Form 201BC:  Assessment Report Form for Instructional Programs

Program  CMAT          Department _____ Art and CMAT _____

Outcomes
#1        Use of standard American English in speaking, writing and reading;
#2        Students will be able to find information, evaluate it critically in terms of reliability, and use it appropriately within their own thinking and writing;
#5        Students will be able to apply the basic methods, questions, and vocabularies of the humanities, mathematics, the natural sciences and the social studies;
#8        Students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of the interaction of human beings, human cultures and the natural environments within which they live; and
#11       Students will develop analytical skills, logic and reasoning.

Method of Assessment
The previously used pre- and post-test instrument was modified in Fall 2009 because the content did not address Speech General Education Criteria 1, 2, 5, 8, and 11.  It was further determined that the True/False method of assessment did not address Outcomes #1, 2, and 11.   Because CMAT 2030 and CMAT 1130 are ultimately performance-based courses, it was necessary that an assessment instrument be designed that evaluated the students' application of course content to task, exposed areas of weakness, highlighted strengths and revealed to the student and instructor areas that needed improvement.   In Spring 2010, a standard rubric was developed to assess all five General Education Outcomes, include criteria dictated by the Illinois Transferable General Education "Communication Course Description" for C2 900 courses, as well as standard criteria for preparing oral speeches.

In Spring 2011, the standard rubric was again revised and simplified for use beginning Fall 2011 (see new rubric on page 5).  The previous rubric had many categories, which made the assessing of the specific general education outcomes challenging.  Therefore, our revised rubric has five specific content areas for evaluation that allow us to more clearly address the five speech general education outcomes and the criteria dictated by the Illinois Transferable General Education "Communication Course Description."  Additionally, we revised the assessment procedure to provide a more accurate measure of students' growth in the CMAT 2030 and CMAT 1130 courses.

Our revised assessment method requires all speech instructors to administer two Informative Speech Assignments over the course of the semester.  The first Informative Speech Assignment is due prior to midterm and the second Informative Speech Assignment is due at the end of the semester.  We assess the effectiveness of the course by measuring the improvement in grades between the first informative speech assignment and the second informative speech assignment.  We pay particular attention to improvement in grades in the five specific categories on the revised standardized evaluation rubric: Content and Organization, Delivery, Audience Analysis, Language Use and Written Work and Outline.  This procedure enables us to gain a greater understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the students and more succinctly identify student growth, or the lack thereof, throughout the semester.

Students should receive a passing benchmark grade of 60% (a D) or higher on the second Informative Speech Assignment and should illustrate an overall improvement in grades on the second Informative Speech Assignment.

Assessment Findings/Interpretations/Conclusion
What do the data for this year's assessment reveal?
**Fall 2011**
226 students participated in the first Informative Speech Assignment.  29.7% of the students received an A.  38.5% of the students received a B.  20.8% of the students received a C.  5.7% of the students received a D.  5.2% of the students received an F.  94.7& of the participating students met or surpassed the benchmark grade.

**221 students participated in the second Informative Speech Assignment.  <u>51.6% of the students received an A.</u> 30.8% of the students received a B.  14% of the students received a C.  2.7% of student received a D.  .9% of students received an F.  <u>99.1% of the participating students met or surpassed the benchmark grade.</u>**

Spring 2011
204 students participated in the Informative Speech Assignment.  25.9% of the students received an A.  26.5% of the students received a B.  19.6% of the students received a C.  11.2% of the students received a D.  16.8% of the students received an F.  83.3% of the participating students met or surpassed the benchmark grade.

Fall 2010
218 students participated in the Informative Speech Assignment. 29.82% of the students received an A, 38.99% of the students received a B, 23.39% of students received a C, 5.96% of the students received a D, and 1.83% of the students received an F. 94.92% of the students participating in the assignment met or surpassed the benchmark grade.

