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OVERVIEW

Communication 100: Public Speaking is a multi-sectioned course in which all instructors use a common syllabus and a common text. Instructors are free to add course policies and determine the specifics of the assignments, working the student toward a common written final exam and a cumulative speaking presentation. Our instructors begin with simple speaking assignments, non-graded or graded on only specific elements, setting into place additional graded elements as the semester progresses. In general, students are provided 6-8 structured speaking opportunities each semester. Research is required for some assignments, bringing an information literacy piece to the course. Appendix A contains the common syllabus.

Presently, four core adjunct faculty teach most of the fall and spring COMM 100 sections, with seven full-time faculty available to teach sections as needed. As of Intersession 2014, seven sections of students in the Academic Development Program (ADP) are taught by full-time faculty. This document contains the assessment from both Intersession 2014 and Spring 2014.

The Assessment

Prior to Intersession 2014, objectives for Communication 100: Public Speaking were revised to reflect student learning outcomes (SLOs). These SLOs were used in both intersession and spring semesters. To accomplish this revision, the goals and objectives were “unpacked” to phrase SLOs that would be measurable.

Goals/Objectives prior to Intersession 2014:

1. Students will conduct the research required for developing an oral presentation.
2. Students will create and construct the presentation in a pattern appropriate to the general purpose of the presentation (informative, persuasive or ceremonial).
3. Students will present oral presentations using one of two delivery formats: impromptu or extemporaneous.
4. Students will constructively evaluate the presentations of self and others.

Revised to reflect Student Learning Outcomes:

Student Learning Objectives for Intersession and Spring 2014:

1. Students will be able to identify the three general purposes of oral presentation (informative, persuasive, ceremonial) as demonstrated via questions on the final exam.
2. Students will be able to identify the five basic patterns of organization (topical, spatial, chronological, cause-effect, problem-solution) as demonstrated via questions on the final exam.
3. Students will be able to utilize relevant and credible sources in support of claims as demonstrated in the final speaking assignment and assessed using a grading rubric.
4. Students will be able to demonstrate continued improvement of an extemporaneous delivery style (prepared, outlined, relaxed, conversational manner) as demonstrated through evaluation of initial, medial and final speaking assignments and assessed using a grading rubric.
5. Students will be able to construct oral messages appropriate to audience and purpose as demonstrated in various speaking assignments and assessed using a grading rubric.
6. Students will be able to construct a preparation outline in a standard Roman numeral format as demonstrated in the final speaking assignment and assessed using a grading rubric.
7. Students will be able to constructively critique the performance of self and others as demonstrated in written critiques and assessed using a grading rubric.
For this document, results for SLOs 1 and 2 are reported for Intersession 2014; SLOs 1, 2 and 4 are reported for Spring 2014.

Elements of SLOs 3 and 5 are notated on the grading rubric used in the Spring 2014 semester; a more refined rubric is needed to adequately assess these. Fall 2014 instructors are engaged in this assessment now. Additionally, SLO 7 will utilize instructor-created rubrics as these critiques differ greatly among instructors (Spring 2015, along with SLO 6).

Appendix B contains the presentation rubric used during the Spring 2014 semester and this is a slightly modified version of the rubric piloted in Intersession 2014.

**INTERSESSION 2014**

Seven ADP sections and one non-ADP section were taught by full-time faculty during Intersession 2014. Participating instructors were: Matthew Reavy, Sufyan Mohammed, Kim Pavlick, Howard Fisher and Rebecca Mikesell. In this assessment, instructors are identified by numbers and these numbers do not correspond to the order listed above. The non-ADP section is also not identified.

The instructors piloted a grade rubric during intersession, returning the rubric to the students, but did not retain a copy for this assessment purpose. Thus, the assessment results are limited to what can be gathered from the common written final exam.

**Student Learning Outcomes Assessed: Direct Measure**

**Student Learning Outcome 1:**

Students will be able to identify the three general purposes of oral presentation (informative, persuasive, ceremonial) as demonstrated via questions on the final exam.

COMM 100 works with the three general purposes, distinguishing them from “specific purposes,” and “thesis statements.” This SLO was tested using the following exam questions:

**Q8.** Matt wrote these two purpose statements on his paper:
1st statement: To inform.
2nd statement: At the end of my speech, the audience will know how to change the oil in a car.
These two different types of purpose statements are
a) general and specific, respectively *
b) topical and chronological, respectively
c) spatial and hierarchical, respectively
d) closed-ended and open-ended, respectively
e) primary and secondary, respectively

**Q13.** Which of the following is a specific purpose statement?
a) What is involved in protecting oneself from identity theft?
b) To inform
” By the end of my speech, my audience will know five tips to help avoid identity theft. *
c) You must protect yourself from identity theft!

