INSTITUTION ASSESSMENT OF SLOS REPORT
Communication GEO-Read, Write, Speak, and Listen
May 2012

PREPARED BY: ASLO SUBCOMMITTEE

BACKGROUND

Institutional learning is defined as **progress toward becoming an institution where learning is the expected norm for all members of the community**. In such an institution, faculty, administrators, and staff all continue to learn and grow in ways that support increased student learning. Institutional Outcomes Assessment is about the interaction between individual learning and institutional learning—how an individual can contribute to changing a campus culture, which in turn supports and encourages change by colleagues across campus.

The Communication General Education Outcome (GEO) is defined as the ability to effectively interchange ideas and information with diverse audiences and to act within the framework of a society based on information and service. This assessment will encompass the foundational skills of this GEO, which are identified as those abilities to effectively read, write, listen, speak, and/or sign.

ASSESSMENT DESIGN

The GEO Initiative (Curriculum Committee approval February 17, 2010) set the stage for the implementation of institution-level outcomes assessment. This initiative defined curriculum mapping and inter-disciplinary outcomes assessment with a common rubric as the assessment tasks while specifying that such assessment of Plan A's GEOs "will involve cooperation among the College's various disciplines, which serve to house all the courses on Plan A. All departments with course on Plan A will be requested to participate in some or all aspects of the GEO assessment task."

In spring 2011 the ASLO Subcommittee began implementation of the inter-disciplinary GEO assessment. Participation of appropriate departments was derived from the curriculum mapping results. A timeline and

operational plan was approved by the ASLO Subcommittee on February 22, 2011 and presented to the Curriculum Committee in March 16, 2011. The ASLO Subcommittee recommended the use of the VALUE[1] rubrics to assess the General Education Outcomes (GEOs) for this first institution assessment cycle. The rationale was based on the normed and valid information contained in these assessment tools, the undergraduate scope of the VALUE rubrics that support the college's existing GEOs, and the internal benchmarks established by the Accreditation Blueprint[2].

IMPLEMENTATION

Initial outreach efforts by the ASLO Subcommittee in February and March 2011 consisted of personal meetings with relevant department heads (English, Reading, Speech Communications, Math, History/Political Science, Social Science, Learning & Academic Resources, and Foreign Language) and full department meetings when requested (Reading). This was predicated on the assessment timeline's implementation. When these department heads requested a formal, detailed request for participation the ASLO Subcommittee responded and sent a memo with attachments (March 22, 2011). Concerns from department faculty occurred about the nature and scope of this assessment work. A meeting was convened by the Curriculum Committee Chair to clarify the need and process of institution level outcomes assessment as conceived by the ASLO Subcommittee and approved by the Curriculum Committee. This "communication assessment forum" occurred on April 21, 2011. The department heads from English, Reading, and Speech Communications attended along with the Academic Senate President, Curriculum Committee Chair, SLO Coordinator, and Director of Research. The Foreign Language Department Head was invited but was unable to attend.

Agreements were reached for various levels of participation in the Communication GEO assessment based on department choice. The Reading and English Departments agreed to participate in rubric development activity as preliminary to GEO assessment in the 2011-12 academic year. The Speech Communications Department Head agreed to the taping and assessment of the Oral Interpretation Showcase (May 6, 2011) and of student presentations from a range of selected summer courses using the VALUE rubric. The courses' adjunct faculty were those that agreed to the taping. A special meeting was held on May 12, 2011 with the Foreign Language Department Head, Dean of Language Arts, SLO Coordinator, and Curriculum Committee Chair to discuss this program's participation in the oral communication subcomponent of the Communication GEO. It was decided that the SLO Coordinator would

visit with the Foreign Language Department to discuss the GEO assessment protocols in September 2011. Coordination between the Speech Communication and Foreign Language departments would be finalized in Fall 2011.

Summer 2011 saw the development of assessment rubrics, based on previous local work and the VALUE rubrics, for writing and reading and the taping of student presentations for oral communication in agreed upon speech courses. Faculty participation from English, Read, Math, History, Learning & Academic Resources, Art, Sociology, Geography, Political Science, Foreign Language, and Speech Communications was coordinated by the ASLO Subcommittee.

In the fall 2011 term some progress was made on these three subcomponents of the Communication GEO assessment. But implementation fell behind the projected benchmarks for all. In the spring 2012 semester these assessment processes continued in an attempt to follow the established timeline. Specifics are provided in the individual reports that follow.

The ASLO Subcommittee has determined from this initial inter-disciplinary type of institution level assessment that even repeated attempts at communication through electronic media was not found by many to be as effective of an outreach avenue. Personal contact and one-on-one communications appear to provide better results.

PROJECT SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION

The ASLO Subcommittee, cognizant of the Accreditation Blueprint's benchmarks for accreditation proficiency in 2012, has dedicated its focus and efforts to implement a systematic GEO interdisciplinary assessment process. This academic year also saw the aggressive implementation of the Promise Pathways at the college. The focus on college readiness for this initiative mandated the participation of the English and Reading Department faculty at the same time that they were requested to participate in this GEO assessment. These competing initiatives have stretched these departments but both are to be acknowledged for their engagement with the GEO assessment process at this time.

The initial efforts with the foundational elements of the Communication GEO are provided below in this report with their specific recommendations to governing bodies for the general education curriculum. However, the ASLO Subcommittee believes, overall, that additional progress is necessary and that such progress requires collective effort and focused leadership.

WRITING

The 2010 curriculum mapping of Plan A courses indicated that English, History, Math, and various computer courses are the primary disciplines that contribute to the written communication subcomponent of this GEO. Representatives from these departments (2 from English and 1 each from History and CPAS) participated in the rubric development activity (summer 2011) and completed the requested requirements by early fall 2011. (See Appendix A)

In early fall 2011 the writing rubric development activity was finalized and course sampling was determined by the Research Office (September 6, 2011 and modified on September 7, 2011). The Writing Work Group decided on the course section sampling on September 10, 2011. The ASLO Subcommittee liaison and the SLO Coordinator worked with identified department heads (English, Social Science, Math/Statistics, and COS) to solicit the sampling's instructors of record to obtain the designated number of ungraded and unidentified student artifacts according to the protocols. The Research Office made an extension of the original courses sampling section options for the identified CBIS course on November 10, 2011. This was due to the COS Department's request for extended options because of limited faculty cooperation in student artifact collection. Student artifacts were collected at the end of the fall 2011 term from the majority of disciplines in the sampling.

