

**Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes:  
Report From the General Education Assessment Subcommittee  
for Speaking Intensive (SI)**

**General Education Category #11: Speaking Intensive**

Report written by Paul Blanchet

Semester when Assessment Administered: Fall 2010

Date of Report: 5/16/2011

**Subcommittee Members:**

Paul Blanchet (Chair), Communication Disorders & Sciences

Cindy Bird, Education

Bond Benton, Communication

Ann Marie Loughlin, Education

Jonathan Mann, Music

**Overview of Process:**

The subcommittee was charged with creating a simple, efficient, and effective rubric for instructors of speaking intensive (SI) courses to use to rate students' overall oral presentation skills, as well as self-evaluation skills.

**Assessment Task:**

The two skills assessed for each student were overall oral presentation ability and the ability to accurately self-evaluate his or her own presentation. These tasks were chosen to reflect the learning outcomes required for oral communication by the SUNY Board of Trustees.

**Methodology:**

Data were collected from approximately 20% of all students in all sections of SI designated courses taught during the Fall of 2010. Ratings were solicited from SI course instructors from the following departments: Education, Communication and Theatre and Dance. The result was data collected from 15 different courses, with a total of 63 sections. Ratings for a total of 274 students were provided (see Appendix A for listing of all courses involved).

Instructors were provided with a copy of the rubric (see Appendix B), as well as a detailed instruction sheet, and were asked to evaluate each student's final oral presentation of the Fall semester in terms of overall presentation skills, as well as the student's ability to self-evaluate his or her presentation skills. Both skills were evaluated using a 0-3 scale (*i.e.*, 0 = not meeting standards, 1 = approaching standards, 2 = meeting standards, 3 = exceeding standards). After the conclusion of the Fall semester, each instructor provided the subcommittee with individual student data on an Excel spreadsheet. The subcommittee Chair later compiled a data summary table (see Appendix A).

**Results:**

**A) Overall Presentation Rating:**

**Total number of students: N = 274**

	#	% of total students
Exceeding Standards (3)	95	34.7%
Meeting Standards (2)	157	57.3%
Approaching Standards (1)	16	5.8%
Not Meeting Standards (0)	5	1.8%

**B) Self-Evaluation Rating:**

**Total number of students: N = 274**

	#	% of total students
Exceeding Standards (3)	160	58.4%
Meeting Standards (2)	102	37.2%
Approaching Standards (1)	1	0.36%
Not Meeting Standards (0)	2	0.73%

**Conclusions:**

The above results indicate that the vast majority of students enrolled in this sample of CCC speaking intensive courses demonstrated basic oral presentation competencies: 92% of the students either met or exceeded the standards for overall presentation ability, and 95.6% of the students either met or exceeded standards for self-evaluation ability. These results are comparable to results from the previous assessment cycle (Spring of 2007), although the current data also include ratings of the students' self-evaluation skills, which had not been previously included, as well as overall presentation skills

**Additional Comments:**

This subcommittee found it challenging to create a common rubric applicable across the wide range of SI courses assessed. The resulting rubric was intentionally designed to be flexible across the range of disciplines. Instructors were given the discretion to evaluate students' presentation skill using only those listed criteria that were deemed relevant to the specific discipline (e.g., eye contact, explanation/support of topic). However, some instructors reportedly construed this inherent flexibility in the rubric as ambiguity, and questioned the usefulness and feasibility of this entire process. Therefore, the subcommittee recommends a review of the assessment process in order to identify steps that may be taken to make the process less ambiguous and cumbersome for instructors. The subcommittee also recommends that SI course instructors develop criteria for assessing students' oral presentation skill that are more discipline-specific, but that still accurately assess the oral communication skills required by the SUNY Board of Trustees.

## Appendix A: Data Summary of All Participating Courses

Course number, number of sections, number of students (n), and percentage of students scoring 0 (not meeting standards), 1 (approaching standards), 2 (meeting standards), and 3 (exceeding standards) for overall presentation ability (PRES) and self-evaluation ability (S.E.)

COURSE	# of SECS	n	% 0 PRES	% 1 PRES	% 2 PRES	% 3 PRES	% 0 S.E	% 1 S.E.	% 2 S.E.	% 3 S.E.
EDU 420	11	21	5	--	43	52			29	71
EDU 422	10	21	5		29	67			29	71
EDU 424	2	9			44	56				100
EDU 426	2	5		20	40	40			20	80
EDU 429	1	2				100				100
EDU 430	2	8	13		63	25			25	75
EDU 440	8	11			45	55			36	64
EDU 441	9	11			36	64			9	91
COMM 105	9	89	1	7	69	24		1	60	38
COMM 312	2	18		17	39	39			39	44
COMM 344	2	20			75	25			25	75
COMM 351	1	10			50	50			50	50
THEA 131	1	16			100				25	69
THEA 133	2	21		19	48	33			19	62
THEA 441	1	12	8	17	67	8	17		33	50

## Appendix B: Rubric for Assessing Oral Presentations

Oral presentations generally involve 3 criteria areas (nonverbal, verbal, content). Because the details and descriptors of these 3 areas may vary by discipline, we offer the following rubric only as a guide for scoring oral presentations. Please consider student performance in each of those 3 areas and give student an overall rating. Page 2 contains rating slips for printing and distributing to students for their self-evaluations.

Student Name:		Overall Rating		/3
3 Exceeding Standards	2 Meeting Standards	1 Approaching Standards	0 Not Meeting Standards	
<b>Non-verbal skills</b>				
consistent eye contact with entire audience;	some eye contact with entire audience;	makes effort to have eye contact with entire audience;	little or no eye contact with entire audience;	
body language (including gestures and posture) consistently contributes to content;	body language (including gestures and posture) contributes to the content;	body language (including gestures and posture) contribute little to the content;	body language (including gestures and posture) detracts from or obscures the content;	
consistently confident delivery	displays some level of confidence during delivery	displays low level of confidence during delivery	displays little to no confidence during delivery	
<b>Verbal skills</b>				
voice consistently clear and articulate	voice mostly clear and articulate voice	voice unclear or inarticulate some of time	voice unclear or inarticulate most of time	
consistently displays interest and enthusiasm for topic	displays some interest and enthusiasm for topic	displays limited interest or enthusiasm for topic	displays little to no interest or enthusiasm for topic	
minimal to no vocalized pauses (uh, well, um)	some vocalized pauses but do not detract from content	frequent vocalized pauses that detract from the content	excessive vocalized pauses obscure content	
<b>Content</b>				
clearly states and explains topic or purpose of the presentation	states and explains topic or purpose of the presentation	states topic or purpose of the presentation	no mention of topic or purpose of the presentation	
gives overwhelming explanation/support of topic	gives sufficient explanation and support of topic	gives some explanation or support of topic	gives little or no explanation or support of topic	
presentation very well organized into recognizable pattern	presentation organized into recognizable pattern	presentation appears somewhat organized or structured	presentation appears disorganized or unstructured	
content appears thoroughly complete with all relevant points expertly covered	content appears complete with all relevant points and material covered	content appears complete with all relevant points and material covered	content appears complete with all relevant points and material covered	

\*Adapted from the Oral Presentation Rubric of the Texas Center for Educational Technology to match SUNY GEAR

**Rubric for Student Self-assessment of Oral Presentation**      **Name:**

Based on my overall presentation as I see it, I rate my presentation as

<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
Exceeding the Standards for nonverbal skills verbal skills and content	Meeting the Standards for nonverbal skills verbal skills and content	Approaching the Standards for nonverbal skills verbal skills and content	Not Meeting the Standards for nonverbal skills verbal skills and content	