

Institutional Student Learning Outcome (ISLO) Assessment Summary Report Academic Year: 2019-2020 ISLO1: Oral Communication

Oral Communication

Students will demonstrate oral communication skills in a clear and organized manner using appropriate verbal and nonverbal communication techniques with regard to subject, purpose and audience.

Report prepared by Kevin Cavanaugh, Suzanne Riela,
and Susan Rogers, in consultation with participating faculty.

Report submitted on October 1, 2020

Executive Summary

SCOPE:

Courses from which assessment data was gathered (# of students): AHS100 (15); AVI110 (16); BUS210 (41); CIS212 (10); CRJ107 (19); CRJ266 (25); NUR213 (49); NUR215 (20); PFA100 (24); SCI100 (80); SPE101 (91); THE105 (33); THE120 (37)

Participating faculty and academic department:

- AHBS: Karen Ingham, Erich Markert, Deborah Mautone, Carolyn Rounds, Alan Zucker
- BHS: Janay Gasparini
- BACP: Maureen Gittelman, John Trosie, Thomas Winship
- MCS: Frank Whittle
- NUR: Michele Lopez, Regina Odell
- PSET: Susan Conrad
- PVAC: Michael Adams, Christopher Brellocks, Joseph Cosentino, Thomas Costello, Margeaux Lippman Hoskins

Total # of Sections: 29

Total # of Students: Valid data collected for 460 out of 577 possible assessments (403 in Fall 2019; 57 in Spring 2020)

RESULTS:

- Of 460 valid student assessments collected and rated using a 0-4 scale, 92.8% met or exceed standards in Organization (avg. score 3.00), 95% met or exceeded standards in Language (avg. score 3.03), 94.3% met or exceeded standards in Delivery (avg. score 3.00), 86.3% met or exceeded standards in Supporting Material (avg. score 2.83), and 92.4% met or exceeded standards in Central Message (avg. score 3.04).
- Results indicate an excellent inter-item reliability, meaning items could be combined to form a single score representing oral communication competency.
- Continuing students (n=319) outperformed new first-time students (n=130) in all areas. Similarly, part-time students (n=119) outperformed full-time students (n=341) in all areas.
- All ISLO items were positively correlated with total number of credits accumulated, suggesting that the more credits a student had earned, the stronger the results on the assessment.

- Those students who had successfully completed (a grade of C or better) BHS103, ENG101, SPE101, or a college-level Math course all received higher scores than those who did not for all ISLO items.
- Ratings in 200-level courses were higher than rating in 100-level courses for all ISLO items.
- ISLO item results from 2019-2020 appear to have improved across the board from 2016-2017; however, changes in methodology keep us from drawing concrete conclusions from that fact.
- Faculty indicated that using the recommended pedagogical approaches to oral communication led to stronger outcomes, in particular the recommendation to provide ample opportunities for students to practice oral presentations.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The assessment team proffered the following conclusions and recommendations.

Result/Conclusion	Recommendation for Action
Continuing students and those with more college-course credits outperformed new students and those with fewer credits.	Reassess the courses chosen for assessment of ISLO1 for the next cycle. Given that the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in fewer upper-level courses in this assessment cycle than originally planned, encourage the use of 200-level courses or others that are taken later in a program's path in subsequent assessments.
Providing students with opportunities to practice oral communication skills, in which particular student strengths and weaknesses might be emphasized, and scaffolding assignments in a progressive way throughout a semester led to stronger outcomes.	Work with faculty to develop pedagogical approaches and space within a course to practice skill development. Offer workshops on best practices in oral communication. Consider the creation of a Speech Tutoring Center or collaborations with existing tutoring centers to offer out-of-class practice opportunities for students. Recommend SPE101 be added to the required courses in more programs.
The faculty who followed the recommended standards for oral communication pedagogy appeared to have found more success among their students on this assessment.	Encourage more faculty to adopt these approaches when assigning oral presentations.

ACTION PLAN:

Recommendation/Action Item	Potential Resources
Reassess the courses chosen for assessment of ISLO1 for the next cycle. Encourage the use of 200-level courses or others that are taken later in a program's path in subsequent assessments.	FAL and Associate Dean of AA meet with the Program Chairs Council, department chairs, and relevant faculty to discuss curriculum mapping and best places for ISLO1 assessment for 2022-2023 cycle.
Work with faculty to develop pedagogical approaches and space within a course to practice skill development. Offer workshops on best practices in oral communication. Consider the creation of a Speech Tutoring Center or collaborations with existing tutoring centers to offer out-of-class practice opportunities for students. Recommend SPE101 be added to the required courses in more programs.	FAL and Associate Dean of AA meet with Professional Staff Development Committee (PSDC) to provide workshops on best practices in oral communication pedagogy. FAL report to Committee on Student Learning and Assessment (CSLA) and discuss their role in the dissemination of those best practices. FAL meet with the Director of the Writing Center and Oral Communication faculty to look for ways to enhance out-of-class practice space for students working on oral presentations. FAL and Associate Dean of AA meet with Program Chairs Council to discuss feasibility of including SPE101 into program curricula.
Encourage more faculty to adopt the recommended standards and pedagogical approaches to oral communication when assigning presentations.	FAL communicate to the CSLA the results of this assessment and ask what role CSLA should play in continuing to emphasize the success of these recommendations to all faculty. Create a webinar or other online resource to bring together faculty who have had success with the recommendations and those interested in improving oral communication pedagogy in their courses to discuss best practices.

Table of Contents

1. State the specific question(s) asked.....	5
2. Describe the method used to answer the question(s).....	7
3. Summarize the results.....	9
4. Summarize conclusions drawn and action plan for improvement.....	17
5. Recommendations for resources needed to implement action plan.....	21

1 State the specific question(s) asked

The last assessment of ISLO1-Oral Communication, completed during the 2016-2017 academic year, led to calls for clearer standards for the outcome and improved inter-rater reliability. In turn, the faculty and staff of the institution, led by Leah Akins, then Faculty Assessment Leader, embarked on a process to gather consensus on shared standards for oral communication in different disciplines and programs, as well as to offer faculty professional development opportunities to improve the inter-rater reliability in subsequent assessment cycles. A draft of standards based on the ISLO1 report was presented to the Committee on Student Learning and Assessment (CSLA) at the start of the 2017-2018 academic year. After the draft was discussed in committee, CSLA members shared that discussion with faculty and staff across all academic departments and related administrative offices. CSLA solicited feedback, which inevitably led to CSLA approval in 2019 of recommended standards for common oral communication assignments. In addition, an Improvement of Instruction grant allowed two Oral Communication faculty to work on professional development activities. As part of that work, Margeaux Lippman, Assistant Professor of Speech, created online resources for instructors regarding best practices in oral communication pedagogy, which are currently available on myDCC.

Stepping into the current assessment cycle, faculty retained these two points of concern, along with others. Using a rubric closely tied to the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubric for Oral Communication, and incorporating its gradations of value, they embarked on the assessment with the following questions in mind.

Research Questions:

1. How do student academic experiences, including current and prior coursework and course success, impact student results in the ISLO1 assessment?
 - a. Has the student successfully completed (earned grade of C or better) SPE 101?
 - b. Has the student successfully completed THE 120?
 - c. Has the student successfully completed BHS 103?
 - d. Has the student successfully completed ENG 101?
 - e. Has the student successfully completed college-level mathematics?
 - f. Has the student successfully completed developmental writing or reading courses?
 - g. How many credits had the student completed prior to the assessment?

2. How do the results from the 2019-2020 assessment compare with those from 2016-2017?

3. What pedagogical innovations or strategies are currently being used to support student achievement in Oral Communication skills, and with what results?
 - a. What impact did the changes in standards for oral communication pedagogy and assignment development have on the outcome of the assessment?
 - b. What impact did the innovations in professional development (such as the online links to best practices in oral communication pedagogy) have on the outcome of the assessment?

2 Describe the methods used to answer the question(s)

An outline of the methodology is provided below:

- Following the 2016-2017 assessment of ISLO1, program chairs were asked to decide if (a) they have courses in their program that meet the newly CSLA-approved ISLO1 standards, (b) they can modify a course in their program to meet the approved ISLO1 standards, (c) they can add a course to their curriculum that meets the approved ISLO1 standards, or (d) they need to request a waiver from OAA justifying why there is no room in their program to meet this standard (such a waiver process would need to be based on evidence, including benchmarking, that demonstrates the required credits for either transfer or career). All programs at the institution currently list a course in its curriculum that meets the learning outcome, with the exception of Computer Science (CPS), General Studies (GSP), and Liberal Arts and Humanities (LAH). The chairs of those three programs have been tasked with discussing with relevant faculty ways to address that gap.
- In January 2019, all faculty and staff were invited to a workshop to discuss plans for the 2019-2020 assessment of ISLO1. At that workshop, attendees reviewed the definition of the outcome, the current and the VALUE rubrics, the results and recommendations of the 2016-2017 assessment, and ways to improve inter-rater reliability by discussing shared standards for the outcome.
- In May 2019, all faculty and staff were invited to a second workshop to continue those discussions and decide upon the research questions that would drive this current cycle.
- In consultation with department and program chairs, the following courses were selected to participate in the 2019-2020 assessment of ISLO1: AHS100, AVI110, BUS210, CIS212, CRJ107, CRJ266, NUR213, NUR 215, PFA100, SCI100, SPE101, THE105, THE120.