The development of a written communication assessment team was attempted in fall 2011 with only the COS Department identifying a faculty participant for the effort. In early spring 2012 another outreach effort was instituted for this part of the assessment process. At the midterm point and after repeated attempts to generate assessment work group volunteers two members from the Social Science Department joined the faculty member from the COS Department to constitute the assessment work group. This group engaged in a focused interrater reliability session prior to spring break when they received their assessment packets. The work group completed assessment of the artifacts with those scores submitted to the Research Office in May 2012 for preliminary study. The team proceeded to evaluate the GEO and process up to that point and their findings will be included with the results analysis. It is anticipated that this assessment work group will re-convene for the analysis of results and any recommendations during the fall 2012 term.

READING

The 2010 curriculum mapping of Plan A courses indicated that Reading, English, and Math courses are the primary disciplines that contribute to the reading subcomponent of this GEO. Representatives from these departments (3 from Reading, 1 each from English and Math) participated in the rubric development activity that began in summer 2011 and completed the requested requirements very late in fall 2011. (See Appendix B)

In fall 2011 the Reading Work Group continued its initial summer work with the rubric development activity with regular prompting by the ASLO Subcommittee liaison. On November 28, 2011 all aspects (rubric, artifact identification, and course section sampling verification) was completed by the Reading Work Group. The SLO Coordinator immediately contacted the Director of Research on November 28, 2011 with the request for reading course sampling for student artifact collection. An unfortunate delay of this request caused a conflict with the Research Office's institutional workload. The rubric development work group believed it to be preferable that a delay in assessment would better afford instructors of record for the designated courses flexibility in determining comparable student work in alignment with the student artifact suggestions.
Consequently, the ASLO Subcommittee liaison and SLO Coordinator determined that any sampling that late in the term would not be practical for student artifact collection. Prior to the end of the fall 2011 term the Research Office was informed of such and was requested to develop a course sampling for spring 2012. At the midterm point requests for student artifacts and faculty participants for the assessment work group were underway through communication with the identified department heads (Reading, English, Speech, Math) and lead faculty where identified. Student artifacts were collected from the majority of these departments throughout this semester. By the end of the term an assessment work group was developed in anticipation of proceeding with assessment work in fall 2012.

ORAL COMMUNICATION (SPEAKING AND LISTENING)

The 2010 curriculum mapping of Plan A courses indicated that Speech

Communication and Foreign Language courses are the primary disciplines that contribute to the oral communication subcomponent of this GEO. Refer to the "Communications and Timelines" section above for the necessary preliminary information.

On September 20, 2011 the SLO Coordinator met with the Foreign Language faculty to discuss the program's participation in GEO assessment. After extensive discussion this faculty determined that collaboration with the Speech Communications Department would be unworkable due to the disparate missions of these two programs. However, the Foreign Language Department faculty agreed that extrapolating program level assessment information to the institution level (general education) from this department was acceptable. The SLO Coordinator met with the new Speech Communications Department Head and SLO Officer on October 11, 2011 and relayed this information and the current situation. Following departmental dialogue the Speech Communications Department agreed with the Foreign Language Department that an alternative assessment should be developed.

Originally all of the discussions entertained the idea that this subcomponent could be eliminated from the institution level. However, Oral Communication is reflected both in accreditation standards (II.A3) and Title 5 (§ 55061) and thus cannot be eliminated from the GEOs. Consequently, an alternative assessment that obtains evidence from the program level will strongly contribute to the assessment of this component of the Communication GEO. Evidence obtained from the program reviews and correlated for this GEO's scope (speaking and listening) and the general education curriculum has been agreed upon as an expedient and meaningful assessment approach. (See Appendix C) This point was relayed to the Foreign Language and Speech Communications Department Heads on October 27, 2011 with a memo stating the agreed upon information attached for their signatures. On October 31, 2011 the Foreign Language Department Head chose not to sign the memo of understanding because the department faculty was confused about various aspects of this assessment. On November 1, 2011 the Speech Communications Department Head sought internal clarification with the department's faculty. On November 28, 2011 the Foreign Language and Speech Communications Department Heads were sent a note requesting confirmation of their departments' contributions to the oral communication GEO assessment. Attached was also a revised memo of understanding that more thoroughly specified the adjusted assessment and the expectation of department faculty participation in this assessment. Review and confirmations were requested. On November 29, 2011 the SLO Coordinator met with two Speech Communications

Department faculty to discuss the alternative assessment protocol. These department representatives agreed with the proposal and even wished to meet with Foreign Language faculty representatives to address commonalities in elements and standards for oral communication. This information was passed on to the Foreign Language Department Head (December 6, 2011 email) in anticipation of a joint meeting of both programs' department heads and the SLO Coordinator in a few days. The Foreign Language Department Head did not attend that scheduled meeting (December 8, 2011). The ASLO Subcommittee and the Speech Communications Department have decided to proceed without the participation of the Foreign Language Department because of the established timeline and the unfortunate lack of collaboration on the part of the Foreign Language Department at this juncture.

In January 2012 the SLO Coordinator met with the two Speech Communications Department faculty participants who would constitute the GEO Oral Communication Assessment work group. Program and course level SLO data was distributed as well as GEO wording and its descriptors. These work group members decided to meet independently to review the assessment protocol. On February 7, 2012 this GEO Assessment work group informed the SLO Coordinator that the work group has determined, in consultation with the Speech Communications Department faculty, that an alternative assessment methodology, more in line with the other GEO assessments, would be more meaningful. (See Appendix D) Consequently, use of previously videotaped speech special event presentations (Oral Interpretation Showcase, spring 2011) and randomly sampled speech classes from Plan A (Speech 10-persuasion speech; Speech 20 listening dyad; Speech 30-final panel discussion; and Speech 60-final debate, summer 2011) will be assessed using a locally developed performance rubric. That rubric's elements and levels were vetted by the Speech Communications Department while the assessment work group established the standards. (See Appendix E)

At the midterm point the work group had assessed these artifacts with those scores submitted to the Research Office (March 5, 2012) for preliminary study. A *Summary of Results of Oral Communication GEO Assessment Research Brief* was developed by the Research Office and submitted to the Oral Communication Assessment Work Group (April 5, 2012) for their use in developing a final report. (See Appendix F) In April the assessment work group presented that report to the ASLO Subcommittee that included their analysis of the information from the Research Office's to identify key findings, develop supportable conclusions, and recommend actions for this GEO. (See Appendix G) However, highlights of those recommended actions from the GEO Oral

Communication assessment work group are provided here.

- Assessment recommendations are 1) Technological issues with videotaping should be addressed; 2) Expansion of student sampling and evaluators within the scope of this GEO; 3) Refine assessment rubric by reducing the achievement levels; 4) Provide evaluators with more time and/or compensation; 5) Remove "listening" from the Communication GEO and its assessment.
- A Curriculum recommendation is to require oral communication as a proficiency for the A.A./A.S. degree.
- A Pedagogical recommendation is for the use of experiential learning techniques.

