or Canvas) ● Designing and/or developing courses in the CMS for face-to-face/web-enhanced, hybrid, and fully online courses ● Designing and/or developing student course projects and course
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● assessments in the course site in the CMS ● Integrating instructional technology tools into course sites (e.g., Panopto, social media tools, collaborative tools, digital storytelling tools, etc.) ● Designing course assessments and grading rubrics, as well as for RU Core Goals reporting ● Troubleshooting technology and/or course problems.
<p>15 course design/development - credit courses</p>	<p>For Spring '17 semester:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 04:547:103 Information Technology & Informatics (large lecture course; new Hashtag Activism Digital Story Project in Sakai using Storify; ITI program) ● 04:547:331 Networking & Internet Technology (multi-section hybrid course; convert and redesign for Canvas; ITI program) ● 17:610:547 Materials for Children (new Digital Storytelling Picture Book Project using Storybird in eCollege (online course; MI program) ● 17:610:571 Transformational Library Leadership (new FTF course delivered in Canvas using the new "online" course template; MI program) <p>For Fall '17 semester:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DCIM Program - Convert from eCollege into Canvas and Hybrid redesign/enhancements of all DCIM courses (7 courses; in-progress) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 04:189:151 Virtual Team Dynamics ○ 04:189:152 Structure of Information ○ 04:189:251 Strategic Presentation Methods in Digital Media ○ 04:189:351 Leadership in Digital Contexts ○ 04:189:352 Self and Society ○ 04:189:353 Digital Technology & Disruptive Change ○ 04:189:451 Capstone ● 04:189:103 Information Technology & Informatics Template course (large lecture course; convert and redesign for Canvas; ITI program) ● 04:547:220 Retrieving & Evaluating Electronic Information Sources Template course (multi-section hybrid course; convert and redesign for Canvas; ITI program) ● 04:567:200 Writing for Media Template course (multi-section FTF course; convert and redesign for Canvas; JMS program) ● 17:610:571 Transformational Library Leadership Template course (new online course design/develop in Canvas; MI program)
<p>150+ courses</p>	<p>Implementation of "Canvas" new course management system (with</p>

100+ instructors	COHLIT) to replace expiring eCollege; convert and re-work eCollege and selected Sakai courses into Canvas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● For Spring '17 semester <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 23 courses for 17 instructors ● For Summer '17 semester (in-progress) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 33 courses for 27 instructors ● For Fall '17 semester (in-progress as of 6/1/17) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 122 courses for 78 instructors
2	Coordinate, prepare and conduct SC&I/IDTS New Instructor Orientation Sessions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● For Spring '17 semester: 1/4/17 (with Karen Novick) ● For Fall '16 semester: 8/17/16 (IDTS only)
9	@5Min videos/instructional support materials developed and/or distributed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● (New) Preparing Your Course Syllabus - Self-Directed Interactive Tutorials (for Fall '17) ● Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher (Fall/Spring) ● Soliciting Mid-Term Course Feedback (Fall/Spring) ● Preparing for bad weather, DDOS attacks... ● Who are They? / Viewing Student Participation ● Prepping for the Upcoming Semester (Fall/Spring) ● Copying Course Shells/Sites
40+ (STEVE)	Videos recorded and produced (SC&I Talks, etc.) Video recording operations were significantly scaled back to allow for the prioritization of assessment and the migration to the Canvas course management system. Videos recorded were primarily for job talks, Ph.D. Colloquium, and LIS Colloquium. A fixed video camera with an automated recording and storage process was implemented for AY '16-'17
2500+	Panopto recordings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Instructor lectures and presentations (e.g. Comm 101, Flipped model hybrid, and online courses) ● Instructor created recordings of student presentations (esp. Public Speaking) ● Student recordings for course projects ● Stored video clips
22	RU Core Course Reports* (Coordinated process with Program Directors) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fall '16/Spring '17 courses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Communication Theory ■ Communication Research ■ Intercultural Communication ■ Communication and Technology ■ Public Speaking (On-Campus and Online)



