

MEETING NOTES

Oral Communication Learning Community 2016-17

October 25 , 2016

9:10 to 10:00am (35-319b)

Membership

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

~~~~~

#### AGENDA

1. Review prior meeting notes - [September 27, 2016](#)
2. Discuss
  - Program (faculty) Assessment Participants
    - i. We've just received 31 STAT senior-level project oral presentations from Beth Chance. The program may not continue this practice of videotaping senior project presentations to partnering may be a challenge based on incentive. Jack will talk to Beth about this collaboration possibility.
    - ii. We have other courses interested in participating (BUS 454 Capstone course, BMED, CPE 450, Environmental Engineering and Physics)- although these are team oriented.
    - iii. It's critical that the upper division programs be integrally involved in the assessment. With the current assessment budget, the 100 upper div artifacts would be assisted by a COMS consultant to assist in the norming and scoring.
  - Lower and Upper Division Artifacts
    - i. End goal is 100 upper div and 100 lower div artifacts
    - ii. For upper div, the programs will need to be directly involved
      1. The faculty would need to help the reviewers understand what is happening
    - iii. Upper div would be group assessment, while lower div is more individual
    - iv. The faculty that provided the artifacts would need to not be the ones to score – this has been debatable but would need to be noted if the instructor were involved in scoring.
    - v. Random Sampling is very difficult when we don't have that many artifacts for upper div
      1. For lower div, it will be somewhat better as there is enough artifacts pulled after random sampling
  - Follow-up to Data Collection & Scoring Strategies
    - i. Possibly having lecturers scoring in conjunction with COMS consultancy
      1. Faculty would be trained by consultant, then they perform individual assessment, which is checked by consultant
      2. Invite Dept. reviewers to norm sessions with the COMS lecturers, then do breakout sessions with individual programs
    - ii. How many program participants are needed from each college?
    - iii. There will necessarily be some asterisks on the report, but it is unavoidable
3. Identify Next Steps and Action Items
  - i. Recruit faculty participants from within the program offering videotaped artifacts, at least two faculty reviewers to partner in this assessment with a COMS consultant.
  - ii. Ideally, the faculty member would not score their own artifacts, but it might be an issue if we can't find others in the program to do it
  - iii. Norming session might need to be longer if Dept. representatives are present

- iv. Add a qualitative box at the bottom of the Qualtrix scoresheet for comments about the nature of the program
- v. Student will be needed to upload the captured artifacts to a private youtube channel
  - 1. Naming convention for videos when uploaded is important
  - 2. Cosmetic cleaning up of Qualtrix rubric still occurring

~~~~~