End Notes

[1.] As part of the Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) project, teams of faculty and other academic and student affairs professionals developed rubrics for fifteen of the AAC&U Essential Learning Outcomes, creating this set of VALUE rubrics for use in any institutional context. The VALUE rubrics emerged from analysis and synthesis of existing campus rubrics, organizational statements on outcomes, input from experts in the respective fields, and faculty feedback from campuses.

Each VALUE rubric contains the most common and broadly shared criteria or core characteristics considered critical for judging the quality of student work in that outcome area. Thus, the VALUE rubrics reflect faculty expectations for essential learning across the nation, regardless of institution type, size, location, or mission.

[2.] The Accreditation Blueprint consists of internal benchmarks for institutional effectiveness, Program Review, and SLO assessment. The Academic Council, which is comprised of members from the Academic Senate and College's Executive Boards, approved this document on April 20, 2010. This body has been cognizant of the 2012 deadline to establish proficiency in SLO assessment at the college and the Accreditation Blueprint provided a framework for such progress.

Appendix A

Writing Rubric	Superior	Satisfactory		Unsatisfactory	N/A
	4	3	2	1	
Statement of purpose	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).	
Support and Content Development	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.	
Organization	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices	Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation	Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation	
Control of grammar and mechanics	Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error free.	Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage	

Writing Rubric

1. The writing assignment is focused around a **statement of purpose** (central point, thesis, hypothesis or claim), which
   a. demonstrates a main idea behind the writing assignment which is self-evident and sophisticated both to the student writer and the audience.
   b. is logical, arguable (if necessary), and provable within the scope of the assignment.
2. The writing assignment utilizes **support**, which
   a. proves that the student writer understands the distinction between subjective and objective knowledge, and uses each one appropriately to benefit the writing assignment.
   b. develops a reasonable variety of credible and relevant evidence which may include: examples (personal, historical, scientific, etc.), specific illustrations, facts, data, or statistics.
   c. includes sources, when required, that are used meaningfully, and relatively to the topic/thesis.
   d. responsibly documents sources, when required, using either MLA or APA as assigned, to avoid plagiarism.
3. The writing assignment demonstrates clear structural **organization**, which
   a. follows a clear plan of development, utilizing coherent paragraph and/or essay structure.
   b. shows clear transitions (either a word or a phrase) that move the writing logically from one point or example to the next.
   c. maintains a single point of focus per paragraph to avoid digressions.
4. The writer has a comprehensive grasp of **grammar and sentence mechanics,** which
   a. correctly uses English grammar, i.e.: punctuation, subject/verb agreement, complete sentences, etc.
   b. dictates college-level language, conveyed in a professional tone.
   c. incorporates a variety of sentence structures to build an interesting and sophisticated writing assignment.
   d. uses language which is sensitive, in that it avoids unnecessary slurs or derogatory ideas.

Writing Artifacts may include: essays, paragraphs, summaries, reports, critiques, analyses, evaluations, and research papers.

Writing Work Group
Summer 2011/September 10, 2011

Appendix B

Communication GEO-Reading Rubric

Depending upon the task, project or assignment the student will . . .

Score	Literal Meaning	Inferential Meaning Drawing Conclusions	Critical Analysis	Application
5 Superior	Clearly state the central idea, main idea or theme in a single sentence. A summary of the author's main points, arguments or issues, including major supporting details or evidence, can be identified and utilized. Relevant facts and/or research evidence are identified correctly. All technical, college level vocabulary is understood and used correctly in the summary.	Use the evidence or facts presented by the author to draw inferences or valid conclusions with **complete accuracy**.	**Accurately** identify the author's theory or primary purpose for writing and any of the author's bias used in the writing.	Correctly identify and address **ALL** components of the task, project, or assignment. **Precisely and accurately** use supporting evidence from the reading to form appropriate responses.
4 Good	Correctly identifies the topic and is able to paraphrase a central idea, main idea or theme that generally reflects the author's point. Most major details are identified along with relevant facts and/or research. Technical, college level vocabulary is present and used correctly most of the time.	Use the evidence or facts presented by the author to draw inferences or valid conclusions with a **high level** of accuracy.	With a **high degree of accuracy**, identify the author's theory or primary purpose for writing, but **may need assistance** identifying subtle forms of bias used in the writing.	Correctly identify and address **most** components of the task, project, or assignment. **Thoughtfully** use supporting evidence from the reading to form appropriate responses.
3 Adequate	Correctly identifies the topic, but may struggle to clearly state the main idea. Most major details and relevant facts or research are identified, but there are a few omissions. Key technical college level vocabulary is present and used correctly most of the time.	Draws some valid inferences or conclusions based on evidence or facts presented by the author, but **will also make mistakes** by relying on personal interpretations not supported by the evidence presented in the text.	In **general terms**, identify the author's theory or primary purpose for writing, but **needs scaffolding and assistance** identifying subtle forms of bias used in the writing.	Identify and address **most** components of the task, project, or assignment—there may be **some errors**. With **some accuracy** use supporting evidence from the reading to form appropriate responses
2 Poor	Identify a topic, but is unable to state the main idea. Some major details and relevant facts or research are identified, but there are obvious omissions. Key technical college level vocabulary is either not present and/or used incorrectly.	Draws **invalid inferences** or conclusions based on personal interpretations not supported by the evidence presented in the text.	Be **unable** to identify the author's theory or primary purpose for writing, with some assistance. The student **may be unaware** of any forms of bias the author may have used in the writing	Identify and address some components of the task, project, or assignment—there will be **multiple errors**. Use supporting evidence from the reading to form responses, though some of the evidence **may not be appropriate** to the response.

1 Insufficient	Identify a supporting detail as the main idea. Major details and relevant facts or research are missing. The vocabulary used does not reflect technical college level vocabulary.	**Does not attempt** to draw inferences or conclusions, or not be able to support inferences or conclusion with evidence presented in the text.	Be **unable** to identify the author's theory or primary purpose for writing, even with prompting. The student is **unaware** of any forms of bias the author may have used in the writing.	Identify and address a few components of the task, project, or assignment—there **will be gaps** and **errors**. There **may not be** supporting evidence from the reading to form appropriate responses,
N/A				

This details page includes agreed upon descriptors and information to clarify the assessment practice for evaluators.

I. Literal Meaning

A. Identify and state the Central Idea (the big topic, theme, theory, purpose, or major idea covered throughout the entire article, passage, or chapter).
B. Be able to identify and paraphrase the main ideas and major supporting details (evidence) for main ideas.
C. Correctly summarize the author's main points, arguments, or issues.
D. Be able to discern and identify facts and research evidence the author presents.
E. Be able to understand technical and college level vocabulary.

II. Inferential Meaning and Drawing Conclusions

A. Where applicable, be able to identify and discern opinions from facts.
B. Where applicable, be able to identify and discern the author's tone and bias.
C. Where applicable, be able to correctly infer the author's implied messages.
D. Where applicable, be able to draw valid conclusions based on the facts presented.
E. Where applicable, be able to articulate how factual evidence led to conclusions drawn.