**Q28.** The difference between a speech's specific purpose and its general purpose is that
a) a specific purpose includes intended results, a general purpose does not. *
b) a specific purpose asked a question, a general purpose is declarative.
c) a specific purpose is chronological, a general purpose is topical.
d) a specific purpose includes references, a general purpose does not.
e) none of above
Q33. The general purpose of a speech of tribute is to
   a) inform.
   b) persuade.
   c) mark an occasion. *
   d) entertain.
   e) motivate.

Q41. If you want to emphasize how best to solve a problem, a _________________ general purpose would be most appropriate.
   a) Ceremonial
   b) Topical
   c) Cause-effect
   d) Persuasive *

Q61. The three categories of general purposes are
   a) general, specific, declarative.
   b) to inform, to persuade, to mark an occasion. *
   c) to motivate, to inspire, to document.
   d) topical, chronological, spatial.
   e) general, specific, preview.

Q70. A speech presented on the topic "The causes and effects of climate change" is categorized under this general purpose:
   a) to inform. *
   b) to persuade.
   c) to mark a special occasion.
   d) to inspire.
   e) to motivate.

Figure 1 below indicates the total percentage of students returning the correct response and notes the percentage of students enrolled in sections taught by Instructors 1-5 who return the correct response.
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Overall, we are meeting this SLO, but there is variance among instructors. These results are shared with the instructors so that they can view the comparison to others and increase the emphasis placed on particular topics.

**Student Learning Outcome 2:**
*Students will be able to identify the five basic patterns of organization (topical, spatial, chronological, cause-effect, problem-solution) as demonstrated via questions on the final exam.*

COMM 100 instructors work diligently to help the students acquire techniques for organizing presentations. One of our most valuable tools for organizing well is knowledge of the five basic patterns of organization. These can function as templates for student to use. Moving from a topical pattern (“Three reasons why you should adopt my view”) to a problem-solution pattern of organization can move a presentation more solidly into persuasion (“The problem is...,” “Seeing/doing what I advocate is the solution...”).

Each presentation is organized according to one of the basic organizational patterns or one of the variations that have a basic pattern as its foundation. For example, Monroe’s Motivated Sequence, frequently used in classes to “sell” a product or service, is a variation of the problem-solution pattern.

However, we do not have the class time to allow the students to practice all five of the patterns in a formal presentation. Knowledge of the five basic patterns and Monroe’s Motivated Sequence was tested using the following exam questions:

Q6. “Pattern of organization” refers to
   a) the organization of the main points in a speech.  *
   b) the organization of the expert testimony in a speech.
   c) the organization of the preview statement in a speech.
   d) the organization of the thesis statement in a speech.

Q11. When the main ideas follow a time pattern, they are organized in
   a) spatial order.
   b) topical order.
   c) cause-effect order.
   d) chronological order.  *

Q20. A speech with the specific purpose, “My audience will know the major features of the Tower of London,” would most likely be organized in ________________ order.
   a) chronological or spatial
   b) causal or topical
   c) topical or spatial  *
   d) causal or spatial

Q35. Problem-solution order is most appropriate when organizing ____________ speeches.
   a) Informative
   b) Persuasive  *
   c) Ceremonial
   d) Introductory
Q42. Monroe's Motivated Sequence is a pattern of organization used in ______________ presentations.
   a) Informative
   b) Persuasive *
   c) Ceremonial
   d) Topical

Q48. A speech with the specific purpose, "My audience will know how to take pictures like a professional," would most likely be arranged in ____________ order.
   a) causal or chronological
   b) topical or chronological *
   c) spatial or topical
   d) chronological or spatial

Figure 2 shows the total percentage of students returning the correct response for each of these questions, and the percentage correct in each instructor’s class.
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In general, it appears that more work is needed to identify the specific patterns of organization. Again, this data is shared with the instructors so that comparisons with other instructors can be viewed and the instructors has the opportunity to revise his/her class to emphasize this issue if needed.

Only questions that directly assessed the SLOs have been shown in this document. However, the final exam assessed additional course concepts such as audience and situational analysis, structure, delivery, apprehension, credibility, claims, evidence & warrants, listening, and using sources. These results are very informative because they identify concepts on which instructors need to place more emphasis. The assessment regarding the additional course concepts is available on request.

**Student Perception Survey: Indirect Assessment Method**

For the past six years, we have administered a Perception Survey to COMM 100 students. Reasoning that only the students can tell us whether or not their public speaking confidence has grown or how prepared they feel to enter other courses with the information garnered from this public speaking course, we’ve designed a survey for students to indicate these things to us. As an instrument
that requests student perceptions, it is not a measure of how much they have actually learned. However, it is a measure of the value they place on what they have learned.

