**Speaking General Education Assessment**

**Fall 2012 & Spring 2013 Results**

**Assessment:**

As a part of the General Education assessment plan, student learning outcomes focused on speaking skills were assessed during the fall 2012 and spring 2013 semesters. Specifically, the speaking goal focused on three student learning outcomes:

* Compose oral, thesis-driven arguments that include appropriate evidence
* Engage with audiences through effective and appropriate delivery
* Participate actively and respectfully in meaningful discussions

Data was collected using a formal class presentation in ENGL 103. Each student in ENGL 103 was required to give an 8-10 minute oral presentation based on an argumentative research paper they completed as a course assignment. Using the Association of American of Colleges and Universities VALUE rubrics as a starting point, a subcommittee of faculty and assessment professional developed a rubric to assess the General Education speaking outcomes (see Appendix A).

A graduate assistant (GA) was hired and trained on applying the rubric. During the fall and spring semesters, a coordinated schedule was prepared that allowed the GA to sit in on selected class periods where students were presenting their argumentative research papers. To improve the validity of the observations and to be as least intrusive as possible, the GA sat in the back of the classroom and scored the students using the developed rubric.

**Results:**

During academic year 2012-13, approximately 1,143 students were enrolled in ENGL 103. For this assessment 127 student presentations (11%) were observed and scored.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Fall 2012 | Spring 2013 |
|  | Sample | Population | Sample | Population |
| Freshmen | 2.88 (N = 107) | 2.76 (1750) | 3.48 (N = 111) | 2.83 (1233) |
| Sophomore | 3.11 (N = 15) | 2.84 (1911) | 3.79 (N = 16) | 2.86 (1750) |

While the results showed that the majority of students were meeting or exceeding expectations for all three criteria, the average scores indicate that they are on the low end of meeting interpersonal communication and listening expectations. Scores of 2-3 indicate that expectations are met, and average scores on the assessment ranged from 2.2-2.6.

|  |
| --- |
| *Fall 2012 Speaking Reliability* |
|  | Criteria | Link to GE Assessment Mapping (Outcome) | Inter-rater Reliability (calculated as Kappa) |
|  | Thesis Driven Argument | 1a-Compose oral, thesis-driven arguments that include appropriate evidence. |  |
|  | Appropriate Evidence | 1a-Engage with audiences through effective and appropriate delivery. |  |
|  | Effective Delivery | 1b &3a-Participate actively and respectfully in meaningful discussions |  |
| \*Rubric reliability: α = .75 |

|  |
| --- |
| *Fall 2012 & Spring 2013 Speaking Expectations* |
|  | Appropriate Evidence | Effective Delivery | Thesis Driven Argument |
|  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring |
|  | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Does not meet expectation | 3 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 14 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 13 |
| Meets expectation | 46 | 73 | 39 | 61 | 45 | 71 | 50 | 78 | 55 | 87 | 41 | 64 |
| Exceeds expectation | 14 | 22 | 20 | 31 | 9 | 14 | 11 | 17 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 23 |
| Total | 63 | 100 | 64 | 100 | 63 | 100 | 64 | 100 | 63 | 100 | 64 | 100 |

*\*Due to rounding, percentages may not total 100%*

|  |
| --- |
| *AY 2012-13 Speaking Expectations* |
|  | Appropriate Evidence | Thesis Driven Argument | Effective Delivery |
|  | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Does not meet expectation | 8 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 10 | 8 |
| Meets expectation | 85 | 67 | 95 | 75 | 96 | 76 |
| Exceeds expectation | 34 | 27 | 20 | 16 | 21 | 17 |
| Total | 127 | 100 | 127 | 100 | 127 | 100 |

*\*Due to rounding, percentages may not total 100%*

**Appendix A**

**2012-13 Speaking Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | **Courses** | **Link to GE Assessment Mapping** | **Does Not Meet Expectation(Score 1-2)** | **Meets Expectation (Score 3-4)** | **Exceeds Expectation (Score 4-5)** |
| Compose oral, thesis-driven arguments that include appropriate evidence | ENGL 103 | 2c.1 Speaking: ***Compose oral, thesis-driven arguments*** that include appropriate evidence | Thesis is not explicitly stated or is not supported by evidence (e.g., outside source information,use of logic, crediblity of the speaker, eliciting an emotional response) | Thesis is clear and supported by appropriate evidence (e.g., outside source information,use of logic, crediblity of the speaker, eliciting an emotional response) | Thesis is convincing and strongly supported with evidence (e.g., outside source information,use of logic, crediblity of the speaker, eliciting an emotional response) |
| Use appropriate sources to support arguments | ENGL 103 | 2c.1 Speaking: Compose oral, thesis-driven arguments that ***include appropriate evidence*** | Uses insufficient supporting material or material that is unrelated to arguments | Source material supports thesis or establishes the presenter's credibility on the subject | Uses a variety of source material (e.g., examples, illustrations, quotations, statistics) to support thesis and establish presenter's credibility on the subject |
| Engage with audiences through effective and appropriate delivery | ENGL 103 | 2c.2 Speaking (as written)  | Delivery techniques (e.g., body language, posture, eye contact, vocal expressiveness) are unclear and inappropriate for audience | Delivery techniques (e.g., body language, posture, eye contact, vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable. The speaker appears relaxed. The language choices are thoughtful and support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language used is clear and appropriate to the audience. | Delivery techniques (e.g., body language, posture, eye contact, vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting and memorable. The speaker appears confident and polished.The language choices are imaginative and ehance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language used is clear and appropriate to the audience.  |