III. Critical Analysis

A. Identify the author's theory or primary purpose for writing and bias.
B. Identify fallacies in persuasive writing (in particular, what an author chooses to emphasize or leave out).
C. Interpret literary elements and poetic devices (metaphor, personification, hyperbole, analogy, etc.).
D. Show information competency by analyzing the evidence and discern if it is current and relevant.
E. Analyze the source from which the evidence is procured and recognize credible and reliable sources.

IV. Application of Reading

A. Be able to correctly identify and address project, task, or assignment components.
B. Use critical thinking and be able to transfer the knowledge of the author's message from the reading passage to the task, project, or assignment at hand.
C. Use the supporting evidence from the reading to form responses for a task, a project, or an assignment.

V. Literal Meaning

A. Identify and state the Central Idea (the big topic, theme, theory, purpose, or major idea covered throughout the entire article, passage, or chapter).

B. Be able to identify and paraphrase the main ideas and major supporting details (evidence) for main ideas.
C. Correctly summarize the author's main points, arguments, or issues.
D. Be able to discern and identify facts and research evidence the author presents.
E. Be able to understand technical and college level vocabulary.

VI. Inferential Meaning and Drawing Conclusions

A. Where applicable, be able to identify and discern opinions from facts.
B. Where applicable, be able to identify and discern the author's tone and bias.
C. Where applicable, be able to correctly infer the author's implied messages.
D. Where applicable, be able to draw valid conclusions based on the facts presented.
E. Where applicable, be able to articulate how factual evidence led to conclusions drawn.

VII. Critical Analysis

A. Identify the author's theory or primary purpose for writing and bias.
B. Identify fallacies in persuasive writing (in particular, what an author chooses to emphasize or leave out).
C. Interpret literary elements and poetic devices (metaphor, personification, hyperbole, analogy, etc.).
D. Show information competency by analyzing the evidence and discern if it is current and relevant.
E. Analyze the source from which the evidence is procured and recognize credible and reliable sources.

VIII. Application of Reading

A. Be able to correctly identify and address project, task, or assignment components.
B. Use critical thinking and be able to transfer the knowledge of the author's message from the reading passage to the task, project, or assignment at hand.
C. Use the supporting evidence from the reading to form responses for a task, a project, or an assignment.

The appropriate student artifacts for use with this rubric have been identified: Students may read literature, world problems, content-specific textbooks, essays, short stories, or articles. Student would demonstrate their comprehension of the aforementioned texts by writing a response paragraph, summary, reflective, analytic, or argumentative essay, research paper, completing textbook exercises, responding to questions or prompts, or solving math equations.

Reading Communication GEO Rubric Development Group
11/28/11

Appendix C

Oral Communication Assessment Proposal

(Initial assessment approved Fall 2011; ultimately disregarded Spring 2012)

COMMUNICATION GEO

Foundational Skills: The ability to effectively read, write, listen, speak, and/or sign.

- The ability to express ideas effectively in written, verbal, and nonverbal form.
- The ability to comprehend verbal, nonverbal, and written information.
- Listen actively and respond appropriately and effectively to the substance of others' comments.
- Receive, attend to, interpret, and respond appropriately to verbal and/or nonverbal messages.

BACKGROUND

The Communication General Education Outcome (GEO) identified oral communication as a subcomponent when approved by the Curriculum Committee in December 10, 2008 and March 18, 2009 against the recommendations of the ASLO Subcommittee ("this skill is not emphasized enough in our curriculum to be considered a core competency", 11/04/08). Further, it was reported in the Communication Study Project 2008-2009 that attempts at oral communication assessment "communication assessment group has run into in its attempt to create a standard rubric" [sic]; and "have not had enough commonality to make for meaningful comparisons".

The 2010 curriculum mapping of Plan A courses indicated that Speech Communication and Foreign Language courses are the primary disciplines that contribute to the oral communication subcomponent of this GEO. The ASLO Subcommittee initiated GEO assessment dialogue with these departments since Spring 2011. These two departments discussed this issue internally and with the ASLO Subcommittee. Each department's faculty has come to a similar conclusion as was determined in the 2008-09 summary report as noted above. That is the broad intent and purpose of these Plan A courses do address oral communication but the focus for each department is distinct. As such the published GEO assessment protocol will not be feasible for the Oral Communication subcomponent of the Communication GEO.

Originally the discussions entertained the idea that this subcomponent could be eliminated from the institution level. However, Oral Communication is reflected both in accreditation standards (II.A3) and

Title 5 (§ 55061) and thus cannot be eliminated from the GEOs. Consequently, an alternative assessment that obtains evidence from the program level will strongly contribute to the assessment of this component of the Communication GEO. Evidence obtained from the program reviews and correlated for the general education curriculum has been agreed upon as an expedient and meaningful assessment approach.

ASSESSMENT TASK

A compilation of assessment evidence from existing systematic processes will integrate to provide a thorough GEO assessment for the Oral Communication subcomponent. These two departments have emphasized that oral communication is being assessed at the program level in both disciplines. This is true for speaking but listening is only assessed in Foreign Language Department at the program level. In Speech Communications Department the listening aspect is addressed at the course level; specifically with SP X and X courses. The ASLO Subcommittee and program representatives will analyze and evaluate the data obtained from appropriate program and course assessments with an eye towards the college's Philosophy of General Education. Recommendations for action to the general education curriculum will be addressed.

Collective analyses of Program Review evidence from Foreign Language and Speech Communication that addresses Communication GEO descriptors will be the primary source of assessment evidence. Program Review contains information from both course and program levels. To address the scope of the Oral Communication subcomponent—speaking and listening—both program level assessments (Foreign Language and Speech Communications) and course level assessments (Speech Communications) should be utilized.

The Foreign Language Program's SLOs of *demonstrate aural comprehension* and *formulate ideas orally* will address the scope of both speaking and listening. The Speech Communications Program's SLO of *formulate and implement effective oral presentations* will address the speaking portion only. Therefore, ASLO evidence about listening from the Speech Communications Program will be obtained from Speech 20 and Speech 30 courses.

Composite of achievement data

The correlation of already collected data identified in the Educational Master Plan (EMP) will highlight these two programs that are identified as contributing to the oral communication subcomponent of the GEO for

analysis. The specific measurable objectives that address associates degrees will be the evidence included in this analysis because of this assessment's purpose. Specifically included are the following objectives from the EMP 2011-15.

Student Success Goal

B. Student Goal Attainment

Measurable Objective 2

Increase the number of certificates and **AA/AS degrees** awarded over the next 5 years.

Equity Goal

A. Student Success

Measurable Objective 1

Increase the rate at which under-represented student groups complete certificates and **AA/AS degrees** within 6 years of entry to LBCC.