Only the data for Intersession 2014 and Spring 2014 are presented in this document, but the results for the remaining semesters are available on request.

The Student Perception Survey asks the students to indicate agreement or disagreement to seven statements (strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree, strongly agree). The results presented here indicate the only the percentage of students who returned responses of “agree” and “strongly agree.”

The seven statements are:
1. This course improved my ability to organize a public presentation.
2. This course improved my ability to deliver a public presentation.
3. I feel more confident about my ability to present a public presentation now that I’ve taken this course.
4. I am better able to argue my position now that I’ve taken this course.
5. I would have taken this course even if it was not required.
6. I’m glad I took this course.
7. I feel more confident about my ability to give presentations in other classes now that I’ve taken this course.

Figure 3 shows the results of the Student Perception Survey for Intersession 2014.

Of course, we expected low “agreement” scores for Statement #5: “I would have taken this course even if it was not required.” Overall, 62% of the total number of students responding to this question in Intersession 2014 returned “disagree,” “strongly disagree,” and “undecided” responses—they would not have taken COMM 100 if it had not been required. However, 73% of the total number of students responding agreed or strongly agreed that they are glad that they did take the course. Figure 4 shows the grand results across all sections in Intersession 2014.
The highest value here is 84% (“organize”), followed by “deliver” at 82%. “Argue” is not as strong as we might have desired, but the course is not designed to further argumentation skills as much as information literacy, organization, structure and delivery, so this is not surprising. Generally, we work on foundational argumentation such as making claims and supporting these claims with evidence, working more with finding and using credible sources.
SPRING 2014

Four adjunct instructors and one full-time instructor taught 10 sections of COMM 100 in the spring of 2014. Contingent faculty members, Kim Curran, Kelly Conlon-Mazzucca, Shannon Keith and Ruth DeSantis-Miller, and one full-time faculty member, Mary Beth Holmes, participated in this assessment. To accommodate the assessment efforts, instructors were asked to do the following:

- Administer the Pre-Test; the Post-Test will comprise 40 questions of the 70 Question final exam;
- Use the assessment rubric (Appendix B);
- Build an early speech into the first or second week that requires the students to structure a presentation that required a little research (not an unstructured, “stand up and talk” speaking opportunity). Have a final, cumulative speech assignment with all elements in place.
- *Record the speeches (initial, media, and final speeches)

*Our rooms are equipped with cameras, but we had numerous equipment malfunctions. Instructional Technology finally determined that a software upgrade was incompatible with the camera system and they have now installed a Panopto lecture capture system. We anticipate greater success with recordings in the fall semester. Currently, the recordings are meant to be a “back-up” to the common grade rubric to which our instructors are still becoming accustomed. If we are well-practiced using the rubric, that may prove sufficient for tracking the development of speaking skills.

Student Learning Outcomes: A Repeat

To remind the reader, the SLOs for COMM 100 are noted below:

1. Students will be able to identify the three general purposes of oral presentation (informative, persuasive, ceremonial) as demonstrated via questions on the final exam.
2. Students will be able to identify the five basic patterns of organization (topical, spatial, chronological, cause-effect, problem-solution) as demonstrated via questions on the final exam.
3. Students will be able to utilize relevant and credible sources in support of claims as demonstrated in the final speaking assignment and assessed using a grading rubric.
4. Students will be able to demonstrate continued improvement of an extemporaneous delivery style (prepared, outlined, relaxed, conversational manner) as demonstrated through evaluation of initial, medial and final speaking assignments and assessed using a grading rubric.
5. Students will be able to construct oral messages appropriate to audience and purpose as demonstrated in various speaking assignments and assessed using a grading rubric.
6. Students will be able to construct a preparation outline in a standard Roman numeral format as demonstrated in the final speaking assignment and assessed using a grading rubric.
7. Students will be able to constructively critique the performance of self and others as demonstrated in written critiques and assessed using a grading rubric.
For the present assessment, SLOs 1 & 2 are the foci, though an attempt was made to assess SLO 4. This SLO assessment was somewhat successful, however, we have improved the method and are repeating this assessment in the fall 2014 semester. A sample of the results for SLO 4 are reported in this document.

Elements of SLOs 3 and 5 are notated on the grading rubric used in the spring 2014 semester, a more refined rubric is needed to adequately assess these. Fall 2014 instructors are engaged in this assessment now. Additionally, SLO 7 will utilize instructor-created rubrics as these critiques differ greatly among instructors (Spring 2015, along with SLO 6).