- Using the agreed upon rubric, the faculty teaching these courses used a variety of instruments to collect data on the ISLO1 skills (see Appendix B for examples), including:
 - Standard course assignments, such as homework;
 - Major course assignments, such as significant projects;
 - Multiple assignments.

- Faculty in the Department of Allied Health and Biological Sciences and the Department of Behavioral Sciences were awarded two assessment grants to assist in the assessment process, totaling 26.5 hours.

- During the academic year, faculty input the data gathered in TracDat/Nuventive (allowing assessment results to be associated with a student and student information in Banner). At the end of the academic year, the data was downloaded and tabulated by the Associate Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IR), who performed further statistical analysis.

- Using the information provided by IR, the Faculty Assessment Leader prepared a draft report of the assessment and provided it to participating faculty for their review. Faculty provided continued feedback for revision of the draft via an August 2020 workshop and through email and conversation with the Faculty Assessment Leader through September 2020.

- The final report was submitted on October 1, 2020.

The COVID-19 novel coronavirus outbreak of 2020 had an impact on the methodology of this assessment cycle. Following guidelines set by the State of New York, the College first delayed reopening after Spring Break in March 2020 by two weeks and asked faculty to prepare for the potential of remote learning. By the end of March, the College decided to close the campus for the remainder of the semester and continue remote learning. The Faculty Assessment Leader and the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs decided by early April to stop the collection of data for the assessment of ISLO1 unless a) a particular program chair deemed it necessary for his/her program review or to satisfy outside accreditors, or b) the data had been collected prior to the shutdown and simply had not been entered into TracDat. The decision stemmed from a belief that any data collected during remote learning, which had necessarily been done quickly and without substantial training for faculty (as is done traditionally for online education), would be so impacted by that change that it would be incomparable to the data collected in the fall or in the spring semester prior to the change. The Faculty Assessment Leader and the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs also believed enough data had been collected prior to that point to allow for useful conclusions. Only two program chairs (NUR and PFA) added data after that point; NUR

needed to address its outside accreditation agencies, and PFA shifted its assessment tool from the final to the midterm.

3 Summarize the Results

3.1 Total Tabulated Data and Comments

There were 577 possible assessments across 29 sections. Valid data was collected for 460 assessments (403 in Fall 2019, 57 in Spring 2020), a rate of 79.7%. Statistics exclude sections where no data was collected.

The rubric shared by all faculty assessing this ISLO (see Appendix A) included five (5) assessment items as provided in the table below. Each item is referred to in the results using the identifier indicated in the table.

Table 1 Assessment Items/Categories for ISLO1

Item	Identifier	Abbreviated Description
1	Organization	Organizational pattern is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.
2	Language	Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.
3	Delivery	Delivery techniques make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.
4	Supporting Material	Supporting materials make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/ authority on the topic.
5	Central Message	Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.

Overall average ratings using the shared rubric were 3.00 for Organization, 3.03 for Language, 3.00 for Delivery, 2.83 for Supporting Material, and 3.04 for Central Message, where 4.0 represents the highest rating. Table 2 provides the percentage of students scoring each individual rating for each category.

Table 2 Percentage of students earning individual rating for ISLO1 items

	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message
% earn 4 (advanced competency)	37.4	39.1	38.9	36.7	42.4
% earn 3 (moderate competency)	33.7	30.4	28.3	29.8	27.8
% earn 2 (modest competency)	21.7	25.4	27.2	20.2	22.2
% earn 1 (developing competency)	5.7	4.3	5.0	6.1	6.3
% earn 0 (skill not demonstrated)	1.5	0.7	0.7	7.2	1.3

Table 3 provides the percentage of students who have either met or exceeded expectations in each category, as well as the percentage of those who did not meet college expectations.

Table 3 Percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations as opposed to not meeting expectations

	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message
2/3/4=met expectations	92.8	95.0	94.3	86.7	92.4
0/1=did not meet expectations	7.2	5.0	5.7	13.3	7.6

Inter-item reliability was assessed using Pearson correlations and Cronbach's alpha. All ISLO items were positively correlated with one another ($r_s > .6$, $p_s < .001$). Reliability was excellent ($\alpha = .94$). This result implies that the items could be combined to form a single score representing oral communication competency.

Furthermore, the means (provided in Table 4, along with standard deviations) for each item were compared using a repeated-measures ANOVA. The results indicate an overall significant difference between items [$F(4, 1836) = 12.69$, $p < .001$]. Bonferroni-corrected pairwise comparisons indicate that Supporting Material was lower than the other ISLO items ($p_s < .001$), but there were no other significant differences.

Table 4 Overall Ratings (Mean Scores and Standard Deviations)

	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message
Overall Ratings (n=460)	3.00 (0.98)	3.03 (0.94)	3.00 (0.96)	2.83 (1.20)	3.04 (1.01)

Finally, independent t-tests were used to compare the results from the Fall and Spring semesters. Ratings in the Fall were lower than ratings in the Spring for all ISLO items [$t_s(458) > 4.99$, $p_s < .001$]. Table 5 provides those results.

Table 5 Outcomes by Semester

	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message
Fall 2019 (n=403)	2.91 (0.98)	2.95 (0.96)	2.91 (0.96)	2.71 (1.21)	2.93 (1.01)
Spring 2020 (n=57)	3.65 (0.67)	3.60 (0.53)	3.60 (0.75)	3.65 (0.67)	3.82 (0.50)

3.2 Types of Assignment Data and Comments

Faculty were asked to describe the assignment(s) used for assessment. Methods varied from single course assignments to major projects. Some faculty assessed multiple assignments over the course of the semester. Samples of the assignments can be found in Appendix B.

3.3 Student Academic Experiences

Research question #1, and its sub-questions, focused on students' previous academic experiences. In order to answer those questions, student characteristics that might impact their experience (such as full-time versus part-time, or previous course work) were examined in relation to performance on the assessment criteria.

3.3.1 Student Characteristics

The students' higher education history (i.e., whether they were new/continuing/transfer/high-school concurrent) was analyzed. The numbers of students in each group were as follows: New First-Time (n=130), Continuing (n=319), Transfer (n=10), and High-School Concurrent (n=1). Given the small sample sizes for Transfer and Concurrent students, those results were ignored. Using independent t-tests, New and Continuing students were compared. Continuing students outperformed New First-Time students for all ISLO items [ts (447) > 5.11, ps < .001]: Organization (3.16 v. 2.60), Language (3.18 v. 2.69), Delivery (3.15 v. 2.65), Supporting Material (3.05 v. 2.29), and Central Message (3.21 v. 2.63).

Students were also grouped into full-time (FT; n=341) and part-time (PT; n=119). Independent t-tests revealed that PT students outperformed FT in all ISLO items [ts (458) > 6.01, ps < .001] (PT v. FT): Organization (3.49 v. 2.83); Language (3.55 v. 2.85); Delivery (3.44 v. 2.84); Supporting Material (3.51 v. 2.59); and Central Message (3.57 v. 2.85).

The total number of credits students had completed prior to the assessment was collected. The average credits accumulated was 34.23 (SD = 28.99, Range = 0 to 136). All ISLO items were positively correlated with credits accumulated, rs (460) > .35, ps < .001, meaning that higher ISLO ratings were associated with more credits accumulated.

Statistical analyses were also performed on the data to test for differences between students who had passed the course in which the ISLO skills were assessed (n=410, grades of A, B, C, or PA) and those who did not pass (n=50, grades of D, F, W, NC, or ZF). Independent t-tests revealed that students who passed the course had higher ratings for all ISLO items than students who did not pass [ts (458) > 2.32, ps < .05]. The results for each item were: Organization (3.05 v. 2.56), Language (3.08 v. 2.62), Delivery (3.03 v. 2.70), Supporting Material (2.87 v. 2.46), and Central

Message (3.10 v. 2.56). Further analyses were performed to test correlations between course grades and the outcomes of the assessment. Grades were transformed to the 4.0 GPA scale (NOTE: withdrawals and other grades not included in GPA calculations were excluded). All ISLO items were positively correlated with course grades [$r_s(454) > .10$, $p_s < .05$], meaning that higher ISLO ratings were associated with higher grades in the course.

Data was also collected on the type of degree the student was pursuing (associate, certificate, or non-degree); however, the sample sizes for certificate ($n=4$) and non-degree ($n=7$) were insufficient to conduct inferential analyses.

Finally, data on students' previous success with particular courses was collected and analyzed. Independent t-tests were used to compare students who had passed specific courses with a C or better before the semester of assessment and students without those courses (because they received grades of D, F, I, W, did not attempt the course, or did not have transfer credits). The following tables (6 through 11) provide those results.

Table 6 BHS 103 Social Problems in Today's World

Students who passed BHS 103 received higher scores than those who did not for all ISLO items, $t_s(458) > 5.74$, $p_s < .001$.

