

# Program Assessment Report

Program: General Education

Year: 14/15

Division: General Education

Contact: Maureen Donegan

## Delta College



### Actions Taken in Response to Last Year's Report

### Rationale for Current Assessments

#### Assessment 1 of 2

#### Goal / Project

#### Outcome(s)

Communicate Effectively

#### Standard / Objective

*A 75% target passing rate was the assessment goal.*

*CE Outcome #1: Complete a formal presentation by gathering appropriate information, developing an effective structure, and using effective delivery techniques. (Note: All three objectives must be met for a student to have mastered the outcome.)*

*Objectives of Outcome #1*

- *Student gathered appropriate information*
- *Student developed an effective structure*
- *Student used effective delivery techniques*

#### Method of assessment

Course Embedded Paper(s)/Projects

#### Comment/Details about the method of assessment

The CE resource group expected 75% of the sampled students to achieve mastery in each of the three objectives. This may be considered a lower percentage than previous assessment group studies, but there were several reasons that led to this decision. First, students typically must have a "C" grade to transfer to other institutions. Thus, utilizing a number established by other institutions for admission made sense. Further, students in some programs do not have to take a basic public speaking class to graduate. Even in the AA/AS degrees students can meet the communication outcome without taking a public speaking course. This means that many students in our sample may not have had the basic public speaking course and are therefore relying on "instructor rubrics" and "general knowledge" to determine how to deliver an effective presentation. Finally, although a large percentage of our sample completed 30+ credit hours, students are not being assessed in a final capstone course. Thus, as assessors we need to understand that more skills are yet to be obtained and practiced by our sample students.

The rubric used the following assessment points: "0" representing no evidence, "1" Emerging (some evidence, but inadequate or inappropriate, "2" Developing (meets most dimensions of the objective), and "3" Mastery (meets all dimensions of the objective).

#### Courses Affected

Courses across the college with an M for the General Education Outcome, "Communicate Effectively".

#### Time Frame

2014-2015

Submitted By

Beth Heyart

## Result

### Result

(1) Results did not meet expectation/standard

#### Data Collection (general or specific stats regarding results)

100 student samples were scored. The data below represents the total number of students that mastered each objective. The final count is the number of students that mastered ALL three objectives thus meeting CE Outcome #1.

- 88 students mastered Objective #1: Student gathered appropriate information
- 23 students mastered Objective #2: Student developed an effective structure
- 64 students mastered Objective #3: Student used effective delivery techniques

A total of 18 students mastered CE Outcome #1: Complete a formal presentation by gathering appropriate information, developing an effective structure, and using effective delivery techniques.

#### What We Learned (areas for improvements, strengths, etc.)

The final result of 18 students meeting Outcome #1 falls significantly short of the expectations expected by the CE Resource Group. In order for a student to meet CE Outcome #1 all three objectives had to be met. If considering the objectives individually only one of them (Objective 1) met the target percentage of the resource group. Objective #2 and #3 created problems for students. The following details provide a better understanding of results in each objective.

Objective #1: Student gathered appropriate information. The CE resource group could only view final presentations not the process that the students undertook to create their presentation. The sample activities for this objective approved by curriculum council in 2012 included choosing an appropriate topic to the audience, choosing an appropriate topic for the assignment and researching a variety of materials based on the audience or assignment needs. These sample activities became the areas of analysis for this objective. The rubric labeled these dimensions as: topic appropriate to the audience, topic appropriate to the assignment and sources (whether the sources used met the variety and number required by the instructor). The first two dimensions were assessed on ALL speeches. The final category of sources could not be applied to all speeches because students were either not required to include sources or because the speech did not have a research component. Thus, students were either assessed based on two or three dimensions depending on source use. These were the ratings for each of the dimensions:

- 95 students mastered having the topic appropriate to the audience
- 93 students mastered having the topic appropriate to the assignment
- 22 of 40 students or 55% mastered the variety and number of sources required by the instructor

Only a few students did not meet topic appropriateness dimensions. The students who did not meet these dimensions did score a "2" for developing which meant that the student's topic needed to be more developed. The source dimension had far lower results. The source dimension resulted in a lower final average for this objective. Of those that did not master this objective 10 students scored a "2" or developing in this dimensions which meant that the student had limited variety and/or number of sources, and 8 students scored a "1" emerging where there was inadequate variety and number of sources. The source dimension is an area for future improvement.