Appendix B contains the presentation rubric used during the Spring 2014 semester and this is a slightly modified version of the rubric piloted in Intersession 2014.

Pre-Test/Post-Test

In the fall of 2013, the full-time faculty\(^1\) teaching the new INTD 184: *EP Foundations*\(^2\) developed a pre-test/post-test to aid in the assessment of that course. Since *EP Foundations* also teaches oral communication skills and it was desired to compare *EP Foundations* with its sister courses, COMM 100: *Public Speaking* and C/IL 102: *Computer Literacy*, this assessment tool was modified for use in both COMM 100 and C/IL 102. For COMM 100: Public Speaking, the oral communication and information literacy portion of the *EP Foundations* course were retained, removing only the digital technology portion. Several questions were then removed from the oral portion because they emphasized concepts that are a part of *EP Foundations*, but not COMM 100. The resulting 40 questions appeared on the pre-test and again as part of the final exam (40 questions pre-test + 30 additional questions = 70 questions).

The Figure 5 below shows the gain in test scores. The pre-test mean of 61% increased to 78% on the post-test, with a pre-test median of 63% and a post-test median at 80%. Both the median and mode increased on the post-test while the standard deviation decreased.

\[\text{Figure 5}\]

\[^{1}\text{The course director for COMM 100: Public Speaking is also the lead faculty member for the oral communication portion of INTD 184: EP Foundations.}\]

\[^{2}\text{*EP Foundations* is a newly developed course designed to satisfy curriculum initiatives for foundational Eloquentia Perfecta. *EP Foundations* combines oral communication, information literacy, and digital technology, and is team taught with full-time faculty from the departments of Communication and Computing Science, and a librarian embedded in each section.}\]
A review of the pre-test lead to a revision of several questions that did not provide an adequate measure of knowledge and this revised version has been administered as a COMM 100 pre-test in the Fall 2014.

Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes: Direct Measures

Student Learning Outcome 1:
*Students will be able to identify the three general purposes of oral presentation (informative, persuasive, ceremonial) as demonstrated via questions on the final exam.*

SLO #1 was assessed using four questions from the final exam:

Q17. The difference between a speech’s specific purpose and its general purpose is that
   a) a specific purpose includes intended results, a general purpose does not. *
   b) a specific purpose asks a question, a general purpose is declarative.
   c) a specific purpose is chronological, a general purpose is topical.
   d) a specific purpose includes references, a general purpose does not.
   e) none of the above

Q26. The general purpose of a speech of tribute is to
   a) inform.
   b) persuade.
   c) mark an occasion. *
   d) entertain.
   e) motivate.

Q30. Matt wrote these two purpose statements on his paper:
   1st statement: To inform.
   2nd statement: At the end of my speech, the audience will know how to change the oil in a car.
   These two different types of purpose statements are
   a) general and specific, respectively. *
   b) topical and chronological, respectively.
   c) spatial and hierarchical, respectively
   d) closed-ended and open-ended, respectively.
   e) primary and secondary, respectively.

Q69. A speech presented on the topic, “The causes and effects of climate change” is categorized under this general purpose:
   a) to inform. *
   b) to persuade.
   c) to mark a special occasion.
   d) to motivate.

The overall percentage of people who returned the correct response for these four questions is presented in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q17</th>
<th>Q26</th>
<th>Q30</th>
<th>Q69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
Figure 6 separates these percentages by instructors (1-5), and we see that low scores for two of the instructors affected the percentage for Q 17 and one instructor’s low scores for Q26 affected the overall percentage. However, for each of these instructors Q30 and Q69 were high scores. All instructors will review the concepts covered by these four questions and revisit the emphasis placed on these concepts in class.

![Figure 6](image1)

Question #69 appeared on both the pre- and post-test. Thus, Figure 7 presents the data for this question, noting the results for instructors 1-5.

![Figure 7](image2)

Instructor #3’s pretest score is much lower than the other instructors, because some data was missing on the pre-test. Likely, students simply did not turn the test booklet over to find the last few
questions. The post-test score for this question actually decreased for Instructor #4, though in the post-test, 85% of this instructor’s students scored correctly (88% on the pre-test).

Overall, it appears that we are meeting SLO 1, but with some variance among instructors.

**Student Learning Outcome 2:**
*Students will be able to identify the five basic patterns of organization (topical, spatial, chronological, cause-effect, problem-solution) as demonstrated via questions on the final exam.*

SLO 2 was assessed using four questions:

Q23: Monroe’s Motivated Sequence is a pattern of organization used in ________ presentations.
   a) informative
   b) persuasive *
   c) ceremonial
   d) topical

Q25: Problem-solution order is most appropriate when organizing ______ speeches.
   a) informative
   b) persuasive *
   c) ceremonial
   d) introductory

Q49: “Pattern of organization” refers to
   a) the organization of the presentation into an introduction, body and conclusion.
   b) the organization of the evidence to be presented in a message into an outline.
   c) the organization of the main points in a presentation. *
   d) the organization of the thesis statement in an introduction.