Timeline

Agreement between all entities occurred in fall 2011 so assessment collection and analysis could occur in spring 2012. The preliminary meeting occurred on January 31, 2012 with two faculty representing the Speech Communications Department and who would be analyzing the data.

Appendix D

Oral Communication Assessment

(Developed by GEO Assessment Work Group, February 2012)

ASSESSMENT TASK

In alignment with the intent of the cross-disciplinary assessment concept in the GEO Initiative, assessment of student performances outside and inside the class environment with a common scoring rubric will be used. The videotaping of the Oral Interpretation Night student performances (Spring 2011) and a random sampling from four (4) Speech Communication courses in Summer 2011—specifically Speech 10, persuasion speech; Speech 20, Listening dyad; Speech 30, Final panel discussion; and Speech 60, Final debate—will be used for this assessment. These video tapings were voluntary and the students involved signed a release form.

Appendix E

Course Number / Assignment / #

Student Identifier

LBCC GEO COMMUNICATION RUBRIC

	Excellent = 4	Proficient = 3	Marginal = 2	Unacceptable = 1	NA = 0
Message Clarity					
Can Receiver Understand Overall Intent/Purpose of Source's Message?	Central message is precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable and strongly supported	Central message is clear and consistent with supporting material	Central message is understandable but support is not credible and not memorable	Central message is totally unclear/unsupported	NA
Vocal Audibility/Expressiveness					
Can Receiver Clearly Hear What the Source is Communicating? Is Source Using Appropriate Vocal Variety (Pitch, Pauses and Rate)?	Receiver can easy hear source. Vocal expressiveness is evident Speaker uses appropriate pitch, rate and pausing	Most content is clearly audible. Vocal expressiveness/variety is adequate/consistent with message	Weak voice compromises message reception. Vocal expressiveness is inadequate. Vocal variety is inconsistent	Source's message cannot be heard by receiver. Voice is monotone.	NA
Vocal Pronunciation/Articulation					
Is Source Using Standard Pronunciation? Does Source Articulate Sounds that Allows the Receiver to Clearly Understand Each Spoken Word?	Receiver clearly understands message. Source uses correct/standard pronunciation. Sounds are clearly articulated	Pronunciation/articulation are adequate for a clear understanding overall message	Message clarity is adversely affected by improper pronunciation. Multiple words are unclear with poor articulation	Source's message cannot be understood by receiver	NA
Nonverbal Body Language					
Are Sources Gestures and Body Movement Appropriate to the Message and Communication Context?	Source's posture is erect, appears relaxed and incorporates purposeful body movements throughout	Source attempts to sit/stand straight, appears prepared, and uses a minimum of body movements	Source leans on podium/table for support; moves unnaturally/uses unnatural or no gestures	Source is visibly uninterested/uninvolved in the communication process	NA
Nonverbal Eye Contact/Facial Expressions					
Does Source Give Receiver Adequate Eye Contact while Communicating? Are Source's Facial Expressions Appropriate for the Message and Communication Context?	Source maintains extended eye contact with receiver; facial expressions are appropriate and effective for message context	Source makes eye contact sometimes; relies on notes; facial expressions are evident	Source eye contact is rare; facial movement is lacking/inappropriate	Source does not make eye contact with receiver; facial expressions are not apparent	NA

Total Score

SpCom Dept Joesting/Misajon Adopted 2/21/2012

Appendix F

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
RESEARCH BRIEF
4901 E Carson Street G-14
Long Beach, CA 90808
(562) 938-4736
FAX (562) 938-4628
http://ie.lbcc.edu

April 4, 2012

Summary of Results of Oral Communication GEO Assessment[1]

In Spring Semester, 2012, two faculty members rated the artifacts of 46 students, 18 women and 28 men. One artifact was difficult to rate on a number of dimensions and one rater was unable to rate 7 of the artifacts due to technological error or missing artifacts. In order to maximize the amount of data examined for this GEO assessment, data for the remaining rater was used for that artifact. Artifacts were rated on 5 dimensions by each rater on a score of 1-4, as seen in Table 1.

Table 1: Dimensions on which artifacts were rated

Message **Clarity** (4=excellent, 3=proficient, 2=marginal, 1=unacceptable, 0=n/a)	Vocal **Audibility** & Expressiveness (4=excellent, 3=proficient, 2=marginal, 1=unacceptable, 0=n/a)	Vocal **Pronunciation** & Articulation (4=excellent, 3=proficient, 2=marginal, 1=unacceptable, 0=n/a)	Nonverbal **Body Language** (4=excellent, 3=proficient, 2=marginal, 1=unacceptable, 0=n/a)	Nonverbal Eye Contact/**Facial Expressions** (4=excellent, 3=proficient, 2=marginal, 1=unacceptable, 0=n/a)

Bold type represents shorthand for categories that will be used subsequently.

Examining the relationship between raters assessments

First, the relationship between the five categories for each rater was examined. For Rater 1, correlations between the different assessment categories suggested a somewhat multidimensional rating structure. As can be seen from Table 2, the correlations between Audibility/Expressiveness, Body Language, and Facial Expression were all significant but neither clarity nor pronunciation correlated with the other dimensions. One possible reason that Audibility/Expressiveness may correlate with the two non-verbal measures may be that it appears to be a double-barreled rating dimension – that is vocal audibility and expressiveness may be capturing two slightly different attributes and, for Rater 1, their rating on this dimension may be picking up more the expressiveness than the audibility. The ratings of clarity and pronunciation do not appear to be substantially related to each other or the other three dimensions.

Table 2: Interdimension, intrarater correlations for Rater 1

	Clarity	Audibility	Pronunciation	Body Language	Facial Expression
Clarity					

[1] Original data request: Requested by Kim Anderson, ASLO Coordinator.

Audibility	.230				
Pronunciation	.156	.591***			
Body Language	.286	.352*	.190		
Facial Expression	.209	.403**	.264	.614***	

*Significance levels are represented by asterisks: * p <.05, ** p <.01, *** p<.001*

Additionally, the internal consistency of Rater 1's assessments on the five dimensions i.e., how tightly interrelated they are) was measured using Cronbach's alpha. Despite the somewhat lower correlations with clarity and pronunciation, the internal consistency met typical standards for acceptable internal consistency, though perhaps slightly on the low side, Cronbach's alpha = .72.

In contrast, Rater 2's ratings of the artifacts were much more one-dimensional/highly interrelated with a Cronbach's alpha of .84, generally considered to be good internal consistent, and as can be easily seen by the strong and consistent pattern of correlations in Table 3. This is not to say that one of the Raters' ratings is better than the other, only that the structure of their assessments of the artifacts is somewhat different.

