

Meeting Notes

Oral Communication Learning Community 2016

April 20, 2016

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

Membership

Academic Programs, Jack Phelan, Mary Pedersen, Bruno Ghiberti, Student Affairs: Tim Archie, Trevor Forzetting
CLA: Richard Bessel, Bethany Conway, Cassandra Carlson; LIBRARY: Kaila Bussert

Meeting Notes

1. Introductions
 - a. Members of the committee introduce themselves.
2. Review goals of the learning community
 - Building on the previous assessment efforts
 - During 2008-09 AY GE level was established. Richard B. expresses his concerns with exit level. Those are the courses that needs to be figured out.
 - Objective of this OCLC should be to identify foundational level courses from programs in each college and identify exit level skills (Richard B.)
 - Visual/Graphic may need enhancement on an updated rubric. 70 percent, a significant number of students, did not have any form of visual content on the last assessment.
 - Current challenge in GE courses: they are focused on intensive public speaking while upper level courses are content intensive. So, the question is will the students be better in public speaking on the general level, rather than later, when they are exposed to specific content. The original assessment (GE) of oral communication was concerned with public speaking and did not necessarily look into upper level courses.
 - Investigate best thinking and practices
 - In the QR committee, when assignments and participation were requested through a formal campus-wide letter a large number of responses and sample assignments. This approach might be repeated for OC in identifying faculty, assignments utilizing Oral Communication in upper division courses.
 - In CT committee, it was found that all programs exercised critical thinking, but not in a meaningful way. At the senior level, there were significant differences in how programs assessed CT, the whole CT rubric formed in writing format, the scientists complained that the artifacts were not representative. The rubric did not work because of disciplinary peculiarities.
 - Developing the OC rubric – review the existing rubric as a starting point alongside the Value rubric and others (local, national)
 - Begin to engage faculty with goals of developing campus-wide conversation
 - The committee encourages involving representatives of all the colleges and asks for possible candidates who would be interested or willing to join the community. Richard B. identified the work of Dr. Chu – recipient of a USDA grant (with ties to English, Comms at foundation level courses.)
 - Richard B. asks, how many Colleges should be involved in the process?

- Looking at rubric formats: Grading vs competency based rubric; Vertical vs Horizontal; 3 point rubrics; etc... should be discussed including research of the curriculum and pedagogy
- Rubric design tied to Planning the assessment – i.e. methods, analysis, closing the loop
- Identifying program partners
 - (Bruno) Ideal model can be partnering between different programs in each college, reaching out to people. Using the learning community representatives to reach out to their own colleges, departments and programs to make the connection. The timeline is almost 2 years. The goal would be to develop these relationships.

3. Overview of Oral Communication

- a. [UNIV/GE Assessment Plan \(PDF\)](#)
- b. Current OC Definition - An operational definition was utilized in the previous assessment. *Oral Communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or to avoid (Definition from AAC&U Oral Communication Value Rubric).*
- c. [Current OC Rubric \(PDF\)](#)
 - i. Objective of this rubric was to evaluate competency. This was not set up as a grading rubric.
 - ii. Academic Planning and Programs is trying to break the barrier with assessment, trying to make sure to bring everyone to the table, to develop partnerships, e.g. between Communication Studies and Student Affairs. Bruno hopes that, through large assessment project, it's possible to connect two parts of the student experience. It is possible to improve student performance.
 - iii. Assessing a student based on communication skills and assessing a student based on speech are not the same.
 - iv. Based on the conversation, Richard suggests 3 categories of the OC assessment.
 1. 100 level GE courses: (i.e. COMMS 101, 102); able and easier to control as well as access students.
 2. Upper level: The committee can start collecting artifacts from the Upper level courses of a few colleges, who are willing to participate or can start a random selection of artifacts. These artifacts can be of any format. The artifacts collected last time can help to define the format of artifacts. The question is, should the same rubric be applied this time? Future triangulation could include student perceptions.
 3. Co-curricular: The committee can research existing programs, creating similar kinds of rubrics with actual audiences. e.g. conferences, looking at the reception of the audience at a poster presentation.
 - v. Conclusion: assessment is ugly, it is always changing. There will be bumps. After participation process if the committee do get the data, mixed methods can be used to project a better picture (qualitative and quantitative) than single dimension.

4. Plans for next meeting (5/04)

- a. Analyzing rubric criteria based on (definition, prior rubric, Value rubric, others).
- b. Survey of colleges, faculty representatives to join the community (Survey of courses).

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