

## MEETING NOTES

### Cal Poly Oral Communication Learning Community 2016

May 25, 2016

3:10 to 4:00pm (01-301)

#### Membership

Academic Programs, Jack Phelan, Mary Pedersen, Bruno Giberti, Student Affairs: Tim Archie, Trevor Forzetting CLA: Richard Besel, Bethany Conway, Cassandra Carlson Library: Kaila Bussert

.....

## MEETING NOTES

1. Approve [Meeting Notes May 4, 2016 \(PDF\)](#)
  - Meeting notes are approved.
2. Review: COMS Rubric Draft (Richard Besel, Bethany Conway)
  - Criteria
  - Traits
  - Levels of Performance
    - i. (Richard Besel) Some changes that have been incorporated into the new rubric are the inclusion of: Central Message under Organization, and Audience Adaptation under Content. One thing we talked about is Mode of Delivery. This could be a separate item. This is just a start. If we agree we can continue, or if the committee feels any components are missing we can make changes. The ULO rubric packed multiple traits into one dimension. We are separating these traits out.
    - ii. Mary Pederson appreciates the effort put into the new draft of the rubric noting that the complexity of so many components have been well identified. Kaila B. asks where the use of the supporting documents trait is in the rubric is. Richard B. clarifies it is evaluated under Evidence Based Reason under the Content dimension.
    - iii. Mary P. appreciates that the rubric is comprehensive and there is no need to expand.
    - iv. Richard B. raises the question, what might be the scale of the rubric? 4 or 5 points. Jack says, if 0 is drop-off or no-show, then 1 -4 makes a scale of 5. To look for frequency of student's performance smaller numbers are preferred. 3 levels of performance seem to be too few. Are there good reasons for us going with a 5-point rubric instead of 4? Bethany Conway shares that more numbers give more information or data to evaluate the measurement criteria such as standard deviations or means. Whereas small number scales are more distinguishing. Large scale might reveal interesting things, which might not be needed for our purposes.
    - v. (Mary P.) Academic senate has charged the curriculum committee to find out if the model is effective. For the quarter + program, Brian Tiege proposed doing a study on learning outcomes of oral communication between the 3 week versus 10 week time frame. Gary L. deferred the

whole discussion for next fall reasoning that it is still premature, but is there time to investigate this when the summer Quarter + is run?

- vi. (Richard B.) The scale depends upon what kind of test we want to perform and what level are we evaluating. (Jack P.) The primary struggle with the rubrics that we have been developing are looking at foundation level skills alongside mastery level descriptions in the same rubric. Can both be evaluated in one rubric? What does this show us?
- vii. Will five categories be too many or too few? (Richard) We can change that. The categories are defined to have at least 3 items to accumulate into one criterion.
- viii. (Mary P.) For each of these, what will be the language for 1 to 5? (Richard B.) We have not finalized the language yet. There will be development in this draft. This is not the finished version.
- ix. (Richard B.) In the other assessments the collection format of artifacts are mostly assignments in the form of hard copies or printed documents. For something like oral communication assessment rubric we need technology to assess and collect the artifacts. We will need one or two hours before the norming session to educate the scorers how to use the rubric. Mary P. says we are flexible and open to suggestion on what can be the best arrangement. (Bethany C.) We can use qualtrics.
- x. (Jack P.) In WASC conference three CSU universities shared their recent norming and scoring method where they sat together, did the norming session, and then sent the artifacts to the scorers to be returned with a deadline, it will not to be difficult. Jack and Mary agree to discuss this option.

(Reference: [ULO Rubric \(PDF\)](#) , [AAC&U Value Rubric \(PDF\)](#))

### 3. Discuss: Student Affairs Oral Communication Project (Trevor Forzetting)

- Overview
- [Co-Curricular Oral Communication Rubric \(PDF\)](#)
- [Supplemental Workshops Observation Rubric \(PDF\)](#)
  - i. (Trevor F.) looked into a few references like the oral communication rubric of University of South Carolina. The rubric they are using to assess student facilitators in Student Affairs was established 5 years ago. It was a multipoint rubric which needed to be simplified. As student assistants are utilized, the rubric needed to be easy to use. Going back and redoing the whole rubric was not a beneficial option.
  - ii. (Bethany C.) Why did you move away from 5 point scale and adopted 4 point? (Trevor F.) We needed the facilitators to be specific.
  - iii. (Richard B.) Have you looked into reliability across individuals? (Trevor F.) Yes. In the fall quarter we will have 2 facilitators and currently we have 7 program advisors. There are no inconsistencies. Before the assessment was paper-based. I changed it and incorporated video technology. The scorers use their laptop, open survey gizmo and grade the facilitators. We are using survey gizmo. The data analytics obtained from Survey Gizmo is very rich.

- iv. (Richard B.) How can we incorporate Survey Gizmo in our assessment process? Jack P. and Trevor F. respond that the process is easy and only requires to formally reach out to Craig Schwartz who is the liaison with Survey Gizmo and can authorize license use..
  - v. Answering Bethany C.'s question on for how long the first version of the rubric was being used Trevor F. answers; the first version was used for 5 years.
  - vi. (Richard B.) We could use your rubric against ours to evaluate to see if they are pointing out to the same direction. Our priority is to incorporate upper division classes and how far can we go into that. We don't have good sense about the upper level oral communication and how the responses would be. We have some sense on the introductory level which is covered by the GE courses. But it is expected that the upper level oral communication will be different criteria.
  - vii. (Jack P.) Many of the call for participant respondents mention they use group presentations. Can this rubric be used for group presentations? (Richard B.) No, this rubric is being developed on for individual oral communication purposes.
4. Discuss: Program Responses to Campus-Wide Letter (Jack Phelan)
- [Call for Participants Responses \(PDF\)](#)
    - i. (Richard B.) Can we send student assistants to the upper level classes to gather artifacts? (Mary P.) Can you give a prediction of the cost of hiring a student assistant? (Trevor F.) Currently, student assistants cost \$12 per hour. (Richard B.) In the GE level courses faculty are already videotaping, students are using their phone to record their presentations, so collecting artifacts from the lower level should be easy.
    - ii. (Trevor F.) Is it absolutely necessary to have audience? (Richard B. and Bethany C.) Yes.
    - iii. (Mary P.) The motivational aspect for the faculty should be that we are providing them with validated tools including the rubric, which they can use for assessing oral communication in their own program. (Richard P.) At least for me, that was the motivation to be in the Critical Thinking committee to see what is happening and then bring that information back to my program with suggestions on how we can develop our program.
    - iv. (Jack P.) Adam Bordeman, Phd (Accounting) wanted to know if we are open to assessing graduate programs. (Mary P.) We can see if he is interested to be engaged in the assessment scoring session and then can bring that information into his masters program.
5. Plans for final meeting of the quarter (6/01/16)
- i. Actual numbers and scales will be developed and the draft will be formatted more like a rubric. Instrument development will carry on which will incorporate descriptions of each of the items.
  - ii. (Richard B.) Did we finalize the scale (4 or 5 points)? 4 to be specific or 5 to see the pockets. (Jack P.) In other core-competency rubrics we are using 4 point scale. It will be great to have a consistency between all the core competencies.

~~~~~

**Spring 2016 Schedule**

~~Wednesday 4/20 3:10pm to 4:00pm 01-301~~

~~Wednesday 5/04 3:10pm to 4:00pm 01-301~~

~~Wednesday 5/25 3:10pm to 4:00pm 01-301~~

Wednesday 6/01 3:10pm to 4:00pm 01-301