Table 3: Interdimension, intrarater correlations for Rater 2

	Clarity	Audibility/ Expressiveness	Pronunciation	Body Language	Facial Expression
Clarity					
Audibility	.417**				
Pronunciation	.655***	.570***			
Body Language	.437**	.436**	.562***		
Facial Expression	.552***	.429***	.519***	.489**	

*Significance levels are represented by asterisks: * p <.05, ** p <.01, *** p<.001*

Finally, the relationship between ratings given by Rater 1 and those given by Rater 2 were also examined. To do so, correlation coefficients were calculated on each dimension. In addition, for each rater, a composite of the ratings on all five dimensions was created for each artifact by taking the average rating across the five dimensions; the correlations between the overall assessments were also examined. As can be seen in Table 4, generally speaking the agreement between the raters was reasonable but the lack of correlation between the raters on Audibility/Expressiveness was somewhat troubling. Again, a key possibility appears to be the multidimensional nature of that dimension of the ratings which may lead different raters toward making different assessments of an artifact or the same rater to apply different types of assessment on that dimension he or she rates different artifacts, depending on which of the two aspects the rater might focus on. Additionally, in this context the review of recorded material, audibility itself may be less a function of the delivery and potentially more a function of the method and fidelity of the recording, and thus a more difficult basis to reliably assess the speaker/student. Nonetheless, future assessments may need to work to further clarify this dimension specifically and, based on this and the lower than desired relationship between the raters judgments of clarity, additional attention to developing interrater agreement on judgments of the dimensions would appear to be worth consideration.

Table 4: Correlations between assessments of Rater 1 and Rater 2

	Clarity	Audibility/ Expressiveness	Pronunciation	Body Language	Facial Expression	Overall Rating

Correlation	.293+	.092	.512***	.367*	.457**	.428**

*Significance levels are represented by asterisks: + p <.10, * p <.05, ** p <.01, *** p<.001*

Average ratings of student artifacts

Next, the average ratings of the artifacts for each rater were examined. As can be seen in Table 5, there was general agreement of the raters across the artifacts on the level of quality. Two things should be noted. First, before attending to the table, there was a slightly problem with restriction of range in raters' responses. Neither rater ever assigned an artifact a rating lower than 2 on any dimension, thus transforming a 4 point scale effectively into a 3 point scale. This is not uncommon in ratings such as these but it is worth attention to in future assessment construction to make certain that raters either have enough space to make differentiations between artifacts by increasing the breadth of positive options or by working with raters to improve the use of the entire scale in judging artifacts. The primary problem is that such restrictions of range can meaningfully reduce the utility of the assessment in some circumstances and thus should be carefully guarded against. Second, there was again a notable difference in the raters' judgments of the Audibility/Expressiveness dimension, such that Rater 2 rated the students significantly higher on that dimension than did Rater 1, $t(83)= -2.46$, $p = .02$ as can be seen in Table 5. There was also a slight similarity in tendency for Rater 2 to rater students higher on Pronunciation as well, $t(83) = -.176$, $p=.08$, dovetailing with the findings above of some modest to moderate differences between judgments of the artifacts of the two raters.

Table 5: Comparison of the overall assessments of the artifacts by dimension for Rater 1 and Rater 2

		Clarity	Audibility/ Expressiveness	Pronunciation	Body Language	Facial Expression	Overall Rating
Rater 1	Average	3.20	**3.15**	**3.07**	3.30	3.26	3.20
	Std. Deviation	0.46	0.56	0.44	0.55	0.61	0.36
	N	45	46	46	46	46	45
Rater 2	Average	3.11	**3.46**	**3.28**	3.21	3.36	3.29
	Std. Deviation	0.76	0.60	0.69	0.74	0.67	0.54
	N	38	39	39	38	39	38
	t-statistic	0.70	**-2.46**	**-1.76**	0.66	-0.71	-0.89
	Significance (p)	0.49	**0.02**	**0.08**	0.51	0.48	0.37

Combined ratings of student artifacts

Setting aside some of the moderate differences in ratings, the remainder of this brief considers the averaged assessments of the two raters to examine the overall performance of students on the dimensions of the GEO. Table 6 provides a summary of the combined ratings of the two raters, though in cases of technical error or missing artifacts, the judgment of the remaining rater was used instead of the average of the

two. On average, students scored between proficient and excellent, with pronunciation and clarity potential greater issues of concern.

Table 6: Comparison of the overall assessments of the artifacts by dimension for Rater 1 and Rater 2

	Clarity	Audibility/ Expressiveness	Pronunciation	Body Language	Facial Expression	Overall Rating
Average	3.14	3.30	3.17	3.27	3.32	3.24
Std. Deviation	0.47	0.44	0.49	0.53	0.57	0.38
N	45	46	46	46	46	45

Tables 7, 8, and 9 provide the counts of students at each level of assessment (and providing two different intermediary ranges of good, between excellent and proficient, and near proficient, between proficient and marginal), followed by the percentages of students in each category, followed by the cumulative percentage of students at that level or above (i.e., a cumulative percentage for proficient would include students scoring excellent (4), good (3.5-4), and proficient (3-3.5). Overall, these assessment suggest that a substantial majority of the students assessed for this GEO achieved proficiency, with students achieving proficiency between 80% and 90% of the time on all of the dimensions and more than 70% of the time overall.

Table 7: Number of students in each category range.

	Range	Clarity	Audibility/ Express.	Pronunciation	Body Language	Facial Expression	Overall Rating
Excellent	4	4	7	5	12	12	0
Very good	3.5 to 4	15	19	14	8	14	15
Proficient	3.0 to 3.49	17	15	22	20	14	18
Near proficient	2.5 to 2.99	8	5	2	5	3	10
Marginal	2 to 2.49	1	0	3	1	3	3
Overall N		45	46	46	46	46	46

Table 8: Percentage of students in each category range.

	Range	Clarity	Audibility/ Express.	Pronunciation	Body Language	Facial Expression	Overall Rating
Excellent	4	8.9%	15.2%	10.9%	26.1%	26.1%	0.0%
Very good	3.5 to 4	33.3%	41.3%	30.4%	17.4%	30.4%	32.6%
Proficient	3.0 to 3.49	37.8%	32.6%	47.8%	43.5%	30.4%	39.1%
Near proficient	2.5 to 2.99	17.8%	10.9%	4.3%	10.9%	6.5%	21.7%
Marginal	2 to 2.49	2.2%	0.0%	6.5%	2.2%	6.5%	6.5%
Overall N		45	46	46	46	46	46

Table 8: Cumulative percentage of students in or above each category range.