Q67. A speech with a specific purpose, “My audience will know how to take pictures like a professional,” would most likely be arranged in ____________ order.
   a) causal or chronological
   b) topical or chronological *
   c) spatial or topical
   d) chronological or spatial.

The overall percentage of people who returned the correct response for these four questions is presented in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q23</th>
<th>Q25</th>
<th>Q49</th>
<th>Q67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Figure 8 separates these percentages by instructor and we can see that this issues needs more emphasis in the class sections. Since these patterns provide templates for organizing main points, we would like to see these percentages for the concepts covered in Q49 and Q67 to increase in the future.
Questions 49 and 67 were pre-test questions. Figure 9 shows the pre-test/post-test comparison.

Although the overall percentages for these questions were not high, this demonstrates increased learning about patterns of organization during the semester.

**Student Learning Outcome 6:**
*Students will be able to construct a preparation outline in a standard Roman numeral format as demonstrated in the final speaking assignment and assessed using a grading rubric.*

SLO 6 was meant to be assessed using the final speaking assignment, but one exam question does speak to this and it appeared on both the pre-and post-tests:
Q45. Writing an outline is an important part of the presentation process. Identify the standard Roman number outline format below:

a) Roman numerals are used for main points and capital letters are used for subpoints.

b) Roman numerals are used for main points and numbers are used for subpoints.

c) Roman numerals are used for main points and each main point has a single subpoint indicated by using the number 1.

d) Numbers are used for main points and Roman numerals are used for subpoints.

Sixty-three percent of the students returned the correct response on the final exam/post-test. The instructor breakdown appears in Figure 10.

**Student Learning Outcome 4:**
*Students will be able to demonstrate continued improvement of an extemporaneous delivery style (prepared, outlined, relaxed, conversational manner) as demonstrated through evaluation of initial, medial and final speaking assignments and assessed using a grading rubric.*

The best “pre-test/post-test” to examine this SLO is to require the students to quickly choose a persuasive speech topic, research, organize and present a 6-10 minutes speech using PowerPoint, before any content has been imparted. While this would set up a nice pre-test, allowing students the opportunity to demonstrate what they already know about research, oral citations, outlining, organizing, audience analysis, use of language, and effective use of computer-aided visuals, it would not be pedagogically sound (and would force 3-4 class sessions to be used as presentation days, lessening valuable time for course content), and it would raise, not lower, student speaking anxiety. A pre/post-test of this manner is not feasible and so comparing initial speaking presentations to final presentations must be done with caution.

To assess delivery, ratings regarding conversational delivery, eye contact, voice, fluency, purposeful movement and energy were included on the rubric adopted by the Spring 2014 instructors. The rubric appears in Appendix B. The use of this rubric was problematic in its implementation, but the difficulties are manageable for future attempts. Revisions to this method were made and are currently in use for the Fall 2014 semester.

Instructors were asked to submit rubrics from the initial and final speaking opportunities. The
results from two instructors, representing four sections of the course, are presented in this document as examples.

Using the rubrics from the initial and final presentations, change scores were computed (final score - initial score) and from these, mean, mode, and range were calculated. The sample results from Instructor 1 and Instructor 4 are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor #1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed, Conversational</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.5 to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposeful Movement</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1 to 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor #4</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed, Conversational</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3 to 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposeful Movement</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 to 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

The scores represent the mean change from initial to final presentations. However, these must be interpreted with caution. Comparing initial to final presentations is not quite “comparing apples to oranges,” but can be better likened to comparing Granny Smiths to Delicious apples—they are both apples, but with distinct differences. Likewise, initial speeches are quite unlike a final, cumulative presentation. For example, initial presentations are informative in nature and do not require research, allowing the student to speak from his/her own knowledge. As a result, eye contact may be quite good. However, final speeches are persuasive, requiring research and therefore oral citations, pushing the student beyond his/her own knowledge. It is not unusual for eye contact to decrease as they deal with the additional persuasive information. That the change range would include number in the negative for eye contact is not surprising (e.g. -3 and -2 above); however, the mode is informative here. With the most frequently occurring score of 1 or 2, we are seeing progress made, even under the more arduous circumstance of a final speech.