Objective #2: Student developed an effective structure. The CE resource group was prepared to assess six dimensions for this objective: introductions, conclusions, main points, visual aids, outlines, and bibliography/work cited pages. All recorded speeches included the first three dimensions. The remaining three dimensions were not consistent in either requirements or student completion to fully assess. The CE resource group did review visual aid effectiveness but did not include this in the overall rating for this objective. The CE group did not review the outlines and bibliography/work cited because too few classes included these for analysis and therefore anonymity would be compromised. These were the ratings for each of the dimensions:

- 20 students mastered introductions
- 26 students mastered conclusions
- 89 students mastered main points
- (not included in overall scores.... 54 of 73 students or 74% mastered visual aids; 18 of 73 students or 25%

were assessed as developing; 1 of 73 students or 1% was assessed as emerging) Introductions and conclusions were the most problematic dimensions in this objective. To master the introduction dimension students needed to provide an introductory statement, thesis and a preview of the main points. Developing students provided two of these elements. Emerging students would state the topic and/or their name and move into their speech. There were 36 students who were rated at developing and 44 students that were at the emerging level for introductions. To master the conclusion dimension students needed to include both a review of the main points and a concluding statement. Developing students for a conclusion provided either a review or a concluding statement. Emerging students provided no real evidence of a rehearsed summary or concluding device. Rather students either ended with “that is it/all” or “does anyone have any questions?”. There were 31 students who were rated at developing and 43 students who were at the emerging level for conclusions. Student results were more favorable for the main point dimension. To master this dimension students were expected to have main points developed into an effective pattern. A developing rating meant that the main points did not have a logical progression whereas emerging was assigned to speeches that did not show main point division. There were 9 students who were rated at developing and 2 students who were at the emerging level for the main point dimension. Visual aid assessment was not included in the overall objective score. Visual aids varied widely in their use and function for the speech. Some instructors required set language to be on the PowerPoint slides. Other instructors only suggested visual aids. The variety in type, requirements and use kept the CE resource group from including this dimension within the final objective measure.

Overall, the introduction and conclusion dimensions provided the most challenge for all students at Delta. The large percentage of students in the emerging area signify an opportunity for future targeted initiatives. Students do not seem to know what should be included in these areas. Improvement in both of these areas will help students to be more effective with their presentations.

Objective #3: Students used effective delivery techniques The CE resource group assessed three dimensions for this objective: verbal communication, nonverbal communication, and effective use of materials. These were the final results for each dimension:

- 68 students mastered verbal communication
- 58 students mastered nonverbal communication
- 57 students mastered effective use of materials

Students were able to master verbal communication by speaking clearly and projecting. Developing students on this dimension had some verbal distractions such as vocalized pauses or raced through their speech. Emerging students were unclear or difficult to understand. There were 27 students who were rated as developing and 5 students who were at the emerging level for the verbal communication dimension. Students received a mastery in nonverbal communication based on effective and appropriate use of such elements as eye contact, gestures, movement and facial expressions. Developing students had some distractions in these areas. Emerging students had inadequate and distracting nonverbal communication (e.g. students would provide no eye contact or paced during their speech). There were 32 students who were rated at developing and 10 students who were at the emerging level for the nonverbal communication dimension. Finally, for effective use of materials, students were assigned a score of mastery if the student effectively used their notes and visual aids. Developing students were somewhat effective but their performance was hindered because their overreliance on their notes and visual aid. Students whose notes and visual aids were distracting and/or ignored in the speech would receive an emerging rating. There were 43 students who scored developing and 0 that scored emerging.

Overall results here indicate a need for students to work on specific verbal and nonverbal skills that would improve consistency and flow of student speeches. In addition, students also need to practice how to use notes and visual aids so that these support mechanisms can help to enhance a presentation instead of being a cause of distraction for the audience and speaker.

### Use of Data to Improve Student Success

Results are scheduled to be presented to GECAC and to Faculty Forum. Some of our next step suggestions follow.

The CE resource group members plan to work with the communication faculty in order to provide a resource web site that can be used for faculty and students. The faculty site would primarily focus on teaching presentational strategies and how to work with speech apprehension. This would enable faculty to have a starting document that could be used on their course eLearning site or syllabus. For the students, the web site would contain documents on effective presentational techniques. In addition, the site would also provide video clips of students being effective and ineffective with speech elements. The CE resource group feels that the use of video clips will help students to actually see why it is important to use the presentational skills described. Both web sources will stress the areas of introductions, conclusions, sources, verbal

communication, and nonverbal communication because these areas were most problematic on the current study. The resource sites will be developed during Fall 2015 and Winter 2016. By the end of Winter 2016 the CE resource group hopes to try out the sites with several classes to gain feedback on their effectiveness before opening these sites to Delta at large.

The CE resource also plans to create a short 20 minute recorded presentation on presentational techniques. The video will feature a communication faculty member providing a mini lecture on the elements of a speech. This mini lecture would be provided on the faculty web resource cite and could be played for classes at the faculty member's discretion. The mini lecture will also be developed during the Fall 2015 and Winter 2016 semesters.

CE resource group members would also be available to present findings of this study and provide an overview of the web resource sites to both division meetings and the first year experience. This will provide other faculty with a Q&A session that would be specific to their division needs. This step can happen after the web sites have been completed.

