



# Core Curriculum Assessment Report 2011\_12

**Department** Communication & Journalism

**Representative** Margaret Fitch-Hauser

**Course Name / number** COMM1000

**1. AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area II: Humanities

**2. SLO(s) being assessed: Student will..**

SLO 7: Students will demonstrate oral communication skills.

**3. Assessment Method(s):**

[Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].

See attached file

**4. Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**

See attached file

**5. How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**

[What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

see attached file

**6. Additional Comments:**

[What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

see attached file

**7. Committee Comments**

Mean of rubric score= 3.89 (out of 4)The data has shown students deficient in presenting counter arguments, designing visual aids and speech delivery. The faculty have made changes to the class that addresses these specific issues. Most of the changes discussed in the report appear to be procedural: who is collecting the data and how are they collecting that data.The report would be more clear, if the proposed improvements were pulled from the report on data and written

## Assessment Report: COMM 1000 2012

### Assessment Data for speeches

The COMM 1000 committee reviewed 34 persuasive value speeches. Previous assessment reports indicated that students did poorly on presenting counterarguments, designing and delivering visual aids and speech delivery in general. Those things are being looked at more closely now that we have identified them as problem areas. In Spring 2012 we will be extending our visual aid lecture from one class day to two class days to deal with some of the problems with visual aids. We will also add a specific lecture day for counterarguments into the syllabus. We have typically been covering counterarguments with other information, but have decided to spend an entire class day talking about and working with activities to help students deliver more effective counterarguments. As a result of these measure, assessment of speeches from Spring 2012 will focus solely on counterarguments and visual aids.

While delivery of the speeches is always a problem, this is something that is constantly addressed throughout the semester. Based on me experiences teaching this class for more than 10 years, this is one area unlikely to change on a grand scale. Next year I plan to consult with colleges at other institutions to see how our guidelines on delivery match with theirs and if there are noticeable improvements in delivery based on these methods.

The past two semesters I have watched all the speeches myself and then analyzed the data. This semester the COMM 1000 Assessment Committee assisted in viewing speeches. We split the 34 speeches into 3 groups. Though instructions were provided on how to report the data, not all instructions were adhered to. As a result, some data is inconclusive. In the future, the COMM 1000 Program Director will watch the speeches and create the report. The committee members will then assist in addressing solutions to the areas of concern from the report.

### **Speech Introduction**

20 out of 34 students had all five elements of an effective introduction  
14 out of 34 students had most or some of the elements of an effective

introduction. Most of these students were only missing one of the five required statements.

### **Speech Body**

15 out of 34 students had well developed main points

The remaining responses from committee members indicated that students cited sources incorrectly or did not cite at all. The data was inconclusive regarding whether the remaining 19 students had main points but did not present them effectively, or if main points were missing.

### **Conclusion**

21 out of 34 students had a well developed conclusion

9 out of 34 students had most or some of the elements of an effective conclusion

4 out of 27 students had no conclusion

### **Visual Aid**

Explanation of the Aid

16 out of 34 students explained the visual aid in relation to topic at hand

18 out of 34 students either did not explain the visual aid, or did not do so in a way that related to the topic or the major idea where the visual was presented

Effective Supporting Material on the Visual Aid

18 out of 34 students included effective supporting material for the visual

16 out of 34 students did not have supporting material that supplements the speech points well

Effective Delivery of the Aid

12 out of 34 students did not effectively deliver the aid

15 out of 34 students did effectively deliver the aid

The remaining 7 students are inconclusive based on the data submitted

Choice of Visual Aid (i.e. the type of visual aid chosen complemented the spoken material in the most effective manner)

15 out of 27 students chose a visual that complemented the material

12 out of 27 student chose a visual that did not complement the material

## **Delivery**

11 out of 34 forms did not contain the appropriate data on delivery for an accurate assessment. Therefore, the numbers reported will be from the 23 forms that did indicate information on delivery.

9 out of 23 students delivered the speech with consistent eye contact with the audience

14 out of 23 students did not maintain consistent eye contact with the audience

13 out of 23 students had too many vocal fillers in the speech

10 out of 23 students had no or so few vocal fillers it was not noticeable

10 out of 23 students moved too much during the course of the speech

13 out of 23 students did not have distracting movement or mannerisms

## **Language**

11 out of 34 forms did not contain any information on language. Therefore, the numbers reported will be from the 23 forms that did indicate information on language.