	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message
Passed ($n=264$)	3.22 (0.92)	3.27 (0.85)	3.21 (0.87)	3.11 (1.05)	3.29 (0.95)
Did not pass/attempt ($n=196$)	2.69 (0.97)	2.71 (0.96)	2.71 (1.00)	2.45 (1.28)	2.70 (0.99)

Table 7 ENG 101 Composition I

Students who passed ENG 101 received higher scores than those who did not for all ISLO items, $t_s(458) > 5.27$, $p_s < .001$.

	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message
Passed ($n=319$)	3.18 (0.91)	3.23 (0.84)	3.15 (0.87)	3.06 (1.09)	3.23 (0.95)
Did not pass/attempt ($n=141$)	2.60 (1.01)	2.59 (0.99)	2.65 (1.06)	2.31 (1.27)	2.61 (1.01)

Table 8 SPE 101 Public Speaking

Students who passed SPE 101 received higher scores than those who did not for all ISLO items, $t_s(458) > 2.46$, $p_s < .05$.

	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message
Passed ($n=46$)	3.37 (0.71)	3.46 (0.72)	3.39 (0.80)	3.24 (0.79)	3.50 (0.66)
Did not pass/attempt ($n=414$)	2.96 (1.00)	2.98 (0.95)	2.95 (0.97)	2.78 (1.23)	2.99 (1.03)

Table 9 THE 120 Performing Skills for the Classroom

Given the disparate/small N for students who passed THE 120, no inferential statistics are reported.

	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message
Passed (n=10)	3.30 (0.82)	3.60 (0.52)	3.60 (0.70)	3.30 (0.82)	3.60 (0.70)
Did not pass/attempt (n=450)	2.99 (0.98)	3.02 (0.94)	2.98 (0.96)	2.82 (1.20)	3.02 (1.01)

Table 10 College-Level Mathematics Course (MAT IXX and above)

Students who passed a college-level MAT course received higher scores than those who did not for all ISLO items, $t_s(458) > 5.74$, $p_s < .001$.

	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message
Passed (n=199)	3.26 (0.86)	3.26 (0.80)	3.17 (0.89)	3.10 (1.05)	3.26 (0.94)
Did not pass/attempt (n=261)	2.80 (1.02)	2.85 (1.00)	2.87 (0.99)	2.62 (1.26)	2.87 (1.02)

Table 11 Remedial ENG or REA Course

There were no significant group differences for any ISLO item, $t_s(458) < 1.77$, $p_s = ns$.

	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message
Passed (n=93)	2.84 (1.01)	2.88 (0.95)	2.96 (0.93)	2.67 (1.11)	2.90 (1.08)
Did not pass/attempt (n=367)	3.04 (0.97)	3.07 (0.93)	3.01 (0.97)	2.87 (1.22)	3.07 (0.99)

NOTE: There was only 1 student who passed a remedial ENG/ESL course (ENG 085, 086, 087, 088, 095, 096). That student was included in the "passed" group.

3.3.2 Course Characteristics Data and Comments

Statistical analyses were performed to test differences based on the course level in which the ISLO items were assessed. Analyses were performed comparing 100-level courses (n=315) and 200-level courses (n=145).

Independent t-tests revealed that the ratings in 200-level courses were higher than ratings in the 100-level courses for all ISLO items [$t_s(458) > 6.59$, $p_s < .001$]. The specific outcomes were (200-level/100-level): Organization (3.46/2.78), Language (3.48/2.82), Delivery (3.41/2.81), Supporting Material (3.35/2.59), and Central Message (3.53/2.81). Given the small sample size for 100-level courses with prerequisites (n=16), no inferential statistics could be reported regarding the differences between those courses and the other course types, as the results would be nearly identical to the ones reported above.

3.4 Current Assessment Cycle Compared to Last Cycle

ISLO1 Oral Communication was last assessed in 2016-2017 (AY16/17). During that assessment cycle, a different rubric and rating scale was used as compared to the ones for the current cycle (AY19/20). For AY16/17, a 1-4 scale was used, where ratings of 3 or 4 indicated students meeting expectations for the ISLO, while ratings of 1 or 2 indicated them not meeting those expectations. For AY19/20, a 0-4 scale was used, where ratings of 2, 3, or 4 indicated meeting

expectations, while ratings of 0 or 1 indicated them not meeting those expectations. Please note that the dataset only included students who had ratings for all items.

For these analyses, item ratings were re-coded to 1 or 0 (did meet vs. did not meet expectations), and then independent t-tests (and chi-square statistics) were used to compare the ratings in AY16/17 and AY19/20. Numbers in the table below represent the percentage of students meeting expectations by academic year. A greater percentage of students met expectations in AY19/20 than in AY16/17 for all ISLO items, $t(1167) > 2.41$, $ps < .05$; however, these results would have been more meaningful had the methodology remained consistent, so keeping the same approach in the next cycle would allow for more robust conclusions.

Table 12 Comparing Results AY16/17 v AY19/20

	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message
AY 16/17 (n=709)	83.2%	86.0%	73.5%	81.4%	81.9%
AY 19/20 (n=460)	92.8%	95.0%	94.3%	86.7%	92.4%

3.5 Assessment Results Disaggregated by Program

ISLO1 Oral Communication outcomes were disaggregated by program (see Appendix C). Table 13 provides an accounting of which courses students were assessed in for each program and how many students were in each of those courses. This data allows programs chairs to know if students in their programs were assessed, and if the major-specific data is generalizable to the program as a whole.

Table 13 Accounting of Students Assessed by Course and Program

Program	Total Students*	Total # Students Assessed	Total # Assessments	Course ID (# of Students)
ACC	53	7	7	BUS 210 (7)
ARC	59	1	1	BUS 210 (1)
AVI	39	11	11	AVI 110 (11)
AVM	17	6	6	AVI 110 (5), SPE 101 (1)
BAT	600	18	18	BUS 210 (16), SPE 101 (2)
BUS	183	10	10	BUS 210 (9), SPE 101 (1)
CIS	94	7	7	CIS 212 (7)
COM	189	13	13	BUS 210 (1), SPE 101 (11), THE 120 (1)
CPS	124	15	15	SPE 101 (15)
CRJ	74	18	18	CRJ 107 (18)
CRT	331	50	52	CRJ 266 (25), SCI 100 (1), SPE 101 (26)
EDB	7	1	1	THE 120 (1)
EDH	72	3	3	THE 120 (3)
EDL	34	3	3	THE 120 (3)
EDS	6	2	2	THE 120 (2)
EED	184	14	15	THE 105 (1), THE 120 (14)
ESW	116	6	6	BUS 210 (1), SPE 101 (4), THE 120 (1)
GSP	1,521	31	32	AHS 100 (1), BUS 210 (2), CRJ 107 (1), PFA 100 (2), SCI 100 (8), SPE 101 (8), THE 105 (6), THE 120 (4)
HMS	399	1	1	THE 120 (1)
INM	29	2	2	CIS 212 (2)
LAH	619	13	14	SPE 101 (5), THE 105 (4), THE 120 (5)

LAM	16	1	1	SPE 101 (1)
LAX	322	70	70	SCI 100 (69), SPE 101 (1)
MLT	59	9	9	AHS 100 (9)
NUR	137	49	69	NUR 213 (49), NUR 215 (20)
PAL	35	4	4	BUS 210 (2), SPE 101 (2)
PDC	44	4	4	AHS 100 (4)
PFA	93	36	44	PFA 100 (22), THE 105 (22)
UND	595	7	7	AHS 100 (1), BUS 210 (2), CIS 212 (1), SCI 100 (2), SPE 101 (1)
VAT	203	15	15	SPE 101 (13), THE 120 (2)

*total # of students data extracted from SUNY BI and reflects the unduplicated headcount for the academic year for each program.

3.6 Relationship between ISLO1 Oral Communication Assessment Results and to ISLO6 Critical Analysis and Reasoning Assessment Results

Pearson correlations were computed between the ISLO1 and ISLO6 items for 71 students. All ISLO1 items were positively correlated with ISLO6 Formulate/Evaluate. The effect sizes were moderate, accounting for 11% to 21% of variance. ISLO1 Delivery and Supporting Material were also positively correlated with ISLO6 Use Evidence. The effect sizes were small, with only about 6% of variance accounted for. See Table 14 for full results.

Table 14 Correlations between ISLO1 and ISLO6

ISLO 1 ↓	ISLO 6 →	Formulate/Evaluate	Arrive Solution	Use Evidence
Organization		.339**	.116	.119
Language		.383**	.118	.139
Delivery		.465***	.202	.239*
Supporting Material		.415***	.152	.259*
Central Message		.350**	.114	.133

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

3.7 Faculty Perspectives (Narrative Results by Course)

Faculty were asked to provide comments on the results of the assessment as they entered that quantitative data into the TracDat system. A full reporting of that commentary is in Appendix D. Below is a summary of the key points from that qualitative data.

- Introduce, Reinforce, Assess:** Many faculty noted that the course level in which the students were assessed had an impact on the outcomes. They perceived struggles in particular ISLO skills, such as Delivery, that they chalked up to the students' lack of maturity or experience. In the introductory seminars in which the assessment took place, faculty often remarked that the students did not appear quite ready to be assessed in the skill, and that those courses would be a far more appropriate place to *introduce* the skill, which could then be reinforced and assessed later. Faculty in other courses noted the same, and found 200-level classes a more appropriate spot for the final assessment of the ISLO. It is important to note here that due to the suspension of assessment data collection during the College closure and then its subsequent remote reopening in the Spring 2020, planned data collection in a number of 200-level courses did not happen. Future assessment cycles will hopefully be able to gather that data.

- **Practice, practice, practice:** A clear recommendation from faculty was that students needed the time to practice oral communication skills. Prior to the assessment, it was recommended that faculty allow for that practice, but it is not clear how often faculty could fit that into their curriculum. However, those that did found it beneficial. Many faculty noted the need to scaffold assignments, building them progressively over the course of a semester to provide for feedback and pre-assessments before the actual presentation that would judge their oral communication skills. Similarly, some faculty noted how that progression could happen over the course of a program, from introductory seminar to capstone courses. They also felt students could benefit from exposure to more “good” presentations, and a connected recommendation was that Communications faculty discuss the possibility of a Speech Tutoring Center, or perhaps collaborations with the Writing Center to provide students opportunities to build their public speaking skills.

- **Stress the Skills:** While different faculty perceived different strengths and weaknesses among the five skill areas assessed, students appeared to do best on Organization. Faculty found the other skills lacking for a variety of reasons. The main reason for the relative strength in Organization appeared to come from the way faculty stress that skill, not only in the assignment used for the assessment, but in the courses overall. In turn, they often noted how they saw a need to stress the other three skills in their courses. The more time they spent discussing particular skill areas, the more the faculty perceived strengths in those areas. However, for the weaker four areas there were some distinct concerns:
 - *Language:* Some faculty felt these assignments were the first time students were being challenged to truly consider language, while others saw the struggle as related to second-language acquisition among their particular group of students.
 - *Delivery:* As noted above, faculty perceived Delivery as a consistent weaknesses, and while they often connected that weakness to the course level and students’ lack of experience (with the notable exception of THE 105, in which Delivery was seen a strength – which the faculty member attributed to theater students’ relative comfort with performance), it was also seen as a weakness in some 200-level courses; again, the key recommendation was to provide practice time for the students to hone that skill.
 - *Supporting Material:* Faculty saw the weaknesses in this skill as connected to similar weaknesses found in ISLO5 Informational Literacy and Technological Competence. The recommendation was to continue discussions across disciplines on how students are taught to incorporate strong supporting evidence in their work.
 - *Central Message:* Some faculty felt the nature of their assignment led to both the strengths in certain areas and weaknesses in others, namely Central Message; however, others believed they needed to reinforce the importance of circling back to the Central Message within an oral presentation.

- **Clear Guidelines = Strong Outcomes:** Most faculty felt the clearer they were with the guidelines of the assignment, with the skills they were assessing, and with the expectations they held for the students, the stronger the outcomes were for this

assessment. This last point connects to many of the above, as it seems to speak to the need to be direct and clear with expectations.

4 Summarize Conclusions Drawn and Action Plan for Improvement

Despite the disruption of the assessment cycle by the short shutdown of the college due to the novel coronavirus outbreak and the subsequent shift to remote learning, the fact that 460 assessments were still tallied allows for a number of significant findings and conclusions regarding ISLO1 Oral Communication.

Conclusions are presented below relative to the specific research questions asked:

How do student academic experiences, including current and prior coursework and course success, impact student results in the ISLO1 assessment?

A number of results stand out in relation to this question, namely:

- Part-time students (n=119) outperformed full-time students (n=341) in all ISLO items. This difference in outcomes could be simply a matter of the difference in sample size, as the fact that more full-time students were assessed might have led to greater discrepancy in the scoring and therefore a lower mean. However, as noted below, the opposite outcome occurred comparing continuing students to new first-time students with a similar difference in sample size. Institutional Research performed a crosstab of full-time and part-time students by higher education history and found that among full-time students, 127 were new and 204 were continuing; among part-time students, only 3 were new and 115 were continuing. That additional information seems to suggest the differences related more to whether a student was new or continuing, and would be in line with the data that revealed that continuing students outperformed new first-timers. However, when IR compared full-time continuing to part-time continuing, the latter group still outperformed the former. Perhaps other attributes of part-time students (age, personal organizational skills, reduced course load) led to these outcomes.
- Less surprisingly, students who had already earned college-credit outperformed those who did not across the board. Continuing students (n=319) outperformed new first-time students (n=130) in all categories. There were clear positive correlations between the number of credits earned and success in the ISLO items, and students who passed the course in which they were being assessed were more likely to outperform those who did not. Faculty expected that students who have successfully completed college-credits, as well as those who succeeded in the course in which the oral communication skill was being assessed, would also score higher in this assessment. These results reinforce the

usefulness of efforts made to teach oral communication skills in specific courses and suggests that completion of college courses strengthens oral communication skills.

- Similar to the above point, students' successful completion of core general education courses, such as BHS 103, ENG 101, and college-level Mathematics, led to stronger outcomes in the assessment. Those foundational courses are the specific ones the continuing students and those with more credits would have under their belt, and therefore, the two results are likely connected. Faculty would also expect that students who have taken a course in public speaking (SPE 101) would perform better than those who did not. And the fact that students in 200-level courses outperformed those in 100-level courses also indicates a strengthening of the skill as a student's experience within his or her college program unfolds. These results may indicate a need to consider more carefully where and how ISLO1 skills are introduced and being sure that students enroll in core general education classes early in their programs.

These results also connect to the data within the faculty narratives which focused on the type and level of course in which the skill was assessed. In follow-up conversations with faculty, they noted that for some programs, it is difficult to determine the most appropriate place at which to assess ISLO1; others suggested program chairs review how their programs are laid out and consider adding capstone courses or experiences (though restrictions stemming from the SUNY 64 mandate do make that nearly impossible for some). Faculty also noted that for transfer programs, the reinforcement and assessment of the skill is more accurately and appropriately performed at the transfer institution in the student's third or fourth year, and so introducing the skill in the two-year program is sufficient. In all, faculty seemed to agree that the expectations of student success in ISLO1 would depend at least in part on the particular program in which he or she was enrolled. Further discussions among faculty, particularly program chairs, would help clarify those expectations.

How do the results from the 2019-2020 assessment compare with those from 2016-2017?

As noted in Section 3.4, the scoring used during the 2016-2017 assessment cycle was different from the one used this time around; therefore, Institutional Research had to make some adjustments in order to compare the data. Item ratings were re-coded to 1 or 0 (did meet vs. did not meet expectations), and then independent t-tests (and chi-square statistics) were used to compare the ratings in AY16/17 and AY19/20. Using that approach, it does appear that the outcomes from 2019-2020 reveal clear improvements in all categories of the ISLO, indicating success in teaching these skills within programs, or perhaps simply within the courses being assessed. A few specific points also emerge:

- Student scores improved most significantly in the area of Delivery (from a 73.5% success rate to a 94.3% rate this time).

- The smallest increase in success rate occurred in Supporting Material (81.4% in 16/17 to 86.7% in 19/20). This corresponds to the overall relative weakness in this particular skill (average score: 2.83) as compared to the others for this ISLO (mean average score of all other areas: 3.02). Furthermore, this result corresponds to the outcomes of the ISLO6 Critical Analysis and Reasoning assessment, in which the Use of Evidence outcome underperformed the other ISLO skills, and could be considered an extension of outcomes from ISLO5 Information Literacy and Technological Competency, in which the areas of Citation (correctly citing sources) and Evaluate (a student's ability to evaluate a source's credibility) were weakest. The result speaks to a need to continue to reinforce how students use supporting material and evidence across the disciplines.

Faculty involved with the assessment provided a number of points that they believed may have led to these improved outcomes. The deliberate effort to discuss the difference between how a skill is introduced, reinforced, and then assessed within a program (or over a student's higher education experience) may have changed rater expectations regarding the skill level, and therefore led to higher scores. Second, the change in the rubric used and the way faculty were instructed to use that rubric (focusing on strengths rather than deficits within the skill) likely led to some improved outcomes. And finally, the implementation of the recommended standards for oral communication led some programs chairs to remove courses from the ISLO curriculum map as they came to realize those courses did not truly introduce, reinforce, or assess the skill, which therefore may have removed what might have been lower scores in this cycle.

Based on faculty perception, the recommended standards for oral communication did indeed have a positive impact. For instance, faculty teaching the SCI 100 introductory seminar noted how they approached the oral presentation in that class in a far more structured way than they had during the 2016-2017 academic year. They provided students time to practice oral presentations in a low-stakes assignment before they were scored in a more high-stakes one. Some SCI 100 faculty also shared the online resources provided to faculty on myDCC, which students reviewed on their own time. These changes to pedagogy, according to the faculty involved, led to clearly improved outcomes.

What pedagogical innovations or strategies are currently being used to support student achievement in Oral Communication skills, and with what results?

Faculty narratives and discussions with those involved with the assessment provide details on particular pedagogical approaches that appear to support student achievement in ISLO1 skill development, namely:

- Providing students with opportunities to practice oral communication skills, in which particular student strengths and weaknesses might be emphasized, and scaffolding assignments in a progressive way throughout a semester led to stronger outcomes.
- Providing clear assignment guidelines and expectations led to stronger outcomes.

However, faculty did see opportunities for improvement in some pedagogical approaches:

- Infusing particular skills, like Supporting Material, throughout disciplines (as perceived weaknesses in that area correlate to similar weaknesses found in ISLO5 and ISLO6 assessments).
- Providing avenues for students to build these skills outside the classroom, such as through a new Speech Tutoring Center or collaborations with the Writing Center. Students would benefit from exposure to more “good” presentations.
- Using lower-level courses as a means to introduce the skill, then reinforce it throughout programs and assess it in upper-level courses. In all, emphasize the particular skills more directly.

A sub-question regarding pedagogical innovations asked, “What impact did the changes in standards for oral communication pedagogy and assignment development have on the outcome of the assessment?” As noted above, the faculty who followed those recommendations appeared to have found more success and provided further recommendations about reinforcing these approaches when assigning oral presentations. Further communication with faculty about the success of those recommendations should occur to reinforce their effectiveness.

Another question asked, “What impact did the innovations in professional development (such as the online links to best practices in oral communication pedagogy) have on the outcome of the assessment?” While no quantitative data was collected that might answer this question, those faculty who followed the recommendations and who provided the online links with their students reported perceived improvement in students’ oral communication.

Is there a connection between the outcomes of ISLO1 and ISLO6 assessments?

Positive statistical correlations could be found among all ISLO1 items and the ISLO6 item Formulate/Evaluate (which asks, “Can the student formulate or evaluate arguments, problems, or opinions?”), as well as between ISLO1 item Delivery and ISLO6 item Use Evidence (which asks, “Does the student use carefully considered evidence?”). While clear conclusions cannot be drawn about all of these correlations, perhaps the relative success of student outcomes in ISLO1 item Organization and ISLO6 item Formulate/Evaluate speaks to the pedagogical success in teaching students how to organize their ideas and state their main points clearly. However, the more telling correlation may be between ISLO1 item Supporting Material and the ISLO6 item Use Evidence, especially given faculty narrative data. In those two ISLO items, the students’

abilities to provide clear, substantial, and relevant supporting information as part of the presentation of their ideas (be it orally or through written format) is central to their success in the development of those skills, and both the quantitative data and the faculty perceptions show these areas as a relative weak point for students. Therefore, faculty should consider ways to enhance student practice in using evidence to support arguments and discussions. The table below looks to summarize the main conclusions from this report and offer potential actions for moving forward:

Result/Conclusion	Recommendation for Action
Continuing students and those with more college-course credits outperformed new students and those with fewer credits.	Reassess the courses chosen for assessment of ISLO1 for the next cycle. Given that the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in fewer upper-level courses in this assessment cycle than originally planned, encourage the use of 200-level courses or others that are taken later in a program's path in subsequent assessments.
Providing students with opportunities to practice oral communication skills, in which particular student strengths and weaknesses might be emphasized, and scaffolding assignments in a progressive way throughout a semester led to stronger outcomes.	Work with faculty to develop pedagogical approaches and space within a course to practice skill development. Offer workshops on best practices in oral communication. Consider the creation of a Speech Tutoring Center or collaborations with existing tutoring centers to offer out-of-class practice opportunities for students. Recommend SPE101 be added to the required courses in more programs.
The faculty who followed the recommended standards for oral communication pedagogy appeared to have found more success among their students on this assessment.	Encourage more faculty to adopt these approaches when assigning oral presentations.

5 Recommendations for Resources Needed to Implement Action Plan

Recommendation/Action Item	Potential Resources
Reassess the courses chosen for assessment of ISLO1 for the next cycle. Encourage the use of 200-level courses or others that are taken later in a program's path in subsequent assessments.	FAL and Associate Dean of AA meet with the Program Chairs Council, department chairs, and relevant faculty to discuss curriculum mapping and best places for ISLO1 assessment for 2022-2023 cycle.
Work with faculty to develop pedagogical approaches and space within a course to	FAL and Associate Dean of AA meet with Professional Staff Development Committee

<p>practice skill development. Offer workshops on best practices in oral communication. Consider the creation of a Speech Tutoring Center or collaborations with existing tutoring centers to offer out-of-class practice opportunities for students. Recommend SPE101 be added to the required courses in more programs.</p>	<p>(PSDC) to provide workshops on best practices in oral communication pedagogy. FAL report to Committee on Student Learning and Assessment (CSLA) and discuss their role in the dissemination of those best practices. FAL meet with the Director of the Writing Center and Oral Communication faculty to look for ways to enhance out-of-class practice space for students working on oral presentations. FAL and Associate Dean of AA meet with Program Chairs Council to discuss feasibility of including SPE101 into program curricula.</p>
<p>Encourage more faculty to adopt the recommended standards and pedagogical approaches to oral communication when assigning presentations.</p>	<p>FAL communicate to the CSLA the results of this assessment and ask what role CSLA should play in continuing to emphasize the success of these recommendations to all faculty. Create a webinar or other online resource to bring together faculty who have had success with the recommendations and those interested in improving oral communication pedagogy in their courses to discuss best practices.</p>

Appendix A: ISLO1 Rubric

	Exceeds Standard - 4	Meets Standard - 3	Approaches Standard - 2	Does Not Meet Standard - 1
Organization (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions)	Organizational pattern is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.	Organizational pattern is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern is intermittently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern is not observable within the presentation.
Language	Language choices are imaginative ¹ , memorable, and compelling ² , and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience.
Delivery (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness ³)	Delivery techniques make the presentation compelling ² , and speaker appears polished ⁴ and confident.	Delivery techniques make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.	Delivery techniques make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative.	Delivery techniques detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable.
Supporting Material (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities)	A variety of types of supporting materials make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/ authority on the topic.	Supporting materials make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/ authority on the topic.	Supporting materials make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/ authority on the topic.	Insufficient supporting materials make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/ authority on the topic.
Central Message	Central message is compelling ² (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)	Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.	Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable.	Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation.

¹ **“Imaginative”** language means inspiring or creative language choices, particularly in regards to a speaker assessing and adapting their language usage to enhance audience understanding /connection in real time.

² **“Compelling”** means “evoking interest, attention, or admiration in a powerfully irresistible way.” It is a measure of the extent to which a speaker is aware of their particular audience, and if they are successfully adapting their communication style to connect with that audience in a meaningful way.

³ **“Vocal Expressiveness”** refers to appropriate usage and variation of vocal paralanguage: Volume, Rate, Pitch, and Quality.

⁴ **“Polished”** implies a high level of preparation, practice, and/or comfort with the material being presented. (e.g. not reading slides, notecards, etc.)

Appendix B: Sample Instruments Used to Collect Data

BUS210 – Business Communication:

Final Project (200 points)

Chapter 10 covers proposals and formal reports.

The ability to spot problems before they turn into serious risks is prized by most managers. So is the ability to pursue improvements--small and large, regardless of whether or not a problem exists--to increase effectiveness, efficiency, quality, safety, customer/employee satisfaction, and the like.

Consider your experiences as students (and customers) of Dutchess Community College. What improvements would you suggest? Is there a problem you'd like to see addressed?

Select one. Strive to choose a relatively impactful option that can be implemented with realistic effort/investment. Then draft an informal proposal to the college president.

Deliverables:

Part I. Informal Proposal (100 points)

- Draft an informal letter proposal, including all components listed in Figure 10.1. You may have to put some considerable thought and/or research into the schedule, staffing, and budget sections, but use common sense and your best judgment, where possible.
- Refer to Figure 10.2 as an example
-

Part II. Business Presentation (100 points)

- Design a multimedia presentation showcasing the details of your proposal (Hint: The proposal components serve as main points!)

- Submit presentation file (PPT) or link (Prezi, Google Slides) here
- Present the details of your proposal on 12/9. It must be 5-7 minutes in length and adhere to effective delivery principles. Your multimedia file must be on a thumb drive. You will not be allowed to access your file online (via Blackboard, Google Drive, etc.), as this wastes valuable class time, nor will you be allowed to present without a multimedia component.

[Revision for an online version of the class:]

- Deliver your presentation (100 pts). Record via Flipgrid. It must be 3-5 minutes in length and adhere to effective delivery principles.

Note: This is a video recording of you delivering; not audio added to PowerPoint. It isn't necessary to capture the multimedia presentation within the video. I only need to see you. I want you to focus on effective delivery techniques--which means standing, not sitting in front of your computer (unless physical or physiological considerations make this challenging). I realize this will make it difficult to read from a computer screen, so practice using notes, handouts, etc.

An audience isn't required, although you can certainly have one.

SPE101 – Public Speaking

M. Lippman

Objectives:

After completing the persuasive speech, students should be able to:

- identify a target audience and engage in audience analysis
- design and explain arguments to persuade an oppositional audience
- select and discuss evidence to persuade an oppositional audience
- use appropriate language and deliver to persuade an oppositional audience
- arrange and perform a complex argumentative case in a clear, persuasive way

- use previews, reviews, and signposting to clarify argument structure
- extemporize a speech and develop ethos

Assignment Description:

The goal of the **persuasive speech** is to get members of an *oppositional audience* (i.e., an audience that disagrees with your position) to be persuaded to support an issue of public policy and controversy. These policies and controversies can be local (i.e., Poughkeepsie, Dutchess Community College), regional (i.e., Dutchess County, Ulster County, Orange County), state (i.e., New York State Senate, New York State Assembly), national (i.e., the United States Federal Government), or international. These can also be policies and controversies for public organizations, such as the NCAA. For this speech, you *must* select an issue that both a) affects the public and b) is publicly debated.

