**2014-2015 Humanities General Education Assessment**

**Results and Closing the Loop Actions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Directions:** For each department/program student learning outcome, the department will provide the following information on the results of assessment completed during this current academic year. What has been learned about curriculum, pedagogy, student learning? What percent of students – exceeded, met, approached, did not meet – the criteria of success? What specific actions will the department initiate for improvement (“Closing the Loop”), including budget requests? Enter this information in the table below. Submit this form at the end of each academic year during the three-year assessment cycle. This table has space for reports on only one outcome; copy it for additional outcomes in this report.

**Results and Closing the Loop actions were discussed with faculty – Chair Signature: Monica Brasted Date: November 17, 2014**

**Faculty Present: Carol Babcock**

**Outcome assessed:** SUNY SLO for Humanities courses: Students will demonstrate knowledge of the conventions and methods of at least one of the Humanities in addition to those encompassed by other knowledge areas in the General Education curriculum. Students will demonstrate competence in analyzing texts in the Humanities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List all courses providing assessment data on this outcome (one row for each)</th>
<th>Specific Assignments/Task Evaluated in each course listed</th>
<th>Results of Assessment: n= ______ (total number of all assessments) [% Exceeding; Meeting/Approaching; Not Meeting Criterion of Success]</th>
<th>What was benchmark or criterion of success?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CMC 219.01/01B Advertising, Mass Persuasion and the Consumer | Analysis of Political Rhetoric Paper | Total number of students assessed in the course – all sections (n): 25  
  Percent exceeding: 67%  
  Percent meeting: 21%  
  Percent approaching: 10%  
  Percent not meeting: 2% | Restate your benchmark:  
  At least 75% of the students will earn overall rating of “meets” or “exceeds” for the outcome being assessed.  
  Did you meet your benchmark?  
  Yes  
  No |
| CMC 219.04/04B Advertising, Mass Persuasion and the Consumer | Analysis of Political Rhetoric Paper | Total number of students assessed in the course – all sections (n): 25  
  Percent exceeding: 53%  
  Percent meeting: 23%  
  Percent approaching: 16%  
  Percent not meeting: 8% | Restate your benchmark:  
  At least 75% of the students will earn overall rating of “meets” or “exceeds” for the outcome being assessed.  
  Did you meet your benchmark?  
  Yes  
  No |

**Actions to be taken as a direct result of assessment results (“Closing the Loop”):**

Based on this data, we are meeting the benchmark for the SLO in both sections of this class. Eighty-eight percent of students met or exceeded in section 1 and 76% met or exceeded in section 4. If we average these two sections together, 82% of the students in these courses met or exceeded the outcome being assessed. Given the results of this assessment, a majority of students were successful in analyzing texts. There does not seem to be any significant changes that need to be made to these courses or the approach used to achieve the assessed student learning outcome.
Overview:

In a 3-4 page analysis containing an introduction, a body, a conclusion, compare/contrast two political ads—one ad must be prior to 1980, and the other ad must be 1980 or after—from the website noted below, or one that you are familiar with which offers videos of political ads. [Hint: If it does not function like a link, highlight it, and copy + paste it into your browser.]

http://www.livingroomcandidate.org/

Structure: Introductions should preview the paper a bit in an interesting way. The Body should provide a summary of the ads—the candidate’s name and year he is running, political party affiliation, and office the politician is running for in the ad, plus any additional information you deem appropriate (i.e. Opponent? Which is incumbent?). Then, move into the comparison and analysis, as described in the next paragraph, below. The conclusion should be clearly separate from the Body, and follow the same guidelines used for speech guidelines earlier this term.

For the Body: Read the questions posed in both The Pitch and The Pep Talk (“Images & Issues” reading posted on Angel) for each of your comparison ads. Use the questions to help you formulate your comparison analysis, and properly use terms as you give your examples. Summarize the similarities and differences of these two ads. The comparison will be evaluated based on critical thinking (substance) and development of your thoughts generated by the questions including specific details/descriptions and relevant examples in your discussion.