20 out of 23 students employed language techniques in an effective manner

0 out of 23 students used inappropriate or offensive language

3 out of 23 students presented at least one fallacy in the speech

## **Counterarguments**

11 out of 34 forms did not contain any discernible information on counterarguments. Therefore, the numbers reported will be from the 23 forms that did indicate information on counterarguments

18 out of 23 students addressed a counterargument in the speech – this seems to be major improvement from the past two semesters. However, since the data from 11 forms is inconclusive, this may not be case.

Some other information about counterarguments can be broken down as follows:

1 student addressed the counterargument, but didn't give it fair weight

8 students addressed the counterargument, but didn't present enough evidence to effectively refute it

4 students did not address any type of counterargument

## Assessment Data for Peer Speech Evaluations

As has been the case for the past year when evaluating the responses from students after they watched a student's COMM 1000 speech from the previous year students recognize elements like the topic, conclusion and whether a speaker demonstrates effective eye contact. They give incorrect responses often for the speech's specific purpose, the main points, the speech's organizational pattern and actual transitions. These four things are simple concepts and each one of these elements is presented in class lectures as well as the assigned readings. We are not spending additional time on these things in the classroom based on our findings. We are, however, pointing out to students that poor listening and not reading often hinders their ability to comprehend important concepts.

To collect this data, all students that met in a technology classroom (23 out of 34 sections) were shown the same speech and asked to answer the same questions about that speech. One student response sheet from each of those 34 sections was evaluated for these purposes. Here are the overall findings:

### **Identified Topic**

All 23 responses indicated that the topic was clear

### **Specific Purpose**

None of the responses indicated the correct specific purpose. All of the responses did not go beyond the topic. The topic was hunting, but more specifically, she discussed bow hunting.

### **Identified Preview Statement**

21 out of 24 students were able to correctly re-state the speaker's preview statement

3 out of 24 students incorrectly stated the speech did not have a preview statement

### **Identified Organizational Pattern**

12 out of 23 students were able to correctly identify the speech's organizational pattern – this is an increase from last year's report

9 out of 23 students left the question blank  
2 out of 23 students answered incorrectly

### **Identified Transitions**

22 out of 23 students were able to recognize that the speech had clear transitions  
1 out of 23 students was unable to recognize that the speech had clear transitions  
Out of the 22 that said the speech had clear transitions, 11 were able to correctly re-state those transitions – this is also an increase from the previous year’s report.

### **Identified Conclusion**

23 out of 23 students were able to clearly recognize the speech conclusion

### **Eye Contact**

18 out of 23 students felt the speaker maintained appropriate eye contact with the audience

### **Vocalized Pauses**

8 out of 23 students identified vocalized pauses in the speech  
14 out of 23 students did not believe the speaker had any vocalized pauses  
1 student put a question mark for the answer

### **Assessment Data for Outlines**

Based on the data analyzed, most students are still turning in properly formatted outlines. To analyze this area we collected an outline from each section. We analyzed 33 out of 34 possible outlines (one instructor did not turn in student outlines from one of his sections).

We like to keep things consistent across sections and it is clear that the outlines match each other in terms of format throughout the program. There are a few variations, but this is likely due to students not following directions.

A breakdown of each part of the outline is not included in this assessment because it is clear that the outlines from this semester are consistent with last semesters report. For the next academic year (Fall 2012), I’m going to come up with a questionnaire for each instructor/GTA to fill out in relation to the outline/speech relationship. Because we know students are turning in correctly formatted outlines, I’d like to get more detailed responses from the instructors about correlations

between grades and the quality of the outline. The spring 2012 report on this section will likely not include a break-down of each part of the outline unless major variations are noticed.

#### Assessment Data for speeches Spring 2012

The COMM 1000 committee reviewed persuasive value speeches (24 out of 28 sections). Previous assessment reports indicated that students did poorly on presenting counterarguments as well as designing and delivering visual aids. This semester, only those portions of speeches were analyzed.

While counterarguments seem to be improving, visual aids still receive low marks. The COMM 1000 Committee will be discussing guidelines for changing explanations and requirements for visual aids this semester.

#### Counterarguments

14 out of 24 students presented effective counterarguments in their persuasive value speech

2 out of 24 students did not have any type of counterargument

The remaining statistics can be broken down as follows:

4 out of 24 students addressed a counterargument, but didn't give it fair weight

3 out of 24 students addressed the counterargument, but didn't present enough evidence to effectively refute it

1 student addressed the counterargument, but did not provide a source citation as required

#### Visual Aid

5 out of 24 students did not present a visual aid in their speech

#### Explanation of the Aid

15 out of 24 students explained the visual aid in relation to topic at hand

### Effective Supporting Material on the Visual Aid

12 out of 24 students included effective supporting material for the visual

### Effective Delivery of the Aid

12 out of 24 students did not effectively deliver the aid

Choice of Visual Aid (i.e. the type of visual aid chosen complemented the spoken material in the most effective manner)

12 out of 24 students chose a visual that complemented the material

### Assessment Data for Peer Speech Evaluations

As has been the case for the past year when evaluating the responses from students after they watched a student's COMM 1000 speech from the previous year students recognize elements like the topic, conclusion and whether a speaker demonstrates effective eye contact. They give incorrect responses often for the speech's specific purpose, the main points, the speech's organizational pattern and actual transitions. These four things are simple concepts and each one of these elements is presented in class lectures as well as the assigned readings. We are not spending additional time on these things in the classroom based on our findings. We are, however, pointing out to students that poor listening and not reading often hinders their ability to comprehend important concepts.

To collect this data, all students that met in a technology classroom (18 out of 28 sections) were shown the same speech and asked to answer the same questions about that speech. One student response sheet from each of those 18 sections was evaluated for these purposes. Here are the overall findings:

#### Identified Topic

All 18 responses indicated that the topic was clear

#### Specific Purpose



3 out of 18 students correctly identified the specific purpose statement.

12 out of 18 students included the phrase “to inform” in their answer, which is part of what makes the specific purpose statement. However, only three of those were able to narrow it down to the actual specific purpose – most just re-stated the topic itself

#### Identified Preview Statement

13 out of 18 students correctly re-stated the speaker’s preview statement – The remaining five did indicate the speaker had a preview statement. They just couldn’t identify all the points detailed in the preview statement.

#### Identified Organizational Pattern

9 out of 18 students correctly identified the speech’s organizational pattern

4 out of 18 students left the question blank

5 out of 18 students listed generic references to the three major portions of a speech (introduction, body, conclusion)

#### Identified Transitions

16 out of 13 students recognized the speech had clear transitions

Of those 16, 9 correctly re-stated a transition. The remaining gave examples of signposts instead of transitions.

#### Identified Conclusion

17 out of 18 students were able to clearly recognize the speech conclusion

#### Eye Contact

14 out of 18 students indicated the speaker maintained appropriate eye contact with the audience

#### Vocalized Pauses

2 out of 18 students identified vocalized pauses in the speech

### Assessment Data for Outlines

Based on the data analyzed, most students are still turning in properly formatted outlines. To analyze this area we collected an outline from each section. We analyzed 25 out of 28 possible outlines (one instructor did not turn in student outlines from her three sections).

A breakdown of each part of the outline is not included in this assessment because it is clear that the outlines from this semester are consistent with last semesters report. For the next academic year (Fall 2012), I'm going to come up with a questionnaire for each instructor/GTA to complete. Because we know students are turning in correctly formatted outlines, I'd like to get more detailed responses from the instructors about correlations between the actual speeches, speech grades and the quality of the outline.

### Assessment Data for Final Exam Questions

Ten questions were analyzed based on student responses from the Spring Final Exam. Not all instructors turned in final exam data as requested. The responses are based on data from 356 students. Below are the results:

#### Main Points:

275 out of 356 students answered correctly

81 out of 356 students answered incorrectly

#### Delivery:

277 out of 356 students answered correctly

79 out of 356 students answered correctly

#### Central Idea:

271 out of 356 students answered correctly

85 out of 356 students answered incorrectly

Evidence:

235 out of 356 students answered correctly

121 out of 356 students answered correctly

Listening:

324 out of 356 students answered correctly

32 out of 356 students answered incorrectly

Informative Speaking:

344 out of 356 students answered correctly

12 out of 356 students answered incorrectly

Fallacies:

355 out of 356 students answered correctly

1 out of 356 students answered incorrectly

Visual Aids:

330 out of 356 students answered correctly

26 out of 356 students answered correctly

Audience:

304 out of 356 students answered correctly

52 out of 356 students answered correctly

Persuasion:

333 out of 356 students answered correctly

23 out of 365 students answered correctly

