

# CENTRAL ARKANSAS"

UCA Core Assessment Annual Brief Effective Communication (AY 18-19)

Prepared by: Jacob M. Held, PhD. Assistant Provost for Academic Assessment and General Education February 2020

# **Table of Contents**

I. Prefatory

# II. Introduction

# III. Results

- A. Rubric A (Oral)
  - Overall
  - Overall by level
  - Central Message
  - Organization
  - Supporting Material/Evidence
  - Context and Audience
  - Verbal and Nonverbal Delivery
  - Evaluation of results
- B. Rubric B (Written)
  - Overall
  - Overall by level
  - Central Message
  - Organization
  - Supporting Material/Evidence
  - Context and Audience
  - Control of Syntax and Mechanics
  - Evaluation of results
- C. Rubric C (Collaboration)
  - Overall
  - Overall by level
  - Evaluation of results
- IV. Recommendations
- V. Appendices

Appendix-A: AQUA Performance Summary - Rubric A

Appendix-B: AQUA Performance Summary - Rubric B

Appendix-C: AQUA Performance Summary - Rubric C

Appendix-D: Evaluator Feedback on Rubrics A and B

# I. Prefatory

The following report covers assessment efforts for the Effective Communication Core competency over the academic year of 2018-2019. Assessment efforts include pre-assessment cycle training, annual artifact collection, scoring, and reporting, as well as end of cycle improvement plans. This report includes a narrative account of all components of the assessment cycle as well as selected data informing those narratives. The intention of this report is to inform the UCA Core Council and other relevant stakeholders regarding the present state of the curriculum as regards the Effective Communication competency.

The report is comprised of three main parts. The first part is an introduction to the process of programmatic assessment of the UCA Core curriculum, including details pertaining to the process itself, as well as the context in which the processes and results are used to inform curricular recommendations. The second part, which comprises the bulk of the report, contains selected assessment data for each component of the Effective Communication competency as well as analyses of those data and summary conclusions. The third part of the report is comprised of conclusions regarding general trends deduced from the data as well as recommendations for programmatic improvement.

The intention of this report is to be advisory to the UCA Core Council and all relevant stakeholders of the general education program at UCA. This report was compiled by Dr. Jacob Held, Assistant Provost for Academic Assessment and General Education in his capacity as primary administrator of the UCA Core curriculum and chair of the UCA Core Council.

# II. Effective Communication

The UCA Core is assessed on a four-year cycle. Each year one competency area is addressed. For AY 2018-2019, Effective Communication was scheduled to be assessed. This competency area faced unique challenges, as discussed below, but the procedure was similar as had been used in previous years. The semester prior to the academic year scheduled for assessment, training sessions were offered for all faculty scheduled to be teaching a course in the Effective Communication area during AY 18-19. Multiple sessions were scheduled for each rubric area, with times being scattered throughout the week to offer several opportunities for faculty to attend. Dr. Held facilitated all sessions in coordination with content area experts. Topics included rubric interpretation, assignment design and selection, as well as a briefing on the process of artifact collection and scoring.

# Rubric A (Oral)

Sessions: April 17<sup>th</sup> 2018 (x-period); April 19<sup>th</sup> 2018 (x-period); April 20<sup>th</sup> 2018 (3:00 pm)

Total attendance: 17 faculty

# Rubric B (Written)

Sessions: April 9<sup>th</sup> 2018 (3:00 pm); April 10<sup>th</sup> 2018 (x-period); April 12<sup>th</sup> 2018 (x-period)

Total attendance: 27 faculty

# **Rubric C (Collaboration)**

Sessions: April 2<sup>nd</sup> 2018 (3:00 pm); April 4<sup>th</sup> 2018 (3:00 pm); April 5<sup>th</sup> 2018 (x-period)

Total attendance: 9 faculty

Overall, attendance at these sessions was poor. Far too few faculty who teach in these areas attended these sessions as noted by the fact that all first-year seminars assess under both Rubric B and Rubric C, yet attendance for the former was 27 whereas the latter only had 9 total attendees. Thus, a minimum of 18 faculty who should have attended Rubric C training failed to attend. Poor attendance indicates a disinterest in the process of general education assessment. This lack of engagement translates into poor participation and thus poor data. In addition, poor attendance at these information sessions foments confusion during the academic year during which assessment takes place. Faculty are unprepared to participate leading to greater work on behalf of assessment staff. In addition, there were concerns raised about collecting oral communication artifacts that could have been readily addressed in these sessions. Instead, faculty who were uninformed due to failure to attend these sessions became recalcitrant to a process they did not understand. Misinformation became wide spread and assessment staff had to address the academic council and faculty senate to clarify issues pertaining to the process. Faculty need to be more engaged in this process at all stages, and the office of assessment will continue to work and offer opportunities for them to participate, yet responsibility ultimately rests on faculty to be active participants in delivering their curriculum and participating in all assessment efforts for that curriculum.