COMM 100 emphasizes an extemporaneous mode of delivery—a relaxed, conversational style with energy in both the body and the voice. It appears that both instructors work with the students on this, though there is some variance in the change scores. Fluency refers to the absence of vocal fillers and, again, there is some variance between the instructors.

Sample data from two instructors was presented in this document as evidence of the work being done with this SLO. The use of the rubric and the method for managing the data that results from this rubric assessment has been modified for Fall 2014 so that results from all the COMM 100 sections/instructors will be documented in future reports.
Student Perception Survey: An Indirect Measure

As in Intersession, students were administered an instrument measuring their own observation of what they learned. Noting again that student confidence in one’s ability to research, organize, argue and deliver should increase after completing this course, and that only the student can determine how he/she feels, this data gives us assurance that students are finding value in the course. This survey is found in Appendix C.

![Student Perception Survey Spring 2014](image)

Figure 11

As expected, students reported that they would not have taken the course if it was not a requirement, however, many students were glad that they did (highest percentage = 80%, lowest percentage = 42%, with variance among instructors). Generally, students reported more confidence in their ability to speak in other classes (highest value = 83%, lowest value = 63%).

CLOSING THE LOOP

This report serves as the starting point for “closing the loop” for both the intersession and spring instructors. It is shared with the instructors and will be combined with future assessments for a more complete picture (see Initiatives for Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 below). Additionally, instructors are encouraged to augment these course-wide assessments with their own methods and to participate in the reporting initiatives of the College and Arts and Sciences.

We will continue our yearly workshop for contingent faculty and offer similar workshops for full-time faculty. At these workshops, we will explore avenues for rating delivery in a similar fashion. In the past, the contingent faculty have viewed and discussed student recordings as a way to determine criteria for grading (for example, what does an A speech look like? What does a C speech look like?). Full-time faculty will be offered the chance to participate in similar viewings.
INITIATIVES FOR FALL 2014 AND SPRING 2015

The following assessment initiatives are underway for Fall 2015:

1. Instructors administered the pre-test. As before this is a modified version of the assessment used in *EP Foundations*, although there have been adjustments made to several questions. The post-test/final exam will not be administered in five versions as was the exam in the spring semester. This will ease the burden on the course director in compiling the results.

2. Instructors were again asked to build an early speech requiring structure and a little research (not an unstructured, “stand up and talk” speaking opportunity). The final speech is to be a 6-10 minute persuasive speech utilizing PowerPoint or Prezi as a speech aid.

3. Instructors will use the new assessment rubric provided (Appendix C). One of the revealed difficulties with the previous rubric was that it was presented as a “grading rubric,” with instructors completing it, recording the grade and then returning it to students. Because of this, instructors tended to assign ratings based on *expectations* for that *particular* speaking assignment. Expectations for early assignments are lighter than for later assignments. Thus, the ratings for many of the categories on the initial rubric (Appendix B) did not reflect an assessment of speaking skills upon entering the course. What is needed is an early assessment of skills that does not constitute a speech grade. This tendency to assess by progressive assignment expectations continued throughout the semester, with the early ratings an “easy 5,” and later ratings a “tough 5.”

   In an attempt to counter this tendency, instructors were asked to separate the concepts of “grading speeches,” from “assessing skills,” using the rubric only to assess as though viewing a final presentation. To aid in this, an abbreviated rubric was provided that only notates the two SLOs being assessed via rubric this semester, SLO 4 (delivery) and SLO 5 (appropriateness to audience and purpose).

   Clerical support will aid the course director in entering data as the semester progresses, making data analysis more efficient.

4. To assess SLO 3 (utilizing relevant and credible sources), it was suggested to have the students complete a form for each source used, noting the credibility and use and for the instructors to create their own rubric for assessing the quality of the students’ work. This method is only a pilot; from this, we may be able to construct a common form for all to use.

5. SLOs 6 (outlining) and 7 (critiquing) will be assessed in Spring 2015 so as to not overload the instructors with too many assessments in one semester.

**Participation in College-Wide Assessment Reporting**

This document serves as a starting point as we strive to “close the assessment loop.” It sets the basis for continued development of common assessment measures/methods and will continue as an annual report. However, with method/electronic formats now constructed, and clerical support in place for data entry, individual instructors are encouraged to submit semester reports to the College of Arts & Sciences, indicating the conclusions they have drawn for their sections and the steps they have devised to close the loop.
COMM 100: PUBLIC SPEAKING

(3 credits)

Syllabus Common to All Sections of COMM 100s

Catalog Description
This is a performance class that emphasizes the theory, composition, delivery, and criticism of speeches. Successful completion of COMM 100 (with a grade of C or better) fulfills the oral communication requirement of the University.