	Range	Clarity	Audibility/ Express.	Pronunciation	Body Language	Facial Expression	Overall Rating
Excellent	4	8.9%	15.2%	10.9%	26.1%	26.1%	0.0%
Very good	3.5 to 4	42.2%	56.5%	41.3%	43.5%	56.5%	32.6%
Proficient	3.0 to 3.49	80.0%	89.1%	89.1%	87.0%	87.0%	71.7%

Near proficient	2.5 to 2.99	97.8%	100.0%	93.5%	97.8%	93.5%	93.5%
Marginal	2 to 2.49	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Overall N		45	46	46	46	46	46

Appendix G

GEO ASSESSMENT

ORAL COMMUNICATION – SPEAKING COMPONENT

FINAL REPORT

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED TO THE ASLO SUBCOMMITTEE

By

Linda Joesting and Lynne Misajon
Department of Speech Communication (Communication Studies)

April 19, 2012

THE METHODOLOGY

THE GEO

1. Discuss the wording of the GEO and its descriptors in relationship to the general education curriculum's mission and manageability of assessment.

The descriptors (Foundational Skills: The ability to effectively read, write listen, speak and/or sign) are accurate. We were given the task of assessing speaking and listening.

The descriptors significance to the mission is reasonable and manageable and should have more meaningful results with multi-disciplinary participation.

2. Is the GEO's wording clear? Is its scope too expansive or too narrow for general education? Is this GEO too detailed for general education?

The wording appears to clearly define what we do as an institution.

3. Were the provided descriptors adequate for you to understand the GEO's intent? Were there missing components to these descriptors? Were there too many components to assess this GEO in a manageable way? How would you adjust/supplement the descriptors?

The components, as defined are understandable but are not manageable in terms of assessment. We concluded that although speaking can be relatively easy to measure and assess, listening cannot in the context speaker to audience exchange. We recommend that listening be removed from the assessment process. Listening assessment can be possibly

accomplished but would have to be done using a revised assessment tool in a structured setting.

THE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

1. **Discuss the assessment materials—rubric and artifacts—against GEO's intent, purpose and meaningfulness of assessment, and manageability of assessment**

In the spring and summer of 2008, a SLO Communication Committee was established by the college. Members from the English, Reading Speech Communication, ESL, Counseling and other departments were included and the committee was the chaired by Trisha Alexander. The goal was to produce a rubric / rating sheet for reading, writing, speaking and listening. The project, for unknown reasons, was ultimately discarded.

We now fast forward to February, 2011. The Speech Communication department was asked to participate in the beginning institutional level communication assessment. Our charge was to assess in and an out of classroom speaking experiences using the institutional level Communication VALUE Rubric. The rational for using the VALUE rubric was that it had been tested nationally and ASLO committee determined that it was to be used college-wide.

Our department met to review the VALUE rubric and was skeptical about using it in the context that the ASLO committee desired; because the artifacts that the committee intended to assess did not fit into the framework of the VALUE rubric. The intent of the VALUE rubric was to measure "all communication forms." When, in reality, it could only accurately assess informative / persuasive speech contexts. So our department felt that all - interpersonal, oral interpretation, etc. - speaking contexts could not be measured equitably utilizing the VALUE rubric. But the ASLO committee was still determined to use it.

In March and, again, in May, a test run of the VALUE rubric was conducted at 3 College-sponsored communication events: one open-mike one reader's theatre event, and one oral interpretation event. The ASLO committee in conjunction with the Speech Communication department concluded that the VALUE rubric was ineffective for assessment of <u>all</u> communication events.

The ASLO committee requested that the Speech Communication department assess our current (spring, 2011) classes. The department felt that there was not adequate time to complete the task and suggested that summer assessment was preferable because we could prepare the instructors, inform the students and prepare a student video volunteer permission form. The ASLO committee agreed. The committee also agreed to include the Oral Interpretation night from the spring semester in order to vary the speaking contexts for the assessment process.

In January, 2012, our department was then approached to find another rubric that could be used. So a committee from the Speech Communication department was established, reviewed numerous rubrics / rating sheets and then designed their own. The committee

presented the LBCC GEO Communication Rubric to the Speech Communication department, where it was approved on Flex Day, February, 7, 2012. It was further determined that the listening component would not be measured on the artifacts that had been collected during spring and summer, 2011.

2. Did the rubric assess the GEO; that is, did the rubric provide strong information in alignment with the GEO's intent?

The LBCC GEO Communication Rubric provided information in alignment with the GEO intent, in that it could be used to measure various types of communication events on a variety of dimensions – Message Clarity, Audibility Expressiveness, Pronunciation, Body Language, Facial Expressions – thus, providing meaningful and manageable results.

3. Was the rubric/definitions clearly worded? Was it easy to apply? What would you adjust to provide further clarity or manageability?

The overall rubric wording was clear. In single speaking situations, it was easy to apply.

The 5 overall rubric variables could be reduced to 3, which would be labeled Verbal, Nonverbal and Clarity, which should make the artifact ratings more one dimensional and highly interrelated, therefore, avoiding the double-barreled rating dimension and capturing single attributes

The sheet itself could also be redesigned to handle multiple speakers.

4. Did the student artifacts align with the GEO and the assessment?

Preliminarily, yes. But when it comes to the results, it is apparent that a wider range of artifact samplings need to be available for a more thorough assessment.

5. Did the rubric distinguish achievement levels adequately?

NA

6. Were the elements clear?

See number 3 above.

7. Were enough standards provided to discern expectations from student artifacts?

Yes.

THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS

1. Was communication about the expectations of the process clear and early enough

for you?

No. We would suggest that the communication used in an attempt to orchestrate this entire process was admirable; however, cooperation levels, outside the Speech Communication department, affected the timing and the number of usable artifacts and the overall assessment process. We contend that the entire working timeline, which began in February, 2012 and is culminating with this Final Report in mid April, 2012, should have been a minimum of one year. The expectation of conducting, assessing and reporting of truly meaningful findings in two months was very unreasonable.

2. Was the assessment administered with reasonable uniformity?

We established guidelines for reviewing the artifacts and did so with uniformity. We rated the artifact independently, exactly as we would have done it in class using an individual rating sheet for each speaker. The rating sheet included class number, assignment, student identifiers, and the overall score.

3. Did you understand the rubric fully enough to conduct assessments successfully?

Yes.

4. Were there any internal/external factors that influenced the assessment's implementation?

Internally, our individual perceptions and connotations of the words used in the rubric might have affected our assessment ratings.

Externally, the videos were defective; some videos were incompatible with playback equipment. These external factors influenced the assessments implementation and, ultimately, posed reliability concerns, as sample size was reduced.

RESULTS, KEY FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

THE RESULTS

1. Does the data relate back to the GEO?

Yes. The data relates back to the GEO, except for the listening component. Overall, the research concludes that the students are satisfying the GEO speaking requirement at a 71.7% rate of proficiency.

2. Did any distinctiveness emerge from examining the data?

We found that the correlation between Audibility/Expressiveness, Body Language and

Facial Expressions were all significant; but neither Clarity, nor Pronunciation correlated with the other dimensions. This follows the old adage: it's not what you say; it's how you say it. The goal in most of our Speech classes is to reduce communication apprehension, which leads to higher overall speaking performance levels. If fear is reduced, confidence levels increase and message in heard because speaker rhetorical style commands more audience attention.