After pre-assessment training, the office of assessment prepared to collect student artifacts during AY 18-19. As noted above, the Effective Communication competency area posed unique challenges in this regard. Whereas Rubric B (Written) allowed for submission of traditional artifacts, such as papers,

essays, exams...Rubric A (Oral) required the collection of student presentations in the form of speeches or other forms of oral presentations. This posed a unique challenge. After consultation with area experts, it was determined that the best process would be to record student presentations in their usual classroom environment by means of portable cameras and upload these video artifacts into AQUA, the assessment software used to house and score all artifacts. A list of presentation times was compiled from the surveys sent to faculty and assessment staff were dispatched to record these presentations in a standard format for later review. Although it would have been logistically possible to record the full population of presentations, given staffing limitations it was determined that a stratified, random sample would be pre-determined and collected. These artifacts were then uploaded into AQUA. The process ran smoothly and will be revisited before the second cycle.

Rubric C also posed a unique challenge since the rubric is designed to be administered by students to students as a peer assessment of student performance in collaborative learning. The Office of Assessment was aware that calibration would be a problem and the results would be problematic. This was borne out as indicated below.

However, all of the issues that were foreseen and which arose through the pre-cycle training process and the actual collection process were valuable learning experiences. This first cycle of assessment proved invaluable in assessing the process itself and in assisting the Office of Assessment in evaluating assessment processes.

# Artifacts:

During AY 18-19, the Office of Assessment attempted to collect artifacts from all courses designated under the Effective Communication Core competency including all Lower and Upper division courses so designated as well as first-year seminar and capstone courses. Faculty teaching these courses were identified through ARGOS. All identified faculty were contacted multiple times by means of email. They were provided with a link to a google form. The form asked for information regarding what artifact would be chosen, when it would be administered to students, and when and how it would be delivered to the Office of Assessment.

## Survey Response Rate:

Fall 2018: 36.54% response rate to the survey (203 contacted, 74 responded)

Spring 2019: 30.63% response rate to the survey (222 contacted, 68 responded)

AY 2018-2019: **37.87%** total response rate to the Effective Communication assessment survey (272 contacted, 103 responded)

Response rate indicates percentage of respondents in relation to total number of faculty identified as teaching a course identified as assessing under the Effective Communication Core competency. This rate does not reflect actual artifacts collected.

The response rate was disappointing, and raises several issues for assessment of the UCA Core. Since we had a significantly low rate of response to the survey, and it is reasonable to assume actual collected artifacts would be a sub-set of the survey responses, since not all that completed a survey did in fact turn in artifacts, nor were all artifacts received usable for assessment purposes due to various factors, the resultant assessment data is problematic. Since we had a low response and this response is not random, but exhibits patterns, the resultant data is not reasonably generalizable. However, we still did review all the collected material and provide an analysis below, keeping in mind the problematic nature of the data.

## **Review of Artifacts:**

Evaluation of the artifacts took place August 14-16, 2019. The evaluation team was recruited from faculty who had participated in the assessment process, participation including teaching a course in the designated area as well as having completed a survey and submitted artifacts. The evaluation team consisted of:

- Rubric A (Oral)
  - Kari Naylor, PhD (Associate Professor, Dept. of Biology)
  - Kelly Quinn, MSN, RN (Clinical Instructor, Dept. of Nursing)
  - Monica Lieblong, CFCA (Professor, Dept. of Family and Consumer Sciences)
  - Staci Fritzges, (Lecturer, School of Communication)
- Rubric B (Written)
  - Jen Talbot, PhD (Associate Professor in Writing, School of Communication)
  - Michael Rosenow, PhD (Associate Professor, Dept. of History)
  - Sonya Fritz, PhD (Associate Professor, Dept. of English)

- Yiling Deng, PhD (Assistant Professor of Insurance and Risk Management)
- Rubric C (Collaboration)
  - N/A (Students scored peers. All rubric data entered into AQUA by Jacob Held and Alyson McEntire)

Evaluators were remunerated \$250 per day. During the three days evaluators participated in calibration exercises as well as artifact scoring. Days consisted of routine evaluation work from 8:00 am until 4:30 pm with intermittent breaks as evaluators deemed appropriate.