This speech aims to get you to persuade, not just to argue. When we argue, we often do not think about making sure that said argument is *persuasive* – that is, an argument can be logical but unconvincing or unpersuasive for your audience. In order to persuade an oppositional audience, you need to be mindful of *why* they disagree with you, *how* they might be persuaded (i.e., identifying area where they can be persuaded), and *what* you can say to highlight interests that are shared between yourself and your audience. Developing your *ethos* (credibility) is necessary in this regard. A good persuader does not ignore their opposition but keeps the concerns of their opposition in mind and speaks to their audience with their best interests at heart. A good persuader also engages the oppositional audience’s arguments in an even-handed, fair way – they make sure that the audience knows that their arguments and objections are taken seriously. If you do this, your *ethos* will grow.

Bear in mind, also, that it is unlikely that you will be able to convert your audience in just one short speech. As a result, it is best not to approach this speech hoping to win and change the hearts and minds of your entire audience. Instead, approach this speech with the intent to weaken your audience’s commitment to their original positions and increase their willingness to consider your position.

Speech Arrangement/Outline:

Your speech should follow the Motivated Sequence, Problem-Solution, or Problem-Cause-Solution arrangement patterns discussed in class and in Lucas.

Assignment Requirements:

To receive at least a C on this assignment, you must adhere to the following:

- **Time limits:** You will have **six to nine** minutes to complete your speech. You will lose five points for being over or under the target time range.
- **Must speak to a public forum topic:** Your speech must be on a topic that both a) affects the public and b) is publicly debated. We will discuss how to select and research a persuasive speech topic in class. In selecting your topic, you must ensure that there are reasonable arguments on both sides of the topic – both pros and cons. **DO NOT** pick a topic that everyone agrees on – you must select an issue that requires persuasion.
- **Must speak in FAVOR of a policy:** For this speech, we are going to learn how to *affirm* public policy. You cannot write your speech in opposition to a policy being proposed. You must speak *in favor* of a given policy.
- **Must speak to an oppositional audience:** Your speech must attempt to weaken the audience’s opposition to your proposal and strengthen their support for your case. You should spend considerable time developing arguments that are designed to sway this oppositional audience.
- **Must address all stock issues:** Your speech must cover all of the stock issues discussed in class. Refer to your class notes for details.
- **Must adequately source your speech:** You must do the following:
 - Orally cite *at least SEVEN* sources according to the guidelines in Lucas
 - Three of these sources must be available in print
 - *Note:* Websites for print publications count as print sources.
 - Other sources can be web-only
 - Use evidence from sources to support your claims
 - Evidence should be clearly explained to adequately articulate the warrant
 - Use a variety of evidence (statistics, testimony, examples, etc.)
 - Your outline **MUST** contain a References page in APA style.
- **Must speak extemporaneously:** Using a key-word outline rather than a pre-written speech is key for this assignment. Make sure you are not reading your speech or reciting from memory. You have the skills necessary to do this!
- **Must submit an outline to speak:** We have discussed this at length in class. You must provide me with a full-sentence or key-word outline (see Lucas’ outlines and the guidelines posted on Blackboard for more on this) to be permitted to speak in class

on your day. This outline must also be submitted to Blackboard prior to the start of class on the day that you are scheduled to speak.

- **Notes:** You will be permitted 3x5 notecards to deliver your speech. **No other notes in any other format will be permitted.**

Please note that these are the bare minimum necessary to get a C on this assignment – excellent speeches will integrate previews, reviews, and signpost words; will use excellent, non-overlapping main points; will provide good, sound evidence; will have a solid introduction and conclusion.

How Can I Do Well? Tips and Tricks:

- **Leverage your logos, ethos, and pathos:** While this speech does emphasize research and reporting on that research, we are not persuaded by facts and statistics alone. Instead, make sure you emphasize the human side of your argument to develop *pathos*. Also, make sure that you sound knowledgeable on the topic and are concerned with the audience’s well-being, thereby developing *ethos*.
- **Choose your language with care:** You may be persuading an oppositional audience, but staying away from phrases like “my opposition” and the like when giving this speech. If you want the audience to understand your position, you need to make it sound like you are on the *same* side, not butting heads. Be sure to use language in your speech that respects the position of your audience, sees their concerns as legitimate, and encourages agreement between parties.
- **Select a topic with controversy (but not too much!):** Speaking on a genuine controversy goes a long way with this speech. Make sure you choose a topic that has room for people to disagree – otherwise, there is no oppositional audience!
- **Get off of the cards!:** Pretty self-explanatory – the best speeches here use note cards minimally. Practicing your speech many, many times will help you out enormously here. Use your cards for an outline and for a few key phrases if you need it, but you will be much better off without them.

PERSUASIVE SPEECH EVALUATION

Name: _____

+ = excellent, √+ = good, √ = adequate, √- = flawed, - = poor/missing

Note: The percentages here are guidelines. All these categories are mutually dependent.

Invention and Style (50%)

- ___ The speaker addressed an appropriate topic in a comprehensive manner
- ___ The speaker included appropriate claims for the topic and the audience
- ___ The speaker included appropriate and varied evidence
- ___ The speaker clearly and effectively used the evidence to support the claims
- ___ The speaker demonstrated a thorough understanding of the debate
- ___ The speaker demonstrated a sympathetic understanding of the target audience
- ___ The speaker used language and rhetorical devices to enhance their message

Arrangement (20%)

- ___ The speaker arranged the speech effectively and appropriately
- ___ The speaker highlighted the speech's main points and subpoints clearly and effectively
- ___ The speaker previewed the speech and oriented the audience to the topic clearly and effectively
- ___ The speaker reviewed the speech clearly and effectively and provided a sense of closure in the conclusion

Delivery (30%)

- ___ The speaker's delivery helped to distinguish between key ideas and elaborating detail
- ___ The speaker used notes effectively and appropriately
- ___ The speaker used projection effectively and appropriately
- ___ The speaker used speech rate effectively and appropriately
- ___ The speaker used vocal variety effectively and appropriately
- ___ The speaker moved and gestured effectively and appropriately

TIME:
TIME PENALTY:
GRADE:

Additional Comments:

THE105 – Theater History I:

Performing a Scene from a Theatre History

Project: Research and perform a scene from a play significant to our study of theatre history.

You will select a specific period, playwright, and/or genre of theatre history, and work in small groups (or individually) to research and produce a scene from that era. The goal of these scenes is not to condense or adapt the story, but rather to get a taste of how it might've been performed when it was in its prime. Groups will:

1. Present on how their play and scene fit the genre/period, and
2. Each student will create a detailed handout on one facet of that style of theatre, and
3. The project will culminate with performances of the scenes for the class.

(Re)Discovering Theatre History:

- Choosing a scene:
 - Survey the texts available from that time period, and read synopses. Select a few plays that sound appealing, or seem to be particularly well known.
 - Have group members read plays and discuss or vote on which will be performed.
 - Keep in mind the composition of your group! (Play to your strengths.)
 - Select a scene that the group feels is indicative of the period and style.
 - Choose an interesting, important, and dramatic scene; those are the most fun.
 - Run Time: Scenes should run 1-2 minutes per person in the group.

- (4-person group = 4-8min, 6 person group = 6-12min, etc.)
 - You many NOT use scenes from plays read in class!
 - If a play was not originally composed in English, look at multiple translations.
 - *Do any members of your group speak the language it was originally written in?*
- Decide who in the group will do what:
 - Most students will be acting in some capacity.
 - Remember: designers, directors, & SM positions are important as well; can be doubled.
 - The entire group will dramaturg the scene collaboratively, but may split specific tasks.
- Present on the genre/period, play, scene and its historical importance:
 - Your group will craft a 20-minute presentation explaining the period, style, and play to our class in advance of the final performance.
 - Divide and conquer: One student might want to address the playwright, one might want to discuss the style or its inspiration, one might want to discuss why this particular play is so important, etc.
 - Each student needs to prepare a detailed handout about their area.
 - The play itself must be addressed, so that the class will understand the scene.
- Rehearse and Perform the scene:
 - Schedule rehearsals both in and outside class, and perform the scene fully realized.