Spring 2010
141 students participated in the Informative Speech Assignment. 51.06% of the students received an A, 26.24% of the students received a B, 12.76% of the students received a C, 6.38% of the students received a D, and 3.54% of the students received an F. 96.44% of the students participating in the assignment met or surpassed the benchmark grade.

Fall 2009
199 students participated in the Informative Speech Assignment. 25.31% of the students received an A, 36.71% of the students received a B, 25.31% of the students received a C, 7.59% of the students received a D, and 5.06% of the students received an F. 98.16% of the students participating in the assignment met or surpassed the benchmark grade.


What does a review of the trend data show?
The trend data for Fall 2011 are as follows:
When considering the participants in both Informative Speech Assignments, we found that 17 more students participated in both Informative Speech Assessment Assignments than those participating in Spring 2011.

Given that our assessment methods have changed, we are using the scores from the second Informative Speech Assignment as a measurement against previous findings.
25.7% more participants received an A in Fall 2011 than those participating in Spring 2011
4.3% more participants received a B in Fall 2011 than those participating in Spring 2011
5.6% fewer participants received a C in Fall 2011 than those participating in Spring 2011
8.5% fewer participants received a D in Fall 2011 than those participating in Spring 2011
4.3% fewer participants received an F in Fall 2011 than those participating in Spring 2011

In what areas do students do well?
Students consistently earned above satisfactory scores on the Audience Analysis and Language Use sections of the rubric.

In what areas have they not succeeded?
Given the revisions to the rubric, we are able to see that students experience some difficulty with aspects of Delivery, including usage of note cards and dress. They continue to struggle with the Written Work and Outline section. The scores on the rubric indicate a modicum of difficulty with Content and Organization. Most specifically, students struggle with verbal citations.

Have the student learning outcomes that this instrument measures been met?
The learning objectives have been met.

Which weaknesses were identified in the course?
Students specifically failed to verbally cite and/or properly credit sources. Students continue to struggle with outlining.

What can be done to improve the weaknesses?
Instructors should devote more instructional time and devise additional enrichment activities to meet deficient areas. All speech instructors are now required to use the online learning resource tool, MySpeechLab (access available with textbook through Pearson Publishing), to assign an outlining exercise beginning Spring 2012.

Decision-making Using Findings
We made many changes to the speech courses during the past year.

Effective Fall 2011, we standardized the course by developing a common syllabus and common rubrics to be used by all speech instructors. We also standardized all assignment rubrics to ensure that the same learning outcomes are

being met in each section of the CMAT 2030 and CMAT 1130 courses.

The course textbook was customized to include copies of all standardized grading rubrics and course outcomes. The customized textbook provides students easy access to evaluation criteria at the start of each semester.

Regular semester speech instructor meetings began in Spring 2011. We use this time to strategize and determine what supplemental activities might be of benefit to the instructors. We also discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the course.

The Speech Assessment Coordinator works with Pearson Publishing to offer workshops that instruct teachers on how to access the online resources, including MySpeechLab, available to students and teachers through Pearson Publishing (our textbook publishers).

All speech instructors must now assign an outlining exercise using MySpeechLab.

While these changes facilitate a positive trend in the data for both courses, we know that our next step is the clearly differentiate CMAT 1130 from CMAT 2030. Dr. Christine List, the department chair, and Professor Kamesha Khan, the speech assessment coordinator, are currently working to revise the curriculum, the textbook and the assessment procedure for CMAT 1130. This will enable use to assess the courses separately. We hope to have revisions ready by Fall 2012.

Demonstrating Improved Learning
What evidence do you have that student learning has improved? Be sure to discuss with reference to trend data.

As indicated by the trend data, it is clear that using a standardized assessment tool/standardized rubrics (embedded in course instruction and enrichment activities) and a standardized syllabus more clearly reveals to both students and instructors the specific evaluation criteria for the course. It is also apparent that having standardized rubrics available in a customized textbook proved beneficial for students.