A total of 1451 artifacts were collected across all three rubrics. Of the total 1451, 1041 were scored by our evaluators, for a total completion rate of 71%. For Rubric A (Oral), a total of 266 artifacts were collected. Of the total 266, 246 were scored. For Rubric B (Written), a total of 799 artifacts were collected. Of the total 799, 587 were scored. Rubric C is the outlier since the artifacts for this area are scored by classmates and the scores merely recorded by the office of assessment. However, for Rubric C (Collaboration) we received 298 artifacts.

Artifacts	Rubric A	Rubric B	Rubric C	Total
Total	266	799	298	1451
Processed	246	587	298	1041
Percentage	92.4%	73.4%	100%	71%

In terms of interrater reliability, there was reasonable joint probability of agreement. Twenty percent of artifacts were scored by two evaluators. For these artifacts, 46% of the time there was no deviation between the scorers. 42% of the time the deviation was one point. On average, across all artifacts the average deviation was .64, with the mode equal to 0, and the median equal to 1. That is, for a plurality of results, there was no deviation, when there was deviation it was equal to or less one point a majority of the time. This indicates fair consistency across the team. However, looking at Intraclass Correlation we find:

Intraclass	Correlation	Coefficient
------------	-------------	-------------

	Intraclass	95% Confidence Interval		F Test with True Value 0			
	Correlation®	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Value	df1	df2	Sig
Single Measures	.323 <sup>a</sup>	.240	.400	2.009	540	540	.000
Average Measures	.488°	.388	.572	2.009	540	540	.000

Two-way mixed effects model where people effects are random and measures effects are fixed.

a. The estimator is the same, whether the interaction effect is present or not.

b. Type A intraclass correlation coefficients using an absolute agreement definition.

c. This estimate is computed assuming the interaction effect is absent, because it is not estimable otherwise.

Here we note an ICC value of .488. Given an acceptable degree of correlation to be .70 or greater, we find here that interrater reliability falls below a tolerable level for reliable agreement. That is, this statistic suggests that roughly 50% of the variance is due to actual factors relative to the artifact scored, and 50% of variance is due to chance. Thus, agreement between scorers is as likely attributable to chance as it is to any factor relevant to the student artifact.

#### III. Results

Assessment in higher education ought to be driven by the idea that reliable data can be used to inform curricular changes to improve student learning. The goal is always on student performance. But if you want to improve student performance you must know where your students are and whether or not your curricula is impactful on their intellectual development. Thus, there must be moments of assessment where student performance is measured consistently, according to an objective standard, across time. Each of these requirements poses its own challenges. When interpreting assessment data in higher education it is important to note some key points. Firstly, the methodology used is often derived from the behavioral and social sciences. However, the higher education environment makes it difficult, if not impossible, to maintain the conditions necessary for reliable statistical analysis within these standards. Samples are small, or in isolated communities, there are myriad factors influencing any variable, all of which cannot be controlled for, nor is it possible to offer control groups as withholding educational opportunities from students for experimental purposes is unethical. The data collected, therefore, must be interpreted in light of these structural barriers, which are endemic to the nature of the study. But while these barriers cannot be removed, they can be ameliorated.

We can get reliable data in terms of identifying trends so long as we know wherein the problems lie and work intentionally to mitigate them. With Core assessment, we have striven to lessen these barriers where possible. We collect student work from the entire population in order to derive a representative sample. Faculty participation is crucial here, since failure to participate undermines the effort. These artifacts are all scored on the same rubric, by a single team of calibrated, trained, faculty scorers. We offer training to faculty on assignment design prior to artifact collection, thus allowing faculty to use individual assignments, not standardized ones, while maintaining a consistency of expectation. Again, faculty participation is crucial in these efforts. We can see trends, we can see high points and low points. That being said, if a general education program is to be assessed for common student learning outcomes at a university the size of UCA, the means by which we are doing so addresses, as well as can be addressed, the limitations inherent in assessment in higher.