The CE resource group believes there are a variety of potential reasons as to the low number of Outcome #1 mastery students. The potential reasons include:

- Assignment goals. More than likely the primary goal of the speech assignments was to deliver a speech that showed an understanding or extension of course concepts. The elements of speech design and implementation for instructors and students may have been secondary to the content portion of the assignment.

- Practice. As mentioned earlier, although the query did recover classes where students had 30+ credit hours, students may not be in a program of study where presentations are the norm or are expected. Thus, students may not have had much exposure to presentation design and delivery.

- Education. The CE group plans to follow up with an assessment on our sample to see how many of them had the COM 112 (basic public speaking class) in the past.

- Assessment Implications. This type of assessment is unique. Student samples are being recorded in the moment of delivery. Student presentations are likely to change with a camera in the audience. Students that may be reticent would be more so in this assessment environment.

Student and faculty access to web resources will help to support student success. The goal for the CE group now is to provide services to help faculty and students understand techniques that help students to present effective speeches

<p>Institutional Student Learning Outcome</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Apply Knowledge and Skills</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Think Critically</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communicate Effectively</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Act Responsibly</p>	<p>Action plan items of what is planned based on the data and results</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Change assignments/activities</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Update course content</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Change materials provided</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Update course outcomes</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Adjust grading rubric</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Update prior courses</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Continue to Monitor</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other</td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/> Change assignments/activities	<input type="checkbox"/> Update course content	<input type="checkbox"/> Change materials provided	<input type="checkbox"/> Update course outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> Adjust grading rubric	<input type="checkbox"/> Update prior courses	<input type="checkbox"/> Continue to Monitor	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
<input type="checkbox"/> Change assignments/activities	<input type="checkbox"/> Update course content								
<input type="checkbox"/> Change materials provided	<input type="checkbox"/> Update course outcomes								
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjust grading rubric	<input type="checkbox"/> Update prior courses								
<input type="checkbox"/> Continue to Monitor	<input type="checkbox"/> Other								

**Assessment 2 of 2**

**Goal / Project**

**Outcome(s)**

Think Critically

**Standard / Objective**

*Eighty percent (80%) or more of artifacts reviewed will be ranked at Mastery – Meets all dimensions of the objective, for all outcomes in Critical Thinking.*

Method of assessment

Course Embedded Paper(s)/Projects

Comment/Details about the method of assessment

Each resource group member read the assignment instructions/criteria, reviewed the answer key to familiarize themselves with what an answer would look like within the subject. The member then used the Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric (attached) to score for No Evidence, Emerging, Developing, or Mastery of effective interpretation of statements, texts, theories. Using the rubric, each member took a different group of assessments, scored them by making a tally mark on the rubric sheet for that assessment. The tally marks were compiled.

Courses Affected

Courses across the college with an M for the General Education outcome "Think Critically".

Time Frame

Fall 2014-Winter 2015

Submitted By

Brian Aldrich

**Result**

Result

The standard for fall 2014 artifacts reviewed was not met. The 65.4% falls well below the 80% set.

Data Collection (general or specific stats regarding results)

One hundred and four (104) artifacts were scored.  
 No assessments were scored with a Zero (0) – No Evidence  
 Eight (8) assessments were scored with a One (1) – Emerging: Some evidence, but inadequate or inappropriate. These eight (8) represent 7.7% of the total artifacts.  
 Twenty-eight (28) assessments were scored with a Two (2) – Developing: Meets most dimensions of the objective. These twenty-eight (28) represent 27.2% of the total artifacts.  
 Sixty-eight (68) assessments were scored with a Three (3) – Mastery: Meets all dimensions of the objective. These sixty-eight (68) represent 65.4% of the total artifacts.

What We Learned (areas for improvements, strengths, etc.)

The Critical Thinking Resource Group will need to develop a plan to work with faculty on best practices within courses/disciplines/programs to teach students how to effectively interpret statements, texts, theories, problems, symbols, and/or observations.

Use of Data to Improve Student Success

Provide information to faculty on how to include assessments/activities that will improve critical thinking skills for students. Information may include articles, suggested activities, books, and webinars.

<p>Institutional Student Learning Outcome</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Apply Knowledge and Skills</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Think Critically</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Communicate Effectively</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Act Responsibly</p>	<p>Action plan items of what is planned based on the data and results</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Change assignments/activities      <input type="checkbox"/> Update course content</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Change materials provided      <input type="checkbox"/> Update course outcomes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adjust grading rubric      <input type="checkbox"/> Update prior courses</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Continue to Monitor      <input type="checkbox"/> Other</p>
--	---

**Comments and Action Plan**

**Discipline/Program Comments**

**Advisory Board Comments**

**Assessment Committee Comments**

**Curriculum Council Comments**

**Action Plan**

**Actions Taken in Response to Older Reports**