

Institutional Effectiveness Report

Name of Program/Department: *Mass Communication Department/Speech Program*

Year: **2016-2017**

Name of Preparer: *Dr. Bryan Fisher*

Program Mission Statement

The Mission of the Speech Program is to equip students with the skills needed to formulate and deliver a wide variety of messages. Such skills include message structure, audience analysis, researching and supporting ideas and arguments, using language effectively, and effective delivery. The speech program is designed to prepare students for success in a world in which oral proficiency is often rated as one of the most important skills one can possess.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

1. Demonstrate and advance academic integrity in all interactions.
2. Demonstrate the ability to use tools and technologies appropriate for the communication professions.
3. Demonstrate the ability to think independently, critically, and creatively.
4. Demonstrate the ability to speak correctly and clearly in forms and style appropriate for specific audiences and purposes they serve.
5. Demonstrate the ability to gain the required skills, knowledge, and dispositions to effectively communicate with audiences and purposes they serve.

Executive Summary of Report (one-page maximum)

In the 2015-2016 academic year, SPCO 101 was assessed to determine the extent to which the course equipped students to demonstrate the competencies necessary for effective public speaking. Two Student Learning Outcomes from SPCO 101 were identified as indicators of whether or not the course not only equipped students with the ability to demonstrate the competencies, but also whether or not they felt more confident in their abilities to demonstrate the competencies.

Each Student Learning Outcome was measured with its own instrument. SLO 1.0 which measures actual student performance, was a direct measure using the *Competent Speaker*

Evaluation Form (2013) published by the National Communication Association. SLO 2.0 was an indirect measure using a 5 question Likert scale survey administered to students.

Targets for both Student Learning Outcomes were surpassed. The target for SLO 1.0 was 70%, and the actual percentage was 73.1%. The target for SLO 2.0 was 80%, and the actual percentage was 81.1%. While both targets were surpassed, strategies and approaches for improvement are offered in the report.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

SLO1.0: 70% of students in SPCO 101 will improve their overall performance on eight speaking competencies at the end of the semester (Benchmark = 73%).

SLO 2.0: 80% of students in SPCO 101 will indicate a positive endorsement level of 80% or higher when describing their confidence in their ability to perform five speaking competencies (New measure. No benchmark).

Assessment Methods

SLO1.0: 70% of students in SPCO 101 will improve their overall performance score on eight speaking competencies at the end of the semester (Benchmark = 73%) as measured by the National Communication Association (2013) *Competent Speaker Form*.

SLO 2.0: 80% of students in SPCO 101 will indicate a positive endorsement level of 80% or higher when describing their confidence in their ability to perform five speaking competencies as measured by a 5-question Likert-styled survey.

Assessment Results

SLO1.0: 71.9% of students in SPCO 101 improved their overall performance on eight speaking competencies at the end of the semester (Benchmark = 73%) as measured by the National Communication Association (2013) *Competent Speaker Form*. As our goal was 70%, this target was achieved.

SLO 2.0: 81.1% of students in SPCO 101 indicated a positive endorsement level of 80% or higher when describing their confidence in their ability to perform five speaking competencies as measured by a 5-question Likert-styled survey. As our goal was 80%, the target was achieved.

(Summary of ongoing assessment activities and comparative data)

Performance	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
Improved	67.5%	79.5%	73.1%	71.9%
Stayed the same	14.2%	13.9%	12.7%	15.6%
Went Down	17.5%	6.6%	14.1%	8.1%

Further breakdown of results:

During the Fall 2016 semester, 85 were supposed to have been evaluated. The percentages below are based on 81 as 4 students dropped the course after the informative speech and before the persuasive speech. The results are as follows:

Improved: 71.8%
Stayed the same: 14.1
Went down: 9.4%

During the Spring 2017 semester, 75 students were supposed to have been evaluated. The percentages below are based on 73 as 2 students dropped the course after the informative speech and before the persuasive speech. The results are as follows:

Improved: 72%
Stayed the same: 17.3%
Went down: 10.6%

Total for the 2016-2017 year:

Improved: 115 or 71.9%
Stayed the same: 25 or 15.6%
Went down: 13 or 8.1%

Comparison with previous years

During the Fall 2015 semester, 90 students were supposed to have been evaluated (5 per section, 18 sections). The percentages below are based on 78 as 7 dropped the course after the informative speech evaluation and before they were evaluated during the persuasive speech. The total number was further decreased by 5 as results from one section were not submitted. The results are as follows:

Improved:	73.0%
Stayed the same:	11.5%
Went down:	15.3%

During the Spring 2016 semester, 85 students were supposed to have been evaluated (5 per section, 17 sections). The percentages below are based on 71 rather than 85 as 4 students dropped the course after the informative speech evaluation and before they were evaluated during the persuasive speech. The total number was further decreased by 10 as results from two sections were not submitted. The results are as follows:

Improved:	73.1%
Stayed the same:	14.1%
Went down:	12.7%

Total for the 2015-2016 year:

Improved:	109 or 73.1%
Stayed the same:	19 or 12.7%
Went down:	21 or 14.1%

During the Fall 2014 semester, 90 students were supposed to have been evaluated (5 per section, 18 sections). The percentages below are based on 84 as 6 students dropped the course after the informative speech evaluation and before they were evaluated during the persuasive speech. The results are as follows:

Improved:	66 or 78.6%
Stayed the same:	12 or 13.1%
Went down:	7 or 8.3%

During the Spring 2015 semester, 85 students were supposed to have been evaluated (5 per section, 17 sections). The percentages below are based on 67 rather than 85 as 8 students dropped the course after the informative speech evaluation and before they were evaluated during the persuasive speech. The total number was further decreased by 10 as some faculty continue to fail to administer the evaluation. The results are as follows:

Improved:	54 or 80.6%
Stayed the same:	10 or 14.9%
Went down:	3 or 4.4%

Total for the 2014-2015 year:

Improved: 120 or 79.5%
Stayed the same: 21 or 13.9%
Went down: 10 or 6.6%

During the Fall 2013 semester, 105 students were supposed to have been evaluated (5 per section, 21 sections). The percentages below are based on 87 as 3 students dropped the course after the informative speech evaluation and before they were evaluated during the persuasive speech. The total number was further decreased by 15 as some faculty continue to fail to administer the evaluation. The results are as follows:

Improved: 56 or 64.3%
Stayed the same: 12 or 13.7%
Went down: 19 or 21.8%

During the Spring 2014 semester, 80 students were supposed to have been evaluated (5 per section, 16 sections). The percentages below are based on 67 rather than 85 as 3 students dropped the course after the informative speech evaluation and before they were evaluated during the persuasive speech. The total number was further decreased by 10 as some faculty continue to fail to administer the evaluation. The results are as follows:

Improved: 49 or 73.3%
Stayed the same: 10 or 14.9%
Went down: 8 or 11.9%

Total for the 2013-2014 year:

Improved: 104 or 67.5%
Stayed the same: 22 or 14.2%
Went down: 27 or 17.5%

Action Items

SLO 1.0: 71.9% of students taking SPCO 101 improved their posttest score on eight speaking competencies, as measured by the Competent Speaker Form published by the National Communication Association (2013). As our goal was 70%, the target was achieved. While we surpassed our target, the faculty in the Mass Communication Department met and decided that more could be done to improve this learning outcome. Based on the data, the Speech Program will take the following steps in 2017-2018 to improve student outcome in this area. We will begin to use an electronic version of the 2013 Competent Speaker Form. This will allow computer analysis of all eight individual competencies on the form. In addition to tracking student overall performance on the competencies (as we have been), we will be able to track performance on each of the eight competencies. Based on this data, we will refine our coursework even further.

SLO 2.0: 81.1% of students taking SPCO 101 indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that they felt more confident in their ability to perform five speaking competencies as measured by a 5-question Likert-style scale. As our goal was 80%, the target was achieved. While we surpassed our target for SLO 2.0, the faculty in the Mass Communication Department met and decided that more could be done to improve this learning outcome. Based on the data, the Speech Program will take the following steps in 2017-2018 to improve student outcome in this area. We will begin to use an electronic version of our survey that students will complete online. One immediate benefit is that we will survey all students taking SPCO 101. Further, the electronic form will allow for computer analysis of each of the five competencies on the survey individually. This data will highlight areas needing improvement and allow us to make pedagogical changes in our course.

Appendix

SLO 1.0 Assessment procedure:

We measured student ability two times during the course. The first assessment was given at the beginning of the course when students delivered their informative speeches, and the second was given at the end of the course when students presented their persuasive speeches. Through this process, we were able to measure the performance of students from the pre-test to the post-test period.

Before each semester began, all Speech 101 instructors were given a randomly generated set of five numbers, each under twenty. By applying these five numbers to their rosters, instructors identified the random list of five students to assess in each of their sections.

During the first major speech, the informative speech, all Speech 101 instructors used the *Competent Speaker* evaluation form to assess these five students in each of their sections. Designed by the National Communication Association, the *Competent Speaker* form includes eight measures as follows:

- 1) *Chooses and narrows a topic appropriately for the audience and occasion.*
- 2) *Communicates thesis/purpose in a manner appropriate for the audience and occasion.*
- 3) *Provides supporting material (including electronic and non-electronic presentational aids) appropriate for the audience and occasion.*
- 4) *Uses an organizational pattern appropriate to the topic, audience, occasion, and purpose.*
- 5) *Uses language appropriate for the audience and occasion.*
- 6) *Uses vocal variety in rate, pitch, and intensity (volume) to heighten and maintain interest appropriate for the audience and occasion.*
- 7) *Uses pronunciation, grammar, and articulation appropriate for the audience and occasion.*
- 8) *Uses physical behaviors that support the verbal message.*

Students received either a 1 (unsatisfactory), a 2 (satisfactory), or a 3 (excellent) in each of the eight measures. Thus the total score received is between eight and twenty-four.

These same five students in each section were then evaluated using the same form and guidelines during their presentations of their persuasive speeches near the end of the semester. Their performances on each evaluation were then compared.

Competent Speaker Evaluation Form (2013)

Reference: <http://www.une.edu/sites/default/files/Public-Speaking2013.pdf>

SLO 2.0 Assessment procedure:

At the end of the semester, a random selection of 5 students in several sections complete a self-report survey that measures the level to which they think they have improved. It is a five-question survey using a Likert scale (strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree)

The self-report survey measures the extent to which, after taking the course, students feel more confident in their ability to:

choose and narrow a topic for a given audience and a given amount of speaking time.

gather quality research material to support thesis and main points.

organize material into a clear message and easy-to-follow progression.

use appropriate and effective language for a given audience and speaking situation.

offer a clear and smooth delivery of the message.