3. Was there consensus involve disaggregated data to see if all of the student artifacts achieved at the same level?

The assessors where able to separate the component parts by sex, class and assignment only and found that student artifacts achieved at the same level - i.e., the artifacts assessed show little difference in the disaggregated date to arrive at a consensus.

4. Does the evidence represent an identifiable trend? Whether or not there is an identifiable trend in the data.

The trend is that regardless of the class / assignment, our students - as individuals, groups, dyads, triads - are scoring at or above proficiency levels, which reinforces our Speech Communication Department Mission statement that "experiential learning is the most effective means of achieving the lessons of human communication." - http://www.lbcc.edu/speech/

5. Is the data Stable? Equal? Consistent? Increasing? Decreasing? Not interpretable?

The data shows stability and consistency in the Speech Communication department's rubric. As can be seen in reviewing the overall assessment results, there was general agreement of the raters across the artifacts on the level of quality.

6. Does the evidence represent an acceptable level of achievement? Whether or not the level of achievement indicated by the data is acceptable, how that achievement level is met or if it is fundamental to the general education curriculum is instructive.

The GEO assessment data demonstrates that students overall ratings in each category are as follows: Excellent: 0%, Very Good 32.6%, Proficient 39.1%, Near Proficient 21.7%, Marginal 6.5%.

Speech Communication standards are defined in the department's Program Outcomes Assessment Plan as an achievement level of 70%. The department standards were met in the GEO Assessment findings. Validity and reliability also correlates with the Department Program Assessment of 73% for all.

The evidence shows that Speech Communication students scored, on the average, Proficient (3.0) to Good (3.5) range.

7. Does the evidence surprise faculty? This intuitive validity check is very important.

The question for the work group members is whether or not the actual documented assessment data matches their intuitive assessment of the qualities expected from general education students. If there is a mismatch, then determine any potential causative factors as to the work group's impressions of the students' abilities.

Yes. As stated in the data mentioned above the student scores meet our departmental expectation levels.

THE KEY FINDINGS

1. How do the results relate to the stated/any published criteria for success? Were expectations met or not and to what extent did the results exceed or miss the target for success?

Success rate was determined at 70% on both our Dept course and program SLOs. The GEO data gathered in April 2012 demonstrates consistency in the accepted outcomes resulting in a 71.7% overall rating for all students assessed.

The assessment suggests that a substantial majority of the students assessed for this GEO achieved proficiency, with students achieving proficiency between 80 and 90% of the time on all of the dimensions and more than 70% of the time overall.

2. What do the assessment results say about how well all students, or particular subgroups of students based on the data breakouts, achieve the intended GEO?

Overall, the students scored at the proficiency level across the board on all variables stated in the cumulative percentage table: Clarity 80%, Audibility 89.1%, Pronunciation 89.1%, Body Language 87% and Facial Expressions 87%.

Another indicator from the assessment evidence examines the relationship between rater assessments. Some artifacts were difficult to rate on a number of dimension and one rater was unable to rate seven of the artifacts due to technological error/missing artifacts. Therefore, in order to maximize the amount of data examined for the GEO Assessment data for the remaining rater was used for that artifact. The authors of this report conclude that this discrepancy may cause an internal validity issue. Even though technological problems occurred, the significance levels are impressive.

Another issue is that according to the Summary Report neither rater assigned an artifact a rating lower than 2 on any dimension. The authors believe that this occurred because of the timing of the assessment and the subjects assessed. Above average quality of Summer school students, the volunteer Oral Interpretation students and the fact that this was the final semester presentations could account for no number one ratings. According to the ASLO Subcommittee Chair, typically the end of the semester assignment demonstrates the student work at his/her best.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Is there additional analysis of the existing data that might provide greater insight into the meaning of the results?

The significant levels for Clarity and Pronunciation, had p scores above .05 with other dimensions. One of the reasons is that Audibility/Expressiveness was two nonverbal measures resulting in a double-barreled rating dimension, possibly skewing the score.

2. Are there new or different things that the work group believes would be worth trying that might improve future results?

Yes, there are a few areas that we would review to improve future project implementation:

a. Preplanning - coordinate departments involved, train all participants to ensure consistency, do a trial run, collect random data, data interpretation, writing group to ensure objectivity of final report.

b. Cooperation - to include other general education disciplines in the study, because the college's mission is to be able to assess GEO Communication outcomes college-wide.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. Assessment: Revising the assessment might be a recommendation and could take the form of GEO wording, assessment tool, process, sampling of student artifacts, scope of assessment, etc.

a. Ensure that artifacts are not corrupted - possibly post them to a secure website for viewing. - Media Services

b. Remove listening from GEO Foundational Skills. - Office of Institutional Effectiveness, ASLO committee

c. Increase sampling and randomness of artifacts. – ASLO committee

d. Assessment tool revision, narrowing the variable from 5 to 3. – Speech Communication Department

e. Wider range of assessors - from different disciplines. – ASLO committee

f. Randomize sampling to include, day, night, weekend, international, etc. students. – all departments involved

g. Assessors need more time to do the workload. – ASLO committee

h. Assessors should be compensated for their work. We have been working on this project for over a year, with very limited assistance and resources. We are writing this during our Spring break. – ASLO committee

i. Compile demographic information from each subject, in order to collect disaggregated data. – Admissions &Records and the Research Offices.

j. Because the GEO Communication – Speaking – Outcome is expected for all students attending Long Beach City College, the Speech Communication Department recommends that counselors encourage students take a Speech course during their first year of college. This could be accomplished by having the Speech Communication Department meet with the Counseling Department.

2. Curriculum: Revising the curriculum might be necessary if gaps are found between desired and actual student performance (e.g. requisites, structure, sequencing, etc.).

If Communication is a GEO, then it should be required for the A.A./A.S. degree. - AD/GE Subcommittee and the Curriculum Committee. This has been recommended for years repeatedly as indicated on the Communication Project Summary (2008-2009) - http://outcomes.lbcc.edu/pdf/CommProjSumm_2008-09.pdf - and the Speech Communication department Program Plan.

3. Pedagogy: If assessment results indicate that students are not demonstrating learning at a desired level, it might be worth rethinking strategies — both inside and outside the classroom — to facilitate student learning (e.g. student-faculty contact, cooperative learning, instructional technologies, time on a particular concept/topic, etc.).

Whereas, the findings of this research demonstrate that Speech Communication students are learning and achieving at desired levels, we recommend that other disciplines try a variety of experiential learning techniques to facilitate student learning outside the Speech Communication Department. (See Results #4 reference to experiential learning.) These techniques could be presented at Flex Day Workshops, etc.