Use 12-pitch font and one-inch margins, double-spaced. Attach a visual image that represents each ad, or a link to a website you used, if possible. Submit your work using the drop box provided by your instructor on Angel.
| 14 | 25 | 9 | 25 | 22 | 89 |
| 15 | 25 | 25 | 18 | 22 | 90 |
| 16 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 19 | 94 |
| 17 | 25 | 20 | 22 | 22 | 89 |
| 18 | 25 | 20 | 19 | 19 | 83 |
| 19 | 25 | 25 | 22 | 25 | 97 |
| 20 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 25 | 98 |
| 21 | 25 | 22 | 25 | 19 | 91 |
| 22 | 25 | 19 | 25 | 22 | 91 |
| 23 | 25 | 22 | 19 | 19 | 85 |
| 24 | 25 | 24 | 25 | 25 | 99 |
| **TOTALS** | **597** | **528** | **529** | **539** | **2193** |

| Averages | avg. 23.88 (11.5%) | avg. 21.12 (84.5%) | avg. 20.16 (80.6%) | avg. 21.56 (86.2%) | **87.72** |

| Details of Rubric Standards | 22E (88%), 1M (4%), 2N (8%) | 11E (44%), 7M (28%), 4A (16%), 3N (12%) | 12E (48%), 5M (20%), 5A (20%), 3N (12%) | **8E (32%), 10M (40%), 5A (20%), 2N (8%)** | **53E (53%), 23M (23%), 14A (14%), 10N (10%)** |

Standards Key: E=Exceeded; M=Met; A=Approached; N=Not Met
People often complain vaguely about political language (“All promises…all lies…too confusing”) or ignore it and drop out, because they don’t understand some basics. Appreciate free elections; using words and images (not force and violence), persuaders seek support for themselves, their ideas.

**Images & Issues: How to Analyze Election Rhetoric**

Prepare yourself to analyze political language in a non-partisan, common sense way. We don’t know in advance whether a message is true or not, beneficial or not, cogent or not, practical or not; but we do know some predictable patterns in content and form.

**CONTENT.** The core message of a candidate can be basically summarized as: “I am competent and trustworthy; from me, you’ll get more ‘good’ and less ‘bad.’” This sentence contains three claims (competent, trustworthy, benevolent—as in Aristotle’s ethos) and a promise of benefits. If politicians are “always promising,” remember we are always benefit-seeking: no matter how we define “good” and “bad,” we want to get and keep the “good” and to avoid or change the “bad.” Thus:

Expect from the HAVES, a conservative rhetoric stressing protection (keep the “good”) and prevention (avoid the “bad”).
Expect from the HAVE-NOTS, a progressive rhetoric stressing relief (change the “bad”) and acquisition (get the “good”).

**FORM.** The “pitch” and the “pep talk” are terms used here to describe two commonly-seen patterns of persuasion, the structure underneath most messages.

**The pitch.**

The “pitch” is basically a five-part strategy, usually seen in commercial advertising, but also common in political ads. Ask these questions:

1. What attention-getting techniques are used? (Often, simple repetition for name-recognition; thus, many posters, buttons, TV spots)
2. What confidence-building techniques are used? (To project the “image” of being competent, trustworthy, benevolent: note the smiles, handshakes, sincere look; the endorsements; the patriotic associations).
3. What desire-stimulating techniques are used? (Conservatives and progressives emphasize different aspects, stimulating desires for “goods” and fears of “bads.” Commercial ads focus on specific, individual benefits; political ads on general, social benefits: peace, prosperity, honest and efficient government. Everyone agrees on these as general goals, but disagrees about the specific means to them.)
4. Are there urgency-stressing techniques used? (Common in campaigns; sometimes an intense “now-or-never, before-it’s-too-late” pleas.)
5. What response is sought? (Often, simply to vote for a person or party.)
The Pep Talk
The “pep talk” seeks committed collective action. It’s less common, but more intense, stirring emotions of fear or anger, as in party rallies, single-issue or “cause” groups, war propaganda, and in targeted direct mail. Often, the “pep talk” pattern is

Threat/Bonding/Cause/Response. As these questions:

1. What is the threat feared? (The danger” The possible loss? Who are the foes? The victims? The warning-givers? What “horror stories” told?)
2. What words and nonverbals are used in bonding the group? (Marching, singing, cheering; symbols, uniforms—stressing unity, loyalty, and quality)
3. What is the “cause” defended? (What duty words are used?—should, ought, must; What defense words—save, protect, help. What “other” needs the defending?—the nation, the people, the workers, the poor, the children, the animals, the environment?)
4. What response is sought? (Simply, to vote? Or more?—join, enlist, work, fight, picket, march, crusade, give, donate.)

Analysis of form and content is limited: It does not examine truth or deception, accuracy or error, intent or consequences; but it’s a useful