## **RUBRIC A (ORAL)**

Rubric A posed a unique challenge insofar as it was difficult to collect student work. In order to collect student artifacts, the Office of Assessment had to record student presentations. Although we had the assistance of student workers, we were understaffed so collecting the population of student artifacts in this area was not feasible. Thus, we collected a stratified, random sample based on survey responses. However, given low participation rate in response to the survey, this sample only reflects respondents, so it does not reflect the full student population under this rubric. The data below, therefore, must be interpreted cautiously.



#### **Overall Average**

# By Criterion



The overall data does indicate that across the five SLOs included under Rubric A, "Supporting Material and Evidence" and "Verbal and Non-Verbal Delivery" are areas where there is room for development.



## Lower Division Average and by Criterion

Looking at the breakdown of the scores at the lower division, we see similar patterns to the overall scores above with Supporting Material/Evidence and Verbal and Non-Verbal Delivery underperforming in relation to the other SLOs of the rubric.

# Upper Division Average and by Criterion



At the upper division, we are able to discern whether or not students seem to improve from their performances at the lower division. Here we note the greatest growth in the Supporting Material/Evidence SLO (Median moving from 2 to 2.75) with marked improvement in both the Organization and Context (Median moving from 2.5 to 3) and Audience (Median moving from 2.5 to 3) SLOs. This indicates that in terms of the theoretical components of oral communication our students are growing over time. However, Verbal and Non-Verbal delivery remains low, actually decreasing slightly, thus suggesting no development over time.

#### **SLO 1: Central Message**

Central Message: The topic, thesis, or main point of the communication that is consistent with the purpose of the assignment.

#### **Overall Average**



#### **Overall Frequency**



#### LD Average



## LD Frequency



#### UD Average



#### **UD** Frequency



#### **SLO 2: Organization**

Organization: The grouping of material in the communication, including a specific introduction, conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions.

#### **Overall Average**



#### **Overall Frequency**



#### LD Average



## LD Frequency



#### UD Average



## **UD** Frequency



It was noted above that there was improvement across the Organization outcome. We see this reflected in the outcome data by an increase in average from LD to UD scores from 2.51 to 2.76. However, most

notable in this regard is the frequency data with shows a negative skew indicating higher frequencies at the upper end of the scale, that is, a higher proportion of high scores (3s and 4s) at the upper division.

#### **SLO 3: Supporting Material/Evidence**

Supporting Material/Evidence: Explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities, or other kinds of information or analysis that support the central message

#### **Overall Average**



## **Overall Frequency**



#### LD Average



# LD Frequency



# UD Average



## **UD** Frequency



This outcome was where we saw improvement. Here we note that the general average on this outcome was 2.4, whereas the LD Average was 2.36. The UD average was 2.41. Thus, there is improvement. Most notable, however, is the frequency data where from LD to UD students we see a movement towards

higher scores of 3s and 4s. We'd hope to see significantly more 3s and 4s than 1s and 2s and the given distribution doesn't indicate as much. But we do see a shift from LD to UD courses indicating student growth. We're moving in the right direction, but there is room for improvement.

#### **SLO 4: Context and Audience**

Context and Audience: The people and situations surrounding the communication, including the cognitive, social, and cultural factors that influence the audience and communicator.

#### **Overall Average**



# **Overall Frequency**



## LD Average



# LD Frequency



# UD Average



# **UD** Frequency



## **SLO 5: Delivery**

Verbal and Nonverbal Delivery: Posture, gesture, eye contact, vocal expressiveness (loudness, tone, emphasis), and vocal fillers ("um," "uh," "like," "you know," etc.).

#### **Overall Average**



#### **Overall Frequency**



#### LD Average



#### LD Frequency







# **UD** Frequency



This outcome, as noted above, shows no growth. In fact, student performance declines from the lower to upper division. (LD average = 2.31 and UD average = 2.23). Most striking is the lack of exemplary scores at the upper division (score of 4 (exemplary) = 0). At the UD level not a single student achieved a 4 (exemplary) score. Clearly, we can improve upon this outcome.

