

MEETING NOTES

Oral Communication Learning Community 2016-17

November 29, 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 Libray: Kaila Bussert

ACTION ITEMS

Agenda Item	Action Items & Context	Responsible Parties	Due Date
1. Data Collection Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Jack Phelan will connect with colleges to get concrete numbers and category (individual/group) for upper division speeches.Mary Pedersen offered to help finding artifacts from upper division CAFES programs.Cassandra Carlson offered to build group presentations in her curriculum for the upper division class that she will be teaching in winter.Cassandra Carlson and Bethany Conway will work on collecting lower division data for winter samples.	Jack Phelan; Mary Pedersen; Cassandra Carlson; Bethany Conway	
2. Rubric Development	COMS will adjust the rubric to be able to assess group presentations.	Richard Besel; Bethany Conway; Cassandra Carlson	

MEETING NOTES

- Trevor Forzetting shared Fall 2016 Supplemental Workshops Observations and result scores.
- Review meeting notes - [October 25, 2016](#)
- Data Collection Strategy – Fall Quarter:
 - UPPER DIVISION DATA COLLECTION
 - CAED - Margot McDonald is very interested and involved in collecting artifacts from upper division presentations in her department, many of them team-oriented but not until late Winter and Spring quarter.
 - OCOB - John York – BUS 310 – 40 speeches (10 teams of 4)
 - CSM – Beth Chance – STAT Senior Project Speeches – individual speeches, video artifacts already UPLOADED and ready for scoring
 - CENG – Ben Hawkins / Lynn Slivovsky -- CPE 350 (50 speeches) and CPE 450. Same cohort continues from 350 to 450. Presentations are done at the beginning and end of the quarter.
 - CLA - COMS 312 – Cassandra Carlson - There are 4 group presentations which are not enough for scoring.
 - CAFES – (Jack P.) Will work with Mary to explore possibilities in CAFES.

- vii. (Mary Pedersen) What are the goals? For WASC, we need a sample from upper division courses. It is dangerous to focus only on one class. How can one class represent the whole college? How faculty are going to evaluate oral communication in their courses? What goals are we trying to achieve? Those are two different aspects I am struggling with. What are your thoughts about training faculty to assess oral communication? The samples do not demonstrate all of Cal Poly. It's a subgroup that is being demonstrated. Where do you want them to be?
- viii. (Richard Besel) It's always been a moving target. We started this process with a focus on evaluating speeches. Group presentations are very different. That is something you are not able to capture through a rubric that is designed for speeches. For lower division GE it will be simple. What is the total number of artifacts being collected?
- ix. (Jack P.) In CAED, Margo's collection is from a number of different domains (studio, public, senior project, Best of Show, and interdisciplinary presentations between departments ARCE and ARCH. The artifacts from CENG (CPE) are pre-prepared (edited) presentation. We are looking into getting the original raw presentations.
- x. (Richard B.) The speeches that you (Jack p.) have shown earlier might work. As the speeches are edited the scores might be higher than others.
- xi. (Bethany Conway) But speeches should be in front of people.
- xii. (Richard B.) Were the CPE speeches delivered in front of any audience?
- xiii. (Cassandra Carlson) I think if we are wanting to be inclusive and focus on GE, COMS will not be representative.
- xiv. (Mary P.) We would expect GE COMS classes to get the highest scores.
- xv. (Cassandra C.) I do not think COMS will outperform.
- xvi. (Richard B.) Can we introduce "non-applicable" as an item on the rubric? I am thinking of adding an optional item without making a second rubric.
- xvii. (Mary P.) Megan Oakleaf will be presenting in Cal Poly. In regards to twiggging the rubric her advice might be as follows; you may have 12 criteria. You can change the bottom ones. You want to have your core criteria and the rest become flexible, that is how they recommend doing the rubric. She comes in January.
- xviii. (Jack P.) What are we really thinking about upper division? Are we still honing in on one course from each college?
- xix. (Richard b.) I think we can adjust the rubric. We will make some addition where colleges can fill in the details. We might have to do some twiggging to adjust the rubric to be able to assess group presentations. But we still need to know what is the total number of artifacts we are scoring.
- xx. (Jack P.) Margo said, her each group comprises of 30-40. I think she said 28. She needs to pitch this to her faculty and get back to me. Possibly some of these are individual presentations. OCOB is providing group presentations. Total of ten (10) groups. CSM is giving individual presentations. Hopefully today we will get more information from each college. In OCOB John York offered to change the group presentations to include a brief summary of individual presentations, with each student recapping individual portions after the presentation. The group felt John York's offer though might be valuable for assessment, but will be too laborious for the faculty.
- xxi. (Mary P.) I used to have 45 students on my class, and they used to give individual presentations on their final project. It is possible for me to dig and find someone who will be willing to give us some presentations.
- xxii. (Richard B.) The strategy should be to collect from whatever sources we find. We have to know if we have enough to sample. We need to get a sense of how many speeches we need to collect.
- xxiii. (Cassandra C.) If we are extending to winter, I am willing to build group presentations in my curriculum for the class that I am teaching in winter.

