

Oral Communication Assessment

Fall 2016

Method:

The General Education Outcome for Oral Communication was defined as the ability to competently construct and effectively present orally, information designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors. This outcome was assessed through the collection of videos of students' speech assignments. Students were randomly selected for assessment from the course Communications 101, which has an oral speech presentation requirement. In the Fall 2016 semester, this course was comprised of 82 individual classes. Two students were randomly selected for assessment from each of these classes, resulting in 164 students being included in the assessment.

Instructors for Communications 101 were notified of the course's participation in the assessment through emails sent in October 2016. This email notice informed the instructors of the students selected for assessment as well as instructions for submitting the recorded speeches. The persuasive speech assignment was chosen for the assessment because the requirements for this speech most closely matched the definition of the outcome. If this speech could not be submitted from a selected student, instructors were asked to indicate a reason for the missing work, such as the student dropped the course or did not complete the persuasive speech assignment. In order to submit the videos of the speech assignment, all COMM 101 instructors were given access to a shared Google Drive folder and asked to upload the videos into this folder. Students' names were removed from the files by the instructors prior to upload. An additional, reminder email was sent approximately two weeks prior to the end of the semester.

All submitted videos were downloaded from Google Drive, and then uploaded into the Tk20 assessment software program. Nine volunteers assessed the videos within Tk20. The group of assessors first attended a norming session in which five artifacts were communally assessed in order to ensure the reliability of the rubric and within the group of assessors. Three of the five videos were found to have technical difficulties that rendered them unusable, and three additional videos were uploaded. After the successful norming session, the remaining videos were assessed using the rubric. Each artifact was assessed twice, by two different volunteers. The analytic rubric consisted of five dimensions: Focus, organization, style, physical behaviors, and language delivery. The dimensions were rated on a 5-point Lykert-type scale, ranging from 4, expert proficiency, to 0, no/limited proficiency.

Results:

Videos were assessed from 67 (40.9%) students. Videos were not submitted from 30 (18.3%) students due to the student dropping the course or not completing the assignment. An additional 51 (31.1%) videos were unusable due to technical difficulties. The remaining videos were not submitted for various reasons, including the videos being submitted after the assessment deadline. Rubric scores for the assessed students are shown in Table 2. Note that row counts do not total the number of assessed students because each student was assessed twice. In addition, “not applicable” and missing scores were not included in the row totals.

Criterion	0- No/Limited Proficiency	1-Some Proficiency	2- Proficiency	3- Advanced Proficiency	4-Expert Proficiency	Total	Mean	NA/ Missing
Focus	0	13 (11.5%)	41 (36.6%)	51 (45.1%)	8 (7.1%)	113	2.48 (.79)	6 (5.0%)
Organization	1 (0.9%)	20 (17.7%)	39 (34.5%)	42 (37.2%)	11 (9.7%)	113	2.37 (.92)	6 (5.0%)
Style	0	23 (20.5%)	40 (35.7%)	39 (34.8%)	10 (8.9%)	112	2.32 (.90)	7 (5.9%)
Physical Behaviors	8 (7.3%)	28 (25.5%)	43 (39.1%)	23 (20.9%)	8 (7.3%)	110	1.95 (1.03)	9 (7.6%)
Language Delivery	0	25 (22.1%)	46 (40.7%)	30 (26.5%)	12 (10.6%)	113	2.26 (.92)	6 (5.0%)
Total	9	109	209	185	49	561	2.28	34