Method of Instruction
COMM 100 is based on the tell-show-do-feedback approach. First, students will be told through lectures and assigned readings how to strategically prepare and deliver a speech to satisfy stated goals. Next, they will be shown examples of speeches in manuscript, videotape or live presentation. Third, students will present their own speeches. Finally, students will receive feedback about their public speaking skills development from their instructor and classmates.

Required Text

Student Learning Outcomes
1. Students will be able to identify the three general purposes of oral presentation (informative, persuasive, ceremonial) as demonstrated via questions on the final exam.

2. Students will be able to identify the five basic patterns of organization (topical, spatial, chronological, cause-effect, problem-solution) as demonstrated via questions on the final exam.

3. Students will be able to utilize relevant and credible sources in support of claims as demonstrated in the final speaking assignment.

4. Students will be able to demonstrate continued improvement of an extemporaneous delivery style (prepared, outlined, relaxed, conversational manner) as demonstrated through evaluation of initial, medial and final speaking assignments.

5. Students will be able to construct oral messages appropriate to audience and purpose as demonstrated in various speaking assignments and notated on a grading rubric.

6. Students will be able to construct a preparation outline in a standard Roman numeral format as demonstrated in the final speaking assignment.

7. Students will be able to constructively critique the performance of self and others as demonstrated in written critiques.
Method of Assessment for Student Learning Outcomes: Outcomes 1 & 2 will be assessed via questions on the final exam. Outcomes 3 - 7 will be assessed using grading rubrics.

Core Assignments

To achieve the student learning outcomes of this course, each COMM 100 instructor will structure the class around the following core of assignments, at least one of which will include the use of presentation software: a minimum of one informative speech on ideas, objects, procedures, people, or events, a minimum of one ceremonial speech, and a minimum of two persuasive or argumentative speeches on policies, facts, or values (length of each speech to be four or more minutes); a minimum of one written exam or a series of quizzes equal to a written exam; and a minimum of one written critique of a speech. To these core assignments, each instructor may, and likely will, provide additional speaking opportunities. Additional written assignments might include full-sentence outlines or a manuscript speech.

Plagiarism and Other Dishonest Behavior

The University of Scranton has adopted the Modern Language Association's definition of plagiarism which describes plagiarism as "giving the impression that you have written or thought something that you have in fact borrowed from someone else." Examples of plagiarism in public speaking include, but are not limited to, the following: paraphrasing or directly quoting material without crediting sources; presenting speeches/outlines/critiques written by another person or persons; fabricating or falsifying evidence or sources. Other dishonest behavior includes, but is not limited to, the following: cheating on quizzes or exams or on any course assignment.

All COMM 100 instructors are mandated by the department to follow the University’s Academic Honesty Policy for each and every instance of dishonesty. Among other things, this policy requires a written report to the Dean for inclusion in the student’s file, regardless of the severity of the offense.

Common Written Final Exam

During finals week, all students enrolled in COMM 100 will be required to take a common comprehensive written exam based on the course. A review sheet will be provided.

Students with Disabilities

In order to receive appropriate accommodations, students with disabilities must register with the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence and provide relevant and current medical documentation. Students should contact Mary Ellen Pichiarello (Extension 4039) or Jim Muniz (Extension 4218), 5th floor, St. Thomas Hall, for an appointment. For more information, see http://www.scranton.edu/disabilities
APPENDIX B

Name _____________________________________
Presentation ________________________________
Time __________________
Grade _________________

Overall Structure

Introduction
Attention Material 1 2 3 4 5
Thesis statement 1 2 3 4 5
Preview statement 1 2 3 4 5
Relevance of topic to self and audience 1 2 3 4 5

Body
Identifiable pattern of organization 1 2 3 4 5
Transitions/signposts apparent 1 2 3 4 5

Conclusion
Review of main point and thesis 1 2 3 4 5
Final, compelling statement 1 2 3 4 5

Content
Arguments created/supported 1 2 3 4 5
Appropriate use of language 1 2 3 4 5

Delivery
Relaxed, conversational manner 1 2 3 4 5
Solid, sustained eye contact 1 2 3 4 5
Voice 1 2 3 4 5
Fluency 1 2 3 4 5
Purposeful movement 1 2 3 4 5
Energy level 1 2 3 4 5

Other
Time 1 2 3 4 5
Appearance of visual aids/slides 1 2 3 4 5
Effective use of visual aids/slides 1 2 3 4 5
Outline 1 2 3 4 5
Rubric guidelines

1= completely unacceptable; 2= inadequate; 3= average; 4= well done; 5= outstanding

Overall Structure

Introduction: Was the first thing spoken your attention-getter (no “so,” “ok,” or speaking your title—begin with your attention-getter). Was the attention getter something that would get the audience thinking or was it rather boring? If you asked a question that the audience could answer, did you allow them to answer and then use the answer in your next comment? Was your thesis statement clearly presented and located properly in your introduction? Did you preview your topic clearly and concisely? If you have some connection to the topic was this established in the introduction (ethos-establishing material)? Was the topic made relevant to the class?