The data reflect a marked improvement in all scores between the first and second Information Speech Assignments with 51.6% of students earning an A on the second Informative Speech Assignment. The trend data also indicate that this semester garnered the highest percentage of students meeting and/or surpassing the benchmark grade during the three-year review cycle for the Informative Speech Assignment with a 99.1 % pass rate.

Publicizing Student Learning
How do you inform the public about what students learn and how well they have learned it? How do you publicize the assessment results? Indicate what data or results you will use, and also indicate the means of internal and external publication: departmental website, brochures, and other published documents or media.

As was previously mentioned, the customized textbook offers all students the opportunity to view our evaluation rubrics for the speech courses. This data will be shared internally via email to all CMAT faculty. We will also post the Speech Assessment Report on the CMAT website.

Accomplishments and Challenge
Identify and explain accomplishments and challenges related to the assessment plan in your department program.
Fall 2011 Accomplishments

1. 100% compliance with administering the assessment tool in all sections of CMAT 2030 and CMAT 1130.

2. The CMAT program's customization of the textbook to include copies of revised rubrics and the course description and outcomes.

3. The development and implementation of a standardized syllabus and standardized rubrics for all assignments.

4. The revision and implementation of the new assessment method, which helps students clearly identify and

meet general education course outcomes and IAI criteria.

5.  The regularly scheduled speech instructor meeting now held each semester.

6.  The inclusion of an outlining exercise using MySpeechLab.

Fall 2011 Challenges

1.  We are working with instructors to ensure that all understand the importance of devoting adequate instructional time to outlining, delivery and content/organization. We must work to more clearly differentiate CMAT 2030 from CMAT 1130.

Grading/Evaluation Rubric for CMAT 2030 Speeches

Excellent = **A**    Good = **B**    Satisfactory = **C**    Barely Acceptable = **D**    Unacceptable = **F**

Name: _____

| INFORMATIVE SPEECH :<br>To teach others new information | A<br>5 | B<br>4 | C<br>3.5 | D<br>3 | F<br>2.5 | Given<br>Mark |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION (GEN. ED. #2)**<br>1. Clear and appropriate general purpose statement presented<br>2. Specific and well-focused thesis statement developed<br>3. Credibility established through knowledge of the subject matter and research with multiple primary and/or secondary sources verbally cited<br>4. Well-organized introduction, body and conclusion<br>5. Effectively followed an organizational pattern when writing the speech<br>6. No evidence of plagiarism was found | | | | | | |
| **DELIVERY**<br>1. Maintained eye contact throughout the presentation<br>2. Projected/Adjusted volume correctly for the size of the space<br>3. Varied pitch, speed, tone and mood of voice<br>4. Maintained strong physical stance without wandering about<br>5. Incorporated gestures that enhanced the presentation<br>6. Dressed appropriately for the speech presentation, considering the chosen topic and situation<br>7. Displayed podium decorum<br>8. Usage of note/index cards was not distracting<br>9. Adhered to time constraints for the assignment | | | | | | |
| **AUDIENCE ANALYSIS (GEN. ED. #8)**<br>1. Analyzed the audience and chose a novel, relevant and appropriate topic for the specified demographic<br>2. Effectively adapted the presentation style to the targeted audience and situation | | | | | | |
| **LANGUAGE USE (GEN. ED. #1)**<br>1. Effectively used standard dialect of American English to enhance the audiences' understanding of the topic<br>2. Avoided colloquialisms, unless they were contextually specific<br>3. Maintained subject-verb agreement throughout the presentation<br>4. Enunciated words<br>5. Pronounced words correctly | | | | | | |
| **WRITTEN WORK AND OUTLINE (GEN. ED. #11)**<br>1. Bibliography page and outline were submitted<br>2. Properly formatted bibliography page, using MLA or APA formatting<br>3. Citations were uniform<br>4. All written work was properly constructed with complete sentences and subject-verb agreement | | | | | | |
| **TOTAL/OVERALL SCORE (GEN. ED. #5)** | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | |
| **FINAL GRADE** (multiply total X 4 for final grade) | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | |

**COMMENTS:**