

*Institutional Effectiveness Report
Academic Year (2013-2014)
(Speech)*

*(Dr. Bryan Fisher)
(Coordinator of Speech)*

*(Mr. Tim Hanson)
(Chair of Mass Communication)*

Mission and Goals

The Speech program resides within the Department of Mass Communication. There are currently four Speech courses listed in the university catalogue. No major, minor or collateral is offered in Speech at this time. Further, proficiency in oral communication is recognized as a vital aspect of education.

The University has adopted speech requirements into student assessment; Speech101, Basics of Oral Communication (Public Speaking), is a general education requirement; and Speech 203, Voice and Diction, is a core requirement for Theatre Arts majors.

The goal of the Speech program is to equip students with the skills needed to formulate and deliver a wide variety of messages. Such skills include audience analysis, message structure, 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.

Assessment Activities

To assess the extent to which the Speech 101 course helps FMU students become orally competent, the program in Speech Communication administered its assessment method during the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 semesters.

Under the system, which was implemented in the 2006-2007 academic year, we measured student ability two times during the course. The first assessment came at the beginning of the course when students delivered their informative speeches,

and the second came at the end of the course when students presented their persuasive speeches. Through this process we were able to more accurately measure the impact of the course on student ability than we were with the previous assessment procedure.

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 addresses speaking skills such as topic selection/focus, clarity of purpose, organization, audience analysis, vocal techniques, language use, and physical behaviors. There are eight categories on the evaluation form, and students were given a 1 (unsatisfactory), a 2 (satisfactory), or a 3 (excellent) for a total between 8 and 24.

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.

(statement of analyses being reported for purposes of IE)

(summary of ongoing assessment activities and comparative data)

Performance	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Improved	74.8%	69.1%	75.4%	67.5%
Stayed the same	15.2%	21%	18.9%	14.2%
Did worse	9.3%	6.7%	5.7%	17.5%

Further breakdown of results:

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%

Comparison with previous years

During the Fall 2012 semester, 100 students were supposed to have been evaluated (5 per section, 20 sections). The percentages below are based on 92 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 5 as some faculty continue to fail to administer the evaluation. The results are as follows:

Improved: 67 or 72.8%
Stayed the same: 22 or 23.9%
Went down: 3 or 3.3%

During the Spring 2013 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 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: 53 or 79.1%
Stayed the same: 8 or 11.9%
Went down: 6 or 9.0%

Total for the 2012-2013 year:

Improved: 120 or 75.4%
Stayed the same: 30 or 18.9%
Went down: 9 or 5.7%

During the Fall 2011 semester, 105 students were supposed to have been evaluated (5 per section, 21 sections). The percentages below are based on 81 as 9 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: 53 or 65.4%
Stayed the same: 18 or 22.2%
Went down: 6 or 7.4%

During the Spring 2012 semester, 80 students were supposed to have been evaluated (5 per section, 16 sections). The percentages below are based on 52 rather than 80 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 25 as some faculty continue to fail to administer the evaluation. The results are as follows:

Improved: 39 or 75%
Stayed the same: 10 or 19.2%
Went down: 3 or 5.7%

Total for the 2011-2012 year:

Improved: 92 or 69.1%
Stayed the same: 28 or 21%
Went down: 9 or 6.7%

During the Fall 2010 semester, 105 students were supposed to have been evaluated (5 per section, 21 sections). The percentages below are based on a total of 80 rather than 90 as 10 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: 54 or 67.5%
Stayed the same: 17 or 21.3%
Went down: 9 or 11.3%

During the Spring 2011 semester, 90 students were supposed to have been evaluated (5 per section, 18 sections). The percentages below are based on 71 rather than 90 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 15 as some faculty continue to fail to administer the evaluation. The results are as follows:

Improved: 59 or 83%
Stayed the same: 6 or 8%
Went down: 6 or 8%

Total for the 2010-2011 year:

Improved: 113 or 74.8%
Stayed the same: 23 or 15.2%
Went down: 14 or 9.3%

During the Fall 2009 semester, 95 students were supposed to have been evaluated (5 per section, 19 sections). The percentages below are based on a total of 92 rather than 90 as 3 students dropped the course after the informative speech evaluation and before they were evaluated during the persuasive speech. The results are as follows:

Improved:	57 or 62%
Stayed the same:	16 or 17.4%
Went down:	19 or 20.6%

During the Spring 2010 semester, 70 students were supposed to have been evaluated (5 per section, 14 sections). The percentages below are based on 54 rather than 70 as 1 student 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:	38 or 70%
Stayed the same:	13 or 24%
Went down:	3 or 5.5%

Total for the 2009-2010 year:

Improved:	95 or 65%
Stayed the same:	29 or 19.9%
Went down:	22 or 15%

Primary Issues Identified During (specify time frame; include a new row for each issues you identify that you are dealing with or plan to deal with during your specified time period. This format allows you to demonstrate continuing work that takes more than one year to complete and allows you to outline the long-term plan you develop. In addition, it allows you to state the current status of ongoing work.)

Issues of Concern 2005-2014	Actions Taken
Weak assessment tool used- - no pre/post analysis of student performance	Development and implementation of a new assessment tool to more accurately measure the impact of the course
Variability and turnover in staffing Speech 101	Unable to address due to current structure, i.e. need for adjuncts, and status of Speech 101 as a safety net for Theater and Mass Com professors whose classes do not make
Lack of consistency in evaluations	Creation and distribution of Speech 101 goals and guidelines
Failure of all faculty to administer the assessment	Continues to be a small problem despite clear instruction and reminders Reiteration of importance of assessment and further reminders needed
Lack of consistency of rigor and workload across sections	Unable to address under current situation. The background, preparation, ability and interest in teaching speech varies greatly among instructors.