

## Oral Communication Assessment

Fall 2019

### Method:

Oral Communication was assessed by course instructors through the completion of rubrics on a sampling of their students' work. Eleven courses were chosen for the assessment (see Table 1), which comprised 142 individual classes. These courses were selected for inclusion based upon course mapping to the Oral Communication General Education Outcome. A stratified random sampling method was used to select the courses for this semester's assessment. Two courses were randomly selected from each department from a list of all of the courses mapped to the outcome from that department's programs. In this way, each department would be represented by two courses in the assessment. However, three departments had only one course mapped to the outcome. Therefore, the final sample only included 11 courses representing eight departments. Two students from each class of the selected courses were randomly chosen for assessment, for a total of 284 students.

Instructors were initially notified of their class's inclusion in the assessment with an email sent within the first month of the semester. This notice informed the instructors of the outcome that was to be assessed, and that they would be asked to assess a sample of student work that demonstrated the skills represented in that outcome. They were further asked to await specific instructions in an additional, forthcoming email notice. The second notice was sent in the second month of the semester and contained full assessment instructions and a link to an online survey to complete for the selected students from each of their class sections. The survey was developed in Qualtrics survey software. Upon clicking on the link in the email notice, instructors were taken into the online survey and presented first with an instruction page containing the text of the general education outcome and the details of the selected class section. The survey was then separated into two parts; one for each of the randomly selected students. Each section listed the name of the selected student and began with an item to indicate whether work from the student was available, with selection options to indicate why the work may be unavailable for assessment.

If student work was available for assessment, the survey continued on to the assessment rubric. The analytic rubric assessed students on five criteria; audience, organization/structure, idea delivery, focus/purpose, and content. These criteria were rated on a four-point scale, ranging from 1, entry, to 4, advanced. The survey also included an option to mark any criterion as not applicable if the student work did not contain any elements that could be assessed for that criterion.

A reminder email that again contained the survey link was sent to faculty members whom had not yet responded approximately two weeks before the due date for submission. Submissions were due after final exams, on the same day that final grades were to be submitted. At the close of the assessment, results were downloaded from the survey software and analyzed in SPSS statistical software.

Table 1. Courses selected for assessment of Oral Communication

| <b>Course</b> | <b>Number of Classes</b> |
|---------------|--------------------------|
| ART 115       | 5                        |
| CNT 120       | 8                        |
| COMM 101      | 77                       |
| COMM 203      | 9                        |
| ENGL 106      | 16                       |
| ENGR 102      | 3                        |
| ENVS 201      | 4                        |
| NURS 141      | 10                       |
| NURS 144      | 7                        |
| PLGL 210      | 2                        |
| THTR 130      | 1                        |

Results:

Artifacts were submitted for 163 students (57.39%). Artifacts could not be collected from 22 (7.75%) of the selected students because the students either dropped the course or did not turn in the assignment that was chosen for assessment. Several instructors indicated that they did not believe that their course was a good fit for the assessment, which accounted for an additional 26 (9.15%) missing artifacts. The remaining missing artifacts (78 (27.46%)) could not be accounted for. Rubric scores for the assessed students are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Frequency table of rubric scores for all assessed students

| Criteria                   | 4- Advanced | 3-Established | 2- Developing | 1-Entry | Mean (SD) |
|----------------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------|-----------|
| Audience                   | 42(26.1%)   | 92(57.1%)     | 22(13.7%)     | 5(3.1%) | 3.06(.72) |
| Organization/<br>Structure | 51(32.1%)   | 83(52.2%)     | 19(11.9%)     | 6(3.8%) | 3.13(.76) |
| Idea Delivery              | 41(25.5%)   | 92(57.1%)     | 25(15.5%)     | 3(1.9%) | 3.06(.70) |
| Focus/Purpose              | 51(31.7%)   | 83(51.6%)     | 23(14.3%)     | 4(2.5%) | 3.12(.74) |
| Content                    | 56(34.8%)   | 81(50.3%)     | 20(12.4%)     | 4(2.5%) | 3.17(.74) |

All five of the criteria for Oral Communication reached proficiency. Mean scores for the criteria showed little variability, with the mean for the Content criterion being the highest with a mean of 3.17 (0.74), and the means for the Idea Delivery and Audience criteria tying for the lowest, with means of 3.06 (SD of .70 and .72 respectively).