# **RUBRIC B (WRITTEN)**

# **Overall Average**



# Overall by Criterion



# LD Overall Average



# LD Overall Frequency



From the data, we note that the strongest area of performance for lower division students is the Control of Syntax and Mechanics outcome. The lowest performing SLO is Supporting Material/Evidence.

# UD Overall Average



# UD Overall Frequency



At the upper level, one notable issue is the failure of the Supporting Material/Evidence SLO to show marked improvement. Our students do not appear to be developing across this outcome.

# SLO 1: Central Message

Central Message: The topic, thesis, or main point of the communication that is consistent with the purpose of the assignment.

#### **Overall Average**



## **Overall Frequency**



## LD Average



#### LD Frequency



# UD Average



# **UD** Frequency



Clear improvement across time.

# **SLO 2: Organization**

Organization: The grouping of material in the communication, including a specific introduction, conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions.

#### **Overall Average**



#### **Overall Frequency**



#### LD Average



# LD Frequency



## UD Average



## **UD** Frequency



Clear and significant improvement across time (LD Average = 2.27, UD Average = 2.6). Notice the drastic increase in proportion of high scores (3s and 4s) to lower scores (1s and 2s) at the Upper Division.

#### SLO 3: Supporting Material/Evidence

Supporting Material/Evidence: Explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities, or other kinds of information or analysis that support the central message.



# **Overall Average**

## **Overall Frequency**



#### LD Average



# LD Frequency



## UD Average



# **UD** Frequency



A more detailed analysis of SLO 3 shows improvement from the lower to upper divisions. However, it is still one of the lowest performing outcomes on average. At the upper division we would hope to see a skew favoring scores of 3 and 4 and instead there is a slight positive skew indicating a below average median score. There is growth, but still much room for improvement.

#### **SLO 4: Context and Audience**

Context and Audience: The people and situations surrounding the communication, including the cognitive, social, and cultural factors that influence the audience and communicator.

#### **Overall Average**



## **Overall Frequency**



## LD Average



# LD Frequency



#### UD Average



# **UD** Frequency



Students overall perform well on SLO 4, and clearly improve from lower to upper division course work, yet there are markedly few exemplary scores.

### **SLO 5: Syntax and Mechanics**

Control of Syntax and Mechanics: The use of language to communicate meaning, including word choice, sentence and paragraph structure, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

#### **Overall Average**



## **Overall Frequency**



#### LD Average



# LD Frequency



## UD Average



## **UD** Frequency



The data for SLO 5 shows virtually no movement, yet relatively high, consistent performances indicating that students possess and maintain a fairly high level of competency in syntax and mechanics. This result betrays the common, anecdotal narrative that "our students can't write." Students seem to possess the necessary mechanics for competent writing, indicating that the narrative complaint is demanding

exemplary writing, not basic competency, or that the perceived lack of skill may lie elsewhere other than control of syntax and mechanics.

The data would suggest that it is in the use of supporting material and evidence, as well as context and audience where the scores are decent but progress only slightly. Given the nature of SLO 4 as effectively a measure of rhetorical skill, this lack of development might help explain the common complaint about students' lack of writing ability. Students seem to fail to know how to use evidence adeptly, and do not articulate their positions forcefully and with nuance given audience and context. Thus, although written communication is a foundation to a liberal/general education, and although our students possess mechanical ability, they lack rhetorical skills such as evidentiary use and sensitivity to audience. In order to reinforce these skills, an emphasis on rhetoric, as opposed to the mechanics and structure of writing might be valuable.

# RUBRIC C (COLLABORATION)

Rubric C (Collaboration) of the Effective Communication competency area is defined as:

Goal C: Students will apply appropriate verbal and nonverbal strategies to promote collaboration.

This rubric assesses the following two specific skill or knowledge areas related to Goal C:

- Individual Contributions: The contributions of a single student that advances a group project, including the timely completion of assigned tasks, thorough and comprehensive work, articulating the merits of alternative ideas or proposals, building constructively upon the contributions of others, and being punctual, focused, and prepared.
- Fosters Constructive Team Climate: Student behaviors that promote collaboration among group members, including being respectful and positive, motivating and assisting teammates, and engaging with teammates in ways that facilitate their contributions.