Body

Was a pattern of organization identifiable? Were the main points made distinct or did it all blend together, making it difficult for the audience to know where you were in the presentation? Did you use transitions and signposts as you moved throughout your speech? Did you make it easy for the audience to follow you?

Conclusion

Did you clearly signal that you reached the end of your presentation? Did you clearly review your main points and thesis? Did you end your presentation with a compelling, meaningful statement?

Content

Did you use arguments well? Were the arguments well-constructed or did you use fallacious reasoning? Did you present new information or perspective on your topic? Were the arguments supported with relevant, credible evidence?

5 = no issues with argumentation or support
4= one issue with argumentation or support
3 = two issues with argumentation or support
2 = three issues with argumentation or support
1 = inappropriate use of argumentation or support

Did you use appropriate language for the audience and occasion? Were there inappropriate words used (poor grammar, mispronunciations, biased, racist, sexist language, expletives, inappropriate slang terms, unexplained jargon)? Did you use language that was clear, vivid and descriptive? Did you use concrete language or did you end sentences with vague phrases such as “or whatever”?

5 = no issues with language use
4= one issue with language use
3 = two issues with language use
2 = three issues with language use
1 = inappropriate use of language

Delivery

Was the presentation delivered in a relaxed, conversational manner? Were you situated behind the lectern or did you walk away and address the audience? Did you use natural gestures, or were you stiff and over-rehearsed? Did you sustain eye contact with the audience? Did you look at your notes or the screen too often? Did you project your voice so the entire class could hear you? Were you speaking too rapidly or too slowly? Did your voice rise at the end of sentences as though a question was being asked when no question was apparent? Did you overuse vocal fillers such as um, uh, like? Did you conduct yourself with proper decorum, engaging in proper appearance and behavior suitable to the occasion? Did you use purposeful movement that engaged the audience? Did you move at appropriate times, or did you sway or move erratically, such as pacing or waving your note cards? Was there energy behind your delivery?
Was your presentation within time limits?

5 = time within 15 seconds on either end of the time limit
4 = time within 30 seconds on either end of the time limit
3 = time within 1 minute on either end of the time limit
2 = time within 1 minute 15 seconds on either end of the time limit
1 = time more than 1 minute 15 seconds on either side of the time limit

Were your visual aids appropriately prepared? (font size and style, color scheme, spelling, grammar, readable graphics, citations for images/information noted on slides)

5 = appropriate, well-constructed slides
4 = one issue with slides
3 = 2 issues with slides
2 = 3 issues with slides
1 = inappropriate use of slides

Was your outline(s) well presented?

5 = well-formatted standard Roman numeral outline, properly cited sources with appropriate number
4 = 1 to 2 issues with outline, sources
3 = 3 to 4 issues with outline, sources
2 = 5 to 6 issues with outline, sources
1 = completely unacceptable outline, sources
APPENDIX C

Name _________________________________ (last, first)
Presentation ______________________________
Time __________________
Grade _________________ (Assigned grade for this speech)

Appropriateness of presentation to audience and purpose

1 2 3 4 5
Comments:

**Delivery**

Relaxed, conversational manner 1 2 3 4 5
Solid, sustained eye contact 1 2 3 4 5
Voice 1 2 3 4 5
Fluency 1 2 3 4 5
Purposeful movement 1 2 3 4 5
Energy level 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

Appearance of visual aids/slides 1 2 3 4 5
Effective use of visual aids/slides 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

Rubric guidelines

1= completely unacceptable; 2= inadequate; 3= average; 4= well done; 5= outstanding

**Delivery**

Was the presentation delivered in a relaxed, conversational manner? Were you situated behind the lectern or did you walk away and address the audience? Did you use natural gestures, or were you stiff and over-rehearsed? Did you sustain eye contact with the audience? Did you look at your notes or the screen too often? Did you project your voice so the entire class could hear you? Were you speaking too rapidly or too slowly? Did your voice rise at the end of sentences as though a question was being asked when no question was apparent? Did you overuse vocal fillers such as um, uh, like? Did you conduct yourself with proper decorum, engaging in proper appearance and behavior suitable to the occasion? Did you use purposeful movement that engaged the audience? Did you move at appropriate times, or did you sway or move erratically, such as pacing or waving your note cards? Was there energy behind your delivery?