Due Dates:

- 11/18 – Last Date to Choose Your Play and Stage Manager. Feel free to discuss ideas with your instructor in advance; final selections are due on this day.
- 11/20: Confirm scene selection and cast/production team responsibilities.
- 11/27 – Individual Final Handouts Due
- 12/2-12/4: Presentations on Period/Style/Significance of Play and/or Playwright
- Final Exam Timeslot: Final Presentation of Scenes (Off Book, Designed, & Awesome)

Grading of Scene:

20% - Group Presentation on Play/Period/Style

30% - Progress, Preparation, and Rehearsal

20% - Final Handout (on one specific topic within your group's chosen area)

30% - Final Group Performance

Very Small List of Some Example Genres/Periods/Styles from Theatre History:

- Ancient Greek (Comedy, Tragedy, Satyr)
- Ancient Roman (Comedy, Tragedy)
- Ancient Egypt
- Mayan/Mesoamerica cosmic drama.
- Medieval Theatre (Liturgical Drama, Morality Plays, Cycle Plays)
- Carnival Theatre Traditions
- Commedia Dell'Arte
- Spanish Golden Age Theatre
- English Renaissance (Elizabethan/Jacobean Theatre)
- Restoration Comedy
- Neoclassical Theatre
- Melodrama
- Romanticism
- The Well-Made Play
- Indian
 - Sanskrit Drama
 - Kathakali
- Japanese
 - Noh
 - Kabuki
 - Bunraku (puppet theatre from Japan)
- Chinese Opera
- Wayang Golek (puppet theatre from Indonesia)

Appendix C: Student Performance on Assessment Disaggregated by Program

MAJ	1.1 Organization				1.2 Language				1.3 Delivery				1.4 Supporting Material				1.5 Central Message			
	AY1617		AY1920		AY1617		AY1920		AY1617		AY1920		AY1617		AY1920		AY1617		AY1920	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
ACC	5	60.0%	7	100.0%	5	100.0%	7	100.0%	5	60.0%	7	100.0%	5	40.0%	7	100.0%	5	40.0%	7	100.0%
ARC	8	37.5%	1	100.0%	8	62.5%	1	100.0%	8	62.5%	1	100.0%	8	75.0%	1	100.0%	8	25.0%	1	100.0%
ASP	1	0.0%			1	100.0%			1	100.0%			1	100.0%			1	100.0%		
AVI	7	100.0%	11	72.7%	7	100.0%	11	81.8%	7	85.7%	11	81.8%	7	100.0%	11	90.9%	7	100.0%	11	90.9%
AVM	6	83.3%	6	83.3%	6	100.0%	6	83.3%	6	100.0%	6	83.3%	6	100.0%	6	83.3%	6	100.0%	6	83.3%
BAT	75	74.7%	18	94.4%	75	84.0%	18	100.0%	75	74.7%	18	88.9%	75	62.7%	18	83.3%	75	68.0%	18	100.0%
BUS	16	87.5%	10	90.0%	16	100.0%	10	90.0%	16	81.3%	10	80.0%	16	68.8%	10	90.0%	16	68.8%	10	90.0%
CIS	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	8	87.5%	7	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	71.4%	8	87.5%	7	85.7%
CNS	3	33.3%			3	66.7%			3	66.7%			3	33.3%			3	33.3%		
COM	30	66.7%	13	76.9%	30	80.0%	13	76.9%	30	36.7%	13	92.3%	30	76.7%	13	84.6%	30	70.0%	13	76.9%
CPS	4	75.0%	15	100.0%	4	75.0%	15	100.0%	4	50.0%	15	100.0%	4	75.0%	15	100.0%	4	75.0%	15	100.0%
CRJ			18	100.0%			18	100.0%			18	100.0%			18	100.0%			18	100.0%
CRT	77	79.2%	52	92.3%	77	76.6%	52	96.2%	77	57.1%	52	100.0%	77	79.2%	52	82.7%	77	79.2%	52	86.5%
ECH	19	89.5%			19	89.5%			19	94.7%			19	84.2%			19	89.5%		
EDB	2	50.0%	1	100.0%	2	50.0%	1	100.0%	2	50.0%	1	100.0%	2	50.0%	1	100.0%	2	50.0%	1	100.0%
EDH	3	100.0%	3	100.0%	3	100.0%	3	100.0%	3	66.7%	3	100.0%	3	100.0%	3	100.0%	3	66.7%	3	100.0%
EDL	6	100.0%	3	100.0%	6	100.0%	3	100.0%	6	100.0%	3	100.0%	6	100.0%	3	100.0%	6	100.0%	3	100.0%
EDP	4	75.0%			4	75.0%			4	75.0%			4	100.0%			4	75.0%		
EDS	1	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	2	100.0%
EED	40	90.0%	15	100.0%	40	90.0%	15	100.0%	40	92.5%	15	93.3%	40	97.5%	15	100.0%	40	92.5%	15	100.0%
ELT	11	81.8%			11	81.8%			11	63.6%			11	90.9%			11	90.9%		
ENR	2	50.0%			2	50.0%			2	50.0%			2	0.0%			2	50.0%		
ESW	29	89.7%	6	100.0%	29	89.7%	6	100.0%	29	65.5%	6	100.0%	29	86.2%	6	100.0%	29	89.7%	6	100.0%
FIR	1	0.0%			1	100.0%			1	100.0%			1	0.0%			1	0.0%		
GSP	67	83.6%	32	100.0%	67	89.6%	32	100.0%	67	76.1%	32	96.9%	67	89.6%	32	90.6%	67	88.1%	32	87.5%
HMS	11	72.7%	1	100.0%	11	81.8%	1	100.0%	11	63.6%	1	100.0%	11	90.9%	1	100.0%	11	63.6%	1	100.0%
INM	9	88.9%	2	100.0%	9	100.0%	2	100.0%	9	100.0%	2	100.0%	9	77.8%	2	100.0%	9	88.9%	2	100.0%
LAH	79	89.9%	14	92.9%	79	82.3%	14	100.0%	79	65.8%	14	100.0%	79	87.3%	14	85.7%	79	88.6%	14	92.9%
LAM	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%
LAX	23	69.6%	70	85.7%	23	69.6%	70	87.1%	23	56.5%	70	84.3%	23	65.2%	70	62.9%	23	65.2%	70	84.3%
MLT	10	100.0%	9	88.9%	10	100.0%	9	88.9%	10	90.0%	9	88.9%	10	90.0%	9	88.9%	10	100.0%	9	88.9%
MPC	2	100.0%			2	100.0%			2	100.0%			2	100.0%			2	100.0%		
NUR	52	100.0%	69	97.1%	52	100.0%	69	100.0%	52	98.1%	69	100.0%	52	100.0%	69	100.0%	52	100.0%	69	100.0%
PAL	9	77.8%	4	100.0%	9	100.0%	4	100.0%	9	55.6%	4	100.0%	9	66.7%	4	100.0%	9	77.8%	4	100.0%
PAR	10	80.0%			10	90.0%			10	90.0%			10	80.0%			10	90.0%		
PDC	14	92.9%	4	75.0%	14	71.4%	4	75.0%	14	64.3%	4	75.0%	14	78.6%	4	75.0%	14	100.0%	4	75.0%
PFA	47	83.0%	44	95.5%	47	87.2%	44	97.7%	47	87.2%	44	97.7%	47	74.5%	44	90.9%	47	80.9%	44	100.0%
PLL	2	100.0%			2	100.0%			2	0.0%			2	0.0%			2	0.0%		
TEA	1	100.0%			1	100.0%			1	100.0%			1	100.0%			1	100.0%		
UND	8	87.5%	7	85.7%	8	75.0%	7	85.7%	8	62.5%	7	85.7%	8	75.0%	7	57.1%	8	87.5%	7	85.7%
VAT	6	83.3%	15	86.7%	6	83.3%	15	93.3%	6	66.7%	15	93.3%	6	66.7%	15	86.7%	6	66.7%	15	86.7%
Total	709	83.2%	460	92.8%	709	86.0%	460	95.0%	709	73.5%	460	94.3%	709	81.4%	460	86.7%	709	81.9%	460	92.4%

Appendix D: Faculty Narrative Data

Course information is listed in the left column. Each box in the right column represents a different faculty member's narrative information.

Course	Narrative Data
AHS100	For the most part, students were able to organize the content in their presentation and focus on the central message. Delivery was notably difficult for many students (nervous, tentative, not comfortable). Almost all of the students were first semester college students.
	Overall the students did well attaining positive learning outcomes. Several students scored lower in the language and delivery categories as they were first semester students and had some language barriers.
AVI110	16 of 16 students enrolled in the course made a presentation. This is a second year 100 level course and students were evaluated at that level. 13/16 students scored at least a two or higher in each category. 3/16 scored a one in at least one category.
BUS210	<p>I assessed ISLO 1 in two sections of BUS 210 Business Communications, one traditional and one online. For each, to prepare students, we spent five to six weeks covering presentation design and delivery, including practice opportunities and at least one pre-assessment. The assessment measured multiple components of oral presentations:</p> <p>Design</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Content 2. Organization 3. Supporting material 4. Visual aids 5. Language <p>Delivery</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delivery 2. Vocal expressiveness 3. Gestures/movement 4. Eye contact/expressions 5. Timing/pace 6. Poise <p>Students were evaluated for each component on a scale of 1-4, where 1 = does not meet expectation, 2 = approaches expectation, 3 = meets expectation, and 4 = exceeds expectation.</p> <p>BUS 210-010 was a traditional course with 19 students. The assessed activity was an oral presentation of a business proposal at the end of the semester. 18 students participated. All participating students demonstrated clear improvement from pre-assessment to assessment.</p> <p>BUS 210-61A was an online course with 18 students. The assessed activity was an oral presentation of a business proposal at the end of the semester (students submitted videos). 10 students participated. All participating students demonstrated clear improvement from pre-assessment to assessment.</p>
	With regard to the ISLO #1 rubric, student scores showed expected results in all but one area (central message). Average scores for the five rating categories are:

	<p>Organization: 3.0 average rating, moderate competency This was the skill area with the highest average and included four students (31%) with a rating of 4/Advanced Competency. This is an expected outcome as Business Communication (BUS210) includes both written and oral communication and considerable time is spent working on content organization.</p> <p>Language: 2.92 average rating, just below moderate competency One student was rated a “2” while the remaining 12 received a “3” rating. This is an expected outcome, as the course has placed a significant focus on audience-appropriate language choices throughout the semester.</p> <p>Delivery: 2.54 average rating, modest competency This was the students’ first presentation that included visual aids and it appears that it impacted their delivery, specifically with regard to eye contact and body language.</p> <p>Supporting Material: 2.92 average rating, just below moderate competency Considerable time had been spent in class discussing the importance of building credibility by including supporting data and this is was demonstrated in students’ oral presentations.</p> <p>Central Message: 2.77 average rating, modest competency This is an area where a moderate competency was expected. While student presentations were well organized and supported, the central message was not explicitly repeated, particularly when needed to summarize and close with a call to action.</p> <p>Overall, students performed well with ratings between modest and moderate competency, which is appropriate for a 200-level course.</p> <p>Action/Modification: Allocate additional class time for students to practice delivering oral presentations using slide presentations to help them deliver information more effectively. Also, focus on the importance of repeating the central message throughout the presentation.</p>
CIS212	<p>Organization 80% support 61% Delivery 84% Language 77% Central Message 79%</p> <p>A number of students only completed the group presentation and did not complete the individual presentation.</p> <p>Also, the results on the supporting materials was surprisingly low given that all of these students are second year students in a technical curriculum. They have been heavily exposed to a variety of software to develop such material but chose not to use them in the presentation.</p> <p>The assessment was primarily based upon the individual presentation delivered at the end of the course. It was difficult to include a valid assessment for the group presentations since the students presentation in the group did not provide enough material for the individual rubric assessment areas.</p>

	<p>Action/Modification: A number of students only completed the group presentation and did not complete the individual presentation. In the future, more emphasis will be placed on the need to participate in the individual presentation. The percentage the presentation has on the final grade will be stressed.</p> <p>Also, the results on the supporting materials were surprisingly low given that all of these students are second year students in a technical curriculum. They have been heavily exposed to a variety of software to develop such material but chose not to use them in the presentation. Again more emphasis will be placed on the value of having supporting material and have them develop material earlier in the semester or as a progressive assignment from the beginning to the end of the class.</p>
NUR213	<p>85% of the class was able to score a perfect grade on the NUR 213-010 Oral communication teaching project. It is my hypotheses that the 15% of the class that scored less than perfect were uncomfortable with public presentation and speaking. These skills will be continually developed throughout the nursing course sequence.</p> <p>* NUR 213-010 and NUR 213-020 a combined cohort of 49 students, 73% was able to score a perfect grade on the oral communication teaching project.</p>
	<p>66% of the class was able to score a perfect grade on the NUR 213-020 Oral communication teaching project. It is my hypotheses that the 34% of the class that scored less than perfect were uncomfortable with public presentation and speaking. These skills will be continually developed throughout the nursing course sequence.</p> <p>* NUR 213-010 and NUR 213-020 a combined cohort of 49 students, but 48 completed the assignment,, 73% was able to score a perfect grade on the oral communication teaching project.</p>
PFA100	<p>Students who persevered in the course were largely successful. However, PFA100 has a relatively high attrition rate.</p>
	<p>"Organization" showed the highest level of accomplishment, followed by "Delivery" and "Supporting Material," with "Language" and "Central Message" showing the lowest competency. The nature of the assignment made some of these categories easier than others so I wasn't surprised that "Organization" showed the highest and "Central Message" showed the lowest competency.</p>
SPE101	<p>These results seem to be in line with the results from previous semesters. As expected, students seem to have performed better in organization and central message than in other categories - these skills have been developed since the first week of the course and tend to be the same across speech genres. However, language adaptation and (in particular) supporting material expectations are truly tested for the first time during the persuasive speech.</p> <p>Action/Modification: Spending more time on reasoning, argumentation, and claim-data-warrant/argument-reasoning-evidence theories in SPE101 may help. I will plan to spend an additional lesson there and see if there is an observable change. However, I think that these issues with supporting material deficiencies are not so much a problem with instruction in SPE101 but more so with the wholesale information literacy skills of first- and second-year students - I think the course assumes a certain base-level proficiency in making an evidence-based claim.</p>
	<p>Overall, students are not demonstrating strong delivery skills. Students read directly from presentation aids (such as PowerPoint,) fail to grasp that importance of eye contact and vocal variety, and do not use class time or time outside of class to properly/adequately rehearse presentations.</p> <p>Action/Modification: Speech Faculty should consider having a second look at developing a Speech Tutoring Center and/or collaborating with the DCC Writing and Tutoring Centers.</p>
THE105	<p>THE105 provides students an opportunity to dive into a facet of theatre history that interests them, and then research and report on that aspect of theatre. The tide in this course often lifts or lowers students together; this term was a tale of two opposite sections. THE105-010 was</p>

	<p>slower to engage in the process and the final projects were less engaged than is normal, thus the assessment scores likely average lower than the other section. THE105-020 was a particularly strong section, with a few remarkable students - who in turn raised the bar for others.</p> <p>Given that THE105 is a theatre class, the students are prepared toward the "delivery" metric throughout the term - and many excel in delivery during their final projects. However, it is also a history class, and for some students in their first term, their academic prowess is still developing. Thus, it is not unusual to see their "supporting material" (and perhaps "organization") skills trailing their delivery skills. This term I was slightly more prescriptive with the supporting materials for the final project, and will likely ramp that up a few notches for next year.</p> <p>Action/Modification: The THE105 final project guidelines will be updated and streamlined to further clarify appropriate supporting data, and I plan to integrate another library research section to help the students begin their research on sound footing.</p>
THE120	<p>All but one of the students achieved competency in all assessed areas. The student who did not achieve competency was rarely in class and missed most of the lecture, discussion, and activities revolving around this assignment. Another student did not do the assignment and has since dropped the class. Regarding the students who achieved competency, most fulfilled all aspects of the assignment in an organized manner. A couple of students forgot a part of their introduction or conclusion. When discussing the learning points or themes of their stories, a couple of students used language that was a bit unclear. A few students did not speak with appropriate volume or diction or animation of voice or body. A few students did not speak with appropriate eye contact to fully engage their audience.</p> <p>Action/Modification: The THE 120 extended course outline is slated for update next semester on the three-year cycle. I will make a minor adjustment to include a bit more emphasis on the importance of a speaker's eye contact with their audience in oral presentations.</p>
SCI100	<p>The oral communication performances of students in this class can, and have been rather varied. I'm not entirely sure whether this class is a good overall measure of the institution's student learning outcomes for oral communication, as many students struggle with English and a significant number of students need to develop their English language speaking skills.</p> <p>I think this class would be great to serve as a baseline assessment of ISLO 1 for internal DCC information, with a follow up ISLO 1 assessment of a second year course that would be reported to Middle States.</p>
	<p>Everyone received a 0 for supporting materials because my assignment did not require any supporting materials. I was not aware that this was needed for the assessment.</p> <p>Overall I found the students did better than expected for what was, for most of them, a first oral presentation in front of a group. Only one student needed to give her presentation to me privately due to nervousness, and many of the students found their rhythm and strength as they proceeded through the presentation.</p>
	<p>The results of my ISLO 1 assessment indicate that the criteria my students struggled with the most was Language. My results also showed that students who presented on the first day of presentations seemed to have better Organization, Delivery, Supporting Material and Central Message than those who presented on the second day. This suggests that, overall, those students who opted to present on the first day were more comfortable with public speaking and had a better understanding of their presentation material than those who presented on the second day. This further suggests that students as a whole could benefit from more practice presenting, and more exposure to the characteristics of a good presentation prior to their final oral presentation assessment.</p>

	<p>Action/Modification: The minor course update I would include in the future is a class period where students could pair up with a partner and practice their presentations. The partner could provide feedback using the rubric that would be used for the actual presentation. After the first partner was done presenting, they could go over the rubric together, share any constructive feedback, and then the other partner could present. This would give everyone a chance to make sure they were meeting the criteria of the rubric, and would also give them a chance to practice their language use and delivery.</p>
	<p>Two students out of 22 did not complete the assessment activity. In general, the students did a better job on their oral presentations than I had anticipated. I think the Dec. 3 DCC snow delay worked to most students advantage, in a way. Students were scheduled to give their presentations on Dec. 3, but DCC's delay cancelled our seminar class. So everyone had to go on Dec. 10 (the day of the final exam). My guess is that people were in pretty good shape before the snow delay, but they had more time to fine-tune things over the coming week. Students seems more relaxed than when they did their previous oral presentations on different topics in October. The majority of students were strongly in the "approaches standard" expected for students early in their college career. The most variation was in the "Delivery," with some 1s and 3s to go with the common 2s. There was also some variation in "language" and "supporting material," with some 3s to go with the common 2s. The students who scored higher for "language" and "supporting material" are getting ready to transfer, they are not first semester students.</p>