This rubric was designed to be applied by students to peers. This is both intuitive and inopportune. It is intuitive insofar as if you want to evaluate a student on their performance in a group, the only individuals with intimate knowledge of those performances would be other members of the group. It is inopportune insofar as the reliability of scores will be irreparably suspect insofar as it would be impracticable to calibrate all students on the rubric to assure that interrater reliability was within an acceptable level. One simply cannot train all students on the rubric and its application, not to mention that the scorer is scoring a member of their own group thus adding an element of bias into the scoring process. Thus, this process is fundamentally flawed when it comes to collecting reliable data on student performance across these outcomes.

The data bear out the consequences of this flawed methodology. The overall average on this rubric was a 3.68, with median scores at both the LD and UD levels of assessment being a 4, the top most score. Students, thus, scored their classmates remarkably high suggesting one of several possible hypotheses. First, students filled out the rubric to be the best of their ability and indicated a stellar performance by everyone. This interpretation would be indicative that students weren't critical in their discernment since, it is unreasonable to presume that everyone is excellent. Second, the consistent high scores indicate a lack of interest in completing the rubric thus scoring all members a 4 out of ease. Third, students may have scored their classmates as exceptional out of courtesy motivated by empathy or a misunderstanding that this score impacted student grades, thus a 4 indicates a charitable disposition on the part of the scorer more than the competence of the student being scored. Regardless, the scores, and the method by which they were obtained, indicate a fundamental flaw in assessing these outcomes by the method adopted.

# **Overall Average**



# **Overall Frequency**



## LD Average



# LD Frequency



#### UD Average



#### **UD** Frequency



Given the results and the hypotheses proffered accounting for the results, it is recommended with respect to Rubric C of Effective Communication that, although collaboration is a laudable learning outcome, one that ought to be pursued, and a valuable skill to be inculcated in students at UCA, assessing this outcome in the manner currently in use cease. The collection of rubrics is a cumbersome process, it requires effort on the part of students, faculty, and staff, the results are uninformative. Barring an alternative assessment technique with respect to measuring collaboration, although educational opportunities with respect to collaboration should continue, assessment should cease. Alternatives to assessment could include training for all faculty who teach first-year students, since this outcome is primarily housed within first-year seminar courses, on promoting successful collaborative experiences for, and fomenting successful collaborative skills in students.

## IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

RUBRIC A: Although students performed well across the board on outcomes dealing with the structure and organization, they underperformed significantly on delivery. There are various ways to interpret this result. Faculty may be failing to prompt students to perform along the outcome, or faculty may be failing to emphasize this component of Oral Communication. In evaluator comments, we do notice that a frequent issue raised is lack of fit between the assignment provided as an artifact of student performance and the rubric outcomes. Regardless, this low performance demonstrates a place for improvement, and one that is needful. Oral Communication resides in the UCA Core as a result of surveying both best practices in general education and employer wants and needs in terms of employee skills. The fact that our students underperform on "Delivery," that is, the actual performance of an oral presentation is problematic. In order for students to be effective public speakers, orators, rhetors, or simply competent communicators, they need to be able to perform well on all facets of oral communication, including delivery. It is recommended that these results be communicated to faculty whom routinely teach oral communication designated courses, and faculty development be offered to facilitate better teaching along this outcome. We should encourage faculty to focus on delivery as they educate their students.

RUBRIC B: As with Rubric A, students performed well, and showed improvement on outcomes one might classify as technical, such as central message, organization, and syntax and mechanics. However, students performed less well on outcomes related to supporting material and evidence as well as audience and context. So as with Rubric A, although our students are competent at the structural components of writing, they are less skillful in effectively operationalizing their writing into rhetorically effective performances sensitive to audience and context, as well as adeptly using evidence. Given, as with Rubric A, written communication is promoted to facilitate development of our students into functional users of the skill, their inability to operationalize the skill is problematic. So as with Rubric A, it is recommended that these results be communicated to faculty whom routinely teach written communication, and faculty development be offered to facilitate greater focus along these outcomes.

Overall, what can reasonably be gleaned from the results of Rubric A and B, is that our students perform well on the mechanical components of writing and presenting, but lack competency in rhetorical art. Insofar as this is demonstrated by a lack of growth, greater focus should be placed at the upper division in educating students about disciplinary conventions and best practices. Thus, although the trope "My students can't write," is common