

Communication Studies
Oral Communication General Education Assessment
2023-2024

Learning Outcome:

1b. Oral: Students will be able to effectively express ideas and information to others through oral communication

Outcome Measure:

A formative assessment of student's informative speech, which is often the student's first major assignment in the COM 1000 course.

Criteria for Success (if applicable):

Minimum average of 2.0 (out of 4.0) for each criteria on the analytic rubric.

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

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

Longitudinal Data:

Beginning in Fall 2015, data was gathered by taking a random sampling of students from all sections of each course. The scores below reflect averages of data collected.

Oral Communication Value Rubric - Average Student Scores:

Course	Semester	N	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message	Average
COM 100	Fall 2013	64	3.00	3.36	2.83	3.16	2.98	3.07
COM 100	Spring 2014	38	3.32	3.47	3.47	3.45	3.39	3.42
COM 100	Fall 2014	89	3.00	3.06	3.06	2.80	2.97	2.98
COM 100	Spring 2015	72	3.03	3.07	3.01	2.83	3.03	3.00
COM 100	Fall 2015	47	3.42	3.42	3.33	3.27	3.24	3.34
COM 100	Spring 2016	22	2.86	3.23	2.91	3.00	3.09	3.02
COM 100	Fall 2015	20	3.35	3.95	3.00	3.75	3.95	3.60
COM 100	Spring 2017	18	3.89	3.72	3.56	3.72	3.75	3.73
COM 100	Fall 2017	104	3.46	3.35	3.05	3.45	3.58	3.38
COM 100	Spring 2018	38	3.22	3.30	3.24	3.32	3.43	3.30
COM 100	Fall 2018	115	3.59	3.32	3.38	3.38	3.58	3.45
COM 100	Spring 2019	41	3.63	3.49	3.22	3.68	3.66	3.54
COM1000	Fall 2019	31	3.29	3.16	3.26	3.29	3.29	3.26
COM1000	Spring 2020	36	3.56	3.56	3.31	3.50	3.47	3.48
COM1000	Fall 2020	88	3.39	3.35	3.17	3.41	3.32	3.33

Course	Semester	N	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message	Average
COM1000	Spring 2021	31	3.35	3.35	3.13	3.26	3.29	3.28
COM1000	Fall 2021	69	3.42	3.43	3.43	3.36	3.49	3.43
COM1000	Spring 2022	38	3.55	3.53	3.24	3.47	3.37	3.43
COM1000	Fall 2022	101	3.35	3.34	3.13	3.34	3.39	3.31
COM1000	Spring 2023	67	2.24	2.18	2.22	2.18	2.25	2.21
COM1000	Fall 2023	182	2.74	2.66	2.53	2.71	2.71	2.67
COM1000	Spring 2024	38	3.42	3.37	2.87	3.26	3.58	3.30

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The most recent data shows we are above the targeted minimum average of 2.0/4.0. Interestingly, the fall scores were lower than spring scores in every category. This could be due the large disparity in enrollment between the two semesters. It could also be due to the significant changes in faculty teaching the course over the past year.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

I am instituting several changes that will make for a better course experience for our students overall. First, I selected a new textbook for the course. The former book has been used since at least 2015 and has never been updated. The next text was published in 2023 and offers engaging and relevant content that is current and fresh.

Second, I connected the publisher with our Canvas team to help integrate their online resources (knowledge checks, interactive lessons, videos, etc.) directly into our canvas shells. Now all COM 1000 students will benefit from the technically savvy course material delivery. Below is the rubric on which we base our assessment.

Third, I continue to seek out quality adjuncts to teach the course. We need better inter-rater reliability for the speech grading so I will be training on this during our Welcome Week meetings. This will help inform our future data collection and make it more reliable.



Rubric Used:

ORAL COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

Definition: Oral communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors. *Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.*

	Capstone (4)	Milestones (3)	Milestones (2)	Benchmark (1)
Organization	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation.
Language	Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience.
Delivery	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable.
Supporting Material	A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.
Central Message	Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)	Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.	Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable.	Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation.