1. Name(s) and Number(s) of Course being assessed for Oral Communication: (e.g. ENGL 4444; Capstone in Literature)

HDFS 3080: Development of Interpersonal Skills

2. Number of Students enrolled per year AND number of those students whose work was assessed for oral communication (SLO 7) competency:

- There are approximately 170 students enrolled in HDFS 3080 per year (including summer). - All students (N = 139) enrolled in HDFS 3080 Fall semester 2012 (n = 63) and Spring semester 2013 (n = 76) were assessed for oral communication competency.

3. Assessment Method(s): Explain how assessment for 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.)

Students enrolled in the HDFS 3080 – Development of Interpersonal Skills for Fall semester 2012 and Spring semester 2013 were required to demonstrate basic oral communication skills by video recording a conflict resolution role-play with another student in the course. Students were randomly assigned a partner and provided with scenarios from which they could choose. Prior to the assessment, students received lectures on skills necessary for effective interpersonal communication and practiced the skills targeted for assessment through in-class role-plays and written assignments for which they received feedback. Any perceived deficiencies were addressed prior to students completing the assignment. Requirements for the oral communication assessment and the grading rubric were also reviewed with students prior to completion of the role-play assignment. In completing the assignment, student pairs recorded their role-plays using webcams. Videos were then uploaded to Canvas and oral communication skills were assessed by both instructors and course peers in three areas: listening, speaking, and non-verbal behavior. A grading rubric was created for the assessment (see attached) and it addressed key skills such as whole messages, paraphrasing, open-ended questions, and non-verbal attending behavior.

4. If the Assessment methods differ from those initially proposed to the CCGEC, identify the differences and explain the rationale for those changes:

N/A

Attachment File Name: SLO 7 Report 2012-2013.docx

5. Based on the comprehensive rubric for the appropriate SLO7, indicate the extent of competency of the average student who has completed this course:

advanced ability

6. Findings: (what add assessment data tell you about student proficiency in this outcome?)

The analysis of the assessment data provided both areas of student proficiency and areas where students’ oral communication skills could be further developed. Continued revision of the assignment and assessment rubric has resulted in a more valid and reliable assessment of student learning. Student proficiency regarding the three skill areas over the past year were as follows: Listening-Paraphrasing Fall 2012: Students were proficient in paraphrasing the content of their role-play partner message (94.35% of students) and feeling (87.5%). 87.5% of students paraphrased both content and feeling. Spring 2013: Students were proficient in paraphrasing the
content of their role-play partner message (97.37% of students) and feeling (93.09%). 91.78% of students paraphrased both content and feeling. - PromptsoFall 2012: 92.86% of students always or almost always provided appropriate prompts to convey listening, 4.76% provided appropriate prompts sometimes, and 2.38% never or almost never provided prompts. oSpring 2013: 46.05% of students always or almost always provided appropriate prompts to convey listening, 26.97% provided appropriate prompts sometimes, and 26.97% never or almost never provided prompts. - QuestionsoFall 2012: All students demonstrated proficiency in asking open-ended questions; however 19% of students included closed-ended questions when seeking clarification from their partner. oSpring 2013: Nearly all students demonstrated proficiency in asking open-ended questions (97.7%); however 21.05% of students included closed-ended questions when seeking clarification from their partner. - Disconfirming ResponsesoFall 2012: Students demonstrated proficiency in avoiding some disconfirming responses, such as advising (3.97% respectively), but they demonstrated less effectiveness in avoiding analyzing, cold comfort, and judging responses (19.74%, 18.25%, and 18.25% of students respectively). oSpring 2013: Students demonstrated proficiency in avoiding some disconfirming responses, such as cold comfort and advising (3.66% and 1.22% respectively), but they demonstrated less effectiveness in avoiding analyzing and judging responses (13.41% and 18.29% of students respectively). Speaking-Whole MessageoFall 2012: 91.67% of students were able to effectively demonstrate a whole message. Students were proficient in communicating all aspects of a whole message (Facts: 96.43%; Opinions: 96.83%; Needs: 93.25%; and Feelings: 91.67%). oSpring 2013: 93.42% of students were able to effectively demonstrate a whole message. Students were proficient in communicating all aspects of a whole message (Facts: 99.34%; Opinions: 95.07%; Needs: 93.42%; and Feelings: 94.08%). Non-verbal-SOLER oFall 2012: Students were proficient in Squarely facing their partner (87.3% of students). Students were deficient in maintaining Eye contact (54.76%), an Open body position (69.84%), Leaning toward their partner (62.7%), and a Relaxed demeanor (57.14%). oSpring 2013: Students were proficient in Squarely facing their partner (100% of students), maintaining an Open body position (92.11%) and Relaxed demeanor (88.82%), and moderately proficient in maintaining Eye contact (74.27%). Students were deficient in Leaning toward their partner (65.79%). Because of the many changes between the fall and spring semesters, the following analyses use the latest version of the assignment and grading rubric administered in the Spring 2013 semester. Changes included an adjustment on the assessment of prompts, an emphasis on training students on using the rubric when evaluating their peers, and an inclusion of an instructor calibration prior to grading student videos independently. The prompt portion of the assessment rubric was changed so that evaluators would rate prompts based on a 5-point likert-type scale from “never” to “always” rather than counting the number of prompts. Additionally, students were better trained by having them watch an interpersonal communication video from the previous semester and then rate the students in the video using the assessment rubric. Once students finished watching the video, their evaluations were compared to the instructors’ evaluations. Discrepancies were then discussed. Finally, the instructors for the course calibrated their grading by using the assessment rubric to grade three student videos independently and then discussing the discrepancies in the grades. Once the instructors’ grading was calibrated, they then graded the remaining videos. - The role-play assessment demonstrated concurrent validity with overall grades (after removing role-play assessment and attendance scores) in the course [r(t74) = .283, p = 0.013]. It appears that students’ scores on the role-play assessment is a significant indicator of overall content in the interpersonal communications course. The moderate correlation also indicates that the role-play assignments also add skills to the course that are not obtained through other required assignments. - Each student’s role-play video was graded independently by two instructors. The instructors were no different in the grading of students’ performances ([t(75) = 1.28, p = n.s.]) indicating that the rubric resulted in similar grade assignments between instructors. The role-play assessment also demonstrated excellent inter-rater reliability (ICC (3, 2) = 0.81; 95% CI [0.694, 0.877]; F = 5.19, p < 0.001) indicating agreement between high and low performers on the assignment. - There was a difference
(t(75) = 2.14, p = 0.036; d = 0.25) between the instructors’ ratings (m = 52.78, s = 2.76) and the student peer ratings (m = 53.22, s = 1.92) which indicate that students were more lenient and less variable in their grading. Although significant, the difference in grading was only half of one point on the assignment which indicates there may not be much of a practical effect (0.1% of student’s grade in the course). Additionally, inter-rater reliability between instructors and students was excellent (ICC (3, 2) = 0.83; 95% CI [0.732, 0.894]; F = 6.17, p < 0.001). It appears students were similar with instructors when distinguishing between high and low performers on the assignment.

7. 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?)

The rubric performed extremely well in evaluating the oral communication assignment for the spring 2013 semester. Adjustments to the assignment, rubric, and training of students in each of the subsequent semesters prior to spring 2013 has progressively refined the role-play assignment and rubric into a valid and reliable instrument. There are no changes anticipated for the assignment and assessment for the Fall 2013. In anticipation for the Spring 2014 semester, both Jamie Sailors and Robert Bubb will meet to discuss ways to increase opportunities for students to identify suitable and effective mediums for message dissemination.

8. Additional Comments: (What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?)

9. Committee Comments