- xxiv. (Richard B.) What will be our goal? We do not need a big number of artifacts.
- xxv. (Mary P.) We have CAED and CSM. I will reach out to CAFES. I don't want the faculty to do extra work.
- xxvi. (Richard B.) Changing the group presentations to individual seems like a lot of work to me. Do they (OCOB) really know how much time it will take? If we have gathered 200-300 speeches, depending on how many we gather, we can randomly select a sample of 100. Do we gather 400 from upper level?
- LOWER DIVISION DATA COLLECTION
 - i. COMS - Quarter Plus – (Bethany C.) named and UPLOADED – 36/37.
 - ii. COMS 101
 - iii. COMS 102
 - iv. (Cassandra C.) You (Bethany C.) and I will work on winter samples.

4. Norming and Scoring Strategy

- 1.5-hour norming session: Week 3 (January 27)
- Remote Scoring: artifacts scored remotely using Qualtrics – Jan 27-Feb 8th.
- Result scores due by Feb 8th
- 1.5 hour Debrief Meeting – Feb 14th
- Discrepancy scores (third view) anticipated to be very low, but could be scored by Jack, Richard, Bethany, Cassandra
- (Cassandra C.) We can score the lower division artifacts in Winter while still collecting upper division samples. That way we are not holding up the assessment process.
- (Bethany C.) Are we going to assess all of the quarter plus speeches?
- (Jack P.) Yes.
- (Cassandra C.) If we have some data, we can show some comparisons. Can we do that? We have 100 from GE. If we can say something about quarter plus, we can do some kind of comparison between GE and upper division.
- (Mary P.) I really like the strategy. I want the programs to be able to assess their own artifacts. Can you help on that?
- (Richard B.) Does that work for us (COMS)?
- (Bethany C.) It does not require any additional work on our part. Once we have the artifacts, getting the codes, embedding the codes is not a big of a deal. What I am concerned is about that, the program has to have their own Qualtrics account. COMS has five accounts but faculty need these for their own research.
- (Mary P.) Can we employ student assistants? Can students upload and use Qualtrics?
- (Bethany C.) It's pretty intuitive once they know where the buttons are.
- (Cassandra C.) Who is doing the coding? Do they know about the dates?
- (Richard B.) We have some lecturers doing the coding. They do not know about the date yet.
- (Bethany C.) Why do we have to collect the names? Is it a WASC requirement?
- (Jack P.) We need that information to work with more comprehensive data categories.
- (Mary P.) One of the reasons we want to use student names, for example, is to follow the achievement gap in minorities. How do minorities do in oral communication?

5. Next Steps and Action Items

- Jack P will connect with colleges to get concrete numbers and category (individual/group) for upper division speeches.
- Mary P. will work with Jack and help find artifacts from upper division CAFES programs.
- Cassandra Carlson offers to build group presentations in her curriculum for the upper division class that she will be teaching in winter.

- Cassandra Carlson and Bethany Conway will work on collecting lower division data for winter samples.
- The COMS team will adjust the rubric to be able to assess group presentations.

~~~~~

### **Fall 2016 Schedule**

~~Tuesday 09/27 9:10 to 10:00am 35-319b~~

~~Tuesday 10/25 9:10 to 10:00am 35-319b~~

~~Tuesday 11/29 9:10 to 10:00am 35-319b~~