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Approaches to Leadership ■ Health Message and Campaign Design ■ Communication, Technology and Society ■ Communication and Social Change ■ Family Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Winter '17 courses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Public Speaking (Online) ○ ITI <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Retrieving and Evaluating Electronic Information (Online) <p>*Redundant RU Core goals were removed during AY '16-'17. This process involved the curriculum committees and full faculty in Communication and Information Technology and Informatics. Final changes approved by the RU Core Curriculum Review Committee</p>
13	<p>Participation in SC&I Curriculum Reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Undergraduate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ n/a ● Graduate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Master of Information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 17:610:514 Learning Theory, Inquiry and Instructional Design - Change to name, description, learning objectives ■ 17:610:515 - Emerging Literacies: Learning and Creating with Digital Youth – New course proposal ■ 17:610:525 - Knowledge Organization, Access, and Services for School Libraries – New course proposal ■ 17:610:547 - Children, Reading, and Literacy – Change of name, description, learning objectives ■ 17:610:548 - Young Adults, Reading and Literacy – Change of name, description, learning objectives ■ 17:610:557 Database Design and Management - Change to learning objectives ■ 17:610:559 - Web Programming – New course proposal ■ 17:610:560 Foundations of Data Science - Change to name, prerequisites, description, learning objectives ■ 17:610:571 Transformative Library Leadership - Change to name, description, learning objectives ■ 17:610:575 - Leadership, Management and Evaluation of School Libraries – Change of name, description, learning objectives

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 17:610:577 Project Management: Theories and Best Practices - New course proposal, cross-listed with MCIS/MCM ■ 17:610:579 - Ethical Decision Making in Information Practices – New course proposal ■ 17:610:583 Foundations of Preservation and Archives - New course proposal
--	--

● **Rutgers-Wide Committees and Initiatives**

- Universal Design/Online Course Accessibility Committee (Steve Garwood, started Spring '15-ongoing)
- Task Force on Technology and Recording in the Classroom (Steve Garwood, started Fall '16-final report created May '17)
- Instructional Technology Services (ITS) Community of Practice Group, Rutgers-wide, Steve Garwood and Denise Kreiger (ongoing)
 - Quarterly meetings with ITS staff across Rutgers campuses to discuss new initiatives and recommendations pertaining to instructional technology, learning management systems, course quality assurance and maximizing resources and expenditures.
 - (ON-HOLD) ITS/ID Sub-Group Rutgers-Wide Committee (ongoing) to recommend quality assurance in blended/hybrid and fully online courses with faculty professional development (Instructional Design - Denise Kreiger-SC&I, Priscilla Hockin-Brown-COHLIT, Sharla Sava-OIRT, Ismael Lara-OIRT, Christie DeCarolis-Camden, Joy McDonald-Newark, and Sarah Ashley-RBHS)

● **Presentations & Professional Development: (Rutgers & Outside Conferences)**

- 5.17.16 - Rutgers Digital Classroom Services Active Learning Boot Camp Conference - "Transforming a Large-Lecture Hall Course by Adding an Active Learning Web-Enhanced Component," Denise Kreiger and Sharon Stoerger (presentation).
- 3.13.17 - Rutgers Online Learning Conference
 - "Reimagine Learning Through Digital Storytelling!" Denise Kreiger and Sharon Stoerger (presentation).
 - "Accessibility Awareness and Universal Design in Online Courses at Rutgers" Steve Garwood and members of the Rutgers Universal Design Committee (presentation)
 - "LMS Roundtable: Multiple Perspectives" Steve Garwood, David Levine (SC&I PTL), and staff from the Center for Online and Hybrid Learning and Instructional Technologies (COHLIT) at Rutgers (presentation)



- 4.21.17 - Quality Matters (QM) Regional Conference - "Reimagine an On-Campus/Classroom Course with Digital Storytelling and Blended Learning! Denise Kreiger and Sharon Stoerger (presentation)

Program Name: Career Services / Student Services

Program Director: Hester Coan, Assistant Director of Student Services for Career Services
Position

The position of Assistant Director of Student Services for Career Services within the School of Communication and Information has been in existence since May of 2015. The focus of the Assistant Director position is threefold:

- (1) Assist in the connection of learning and career possibilities for students
- (2) Cultivate relationships with employers
- (3) Provide students with employment opportunities and information

Further, in recognition of best practices outlined by the National Association of College and Employers (NACE) this position seeks to conduct data collection, management, analysis, and reporting on information about employment, industry trends, and other relevant career services information for students, faculty, and staff. This position works collaboratively with University Career Services to ensure SC&I students are offered career information.

The integration of career-focused education and support with academic and student support was one of our initial goals. In this second year we built the brand of Career Services at SC&I by maintaining an established set of regular programming services:

- Weekly email newsletters to all students
- Weekly drop in advising opportunities
- **The Mingle**, an alumni and student networking event that is hosted in the Fall semester
- **The SC&I WIDE CAREER EXPO** hosted in the Spring semester.

The Mingle – a networking event that provided a forum for current students to meet and interact with SC&I alumni for career, internship, and mentoring opportunities brought out 163 students, staff, faculty and alumni. The SC&I-wide Career Expo brings employers and exhibitors from across the disciplines and career interests represented by the academic programs in SC&I. Over 212 students attended the **SC&I WIDE CAREER EXPO**, and 60 organizations were represented by 99 Exhibitors. Both of these programs experienced growth in the 2016 – 2017 year and were promoted to students in newsletters, tweets, social media posts, in the classroom through posters and through the faculty with the attached slides.

During the 2016 - 2017 year, numerous workshops were presented and resources developed for current students, prospective students, and faculty aimed at increasing awareness of job trends within the disciplines; workshops aimed at developing appropriate job skills; and presentations aimed at facilitating students' understanding of the connection between their academic curriculum and job prospects.

Highlights are included below:

Highlights 2016 – 2017

September 2016

- Hester Coan was added to the course, **MI 501** with a module on Careers, participated in discussions, and connected with new MI students on LinkedIn
- WITI Resume And Interview Skills **Workshop** presented Sept. 19th 6:30 - 9:00 pm
- Student Organization Leadership Panopto **Orientation** and Qualtrics Survey created and distributed to student leaders and faculty advisors
- **International Student Advisors** were identified and promoted on the Career Services at SC&I Website for our international student population.
- The “**Road to Communication and Media**” is initiated new collaborative program between SC&I, University Career Services and RU Alumni Association on career paths and mentoring with alumni.

October 2016

- **Graduating Seniors received tailored email inviting to Workshops and Drop In sessions**
- **WITI posts YouTube promotional video featuring Hester Coan Workshop as background**
- Student Organization Leaders assist in planning for **The Mingle** and outreach to alums
- Presentation in **STS course** with UCS Colin Liebttag 10/21/16
- **New Major Orientation** presentation focused on Career Services at SC&I

November 2016

- Presentation for **Communication/Leadership LLC** on Monday Nov. 7 with UCS Colin Liebttag

December 2016

- **The Mingle, 12/14 (163 signed in participants plus. 250 RSVPs)**

January 2017:

- Newsletters promoting and preparing for the MegaFair (UCS) provided to all majors
- **Master’s New Student Orientation Presentation** on Career Services at SC&I
- **ITI Career Workshop** before Mega Career Fair 1/30th evening workshop pptx

February 2017:

- **Presentation to Undergrad Council** on The Road to Communication and Media and SC&I WIDE CAREER EXPO
- Promoted International Student Career Event - posted in building and in newsletter
- **Career Workshop for RASL** 2/21 evening pptx

March 2017:

- WITI/ ITI Honor Society (Gamma Nu Eta) **Interviewing Skills Workshop** evening pptx
- Emailed and Coordinated with student organizations for tables at the EXPO
- 3/7 **email outreach to all SC&I seniors** about the EXPO, “I wanted to make sure you know about the **SC&I WIDE CAREER EXPO** on March 20th from 6 – 9 pm.”
- Email to all faculty with slide to promote EXPO in class

April 2017

- Outreach to faculty updating on Career Services at SC&I EXPO and summer advising



- Outreach to SC&I students by class year on Career Services at SC&I summer options
- Promotion slide through faculty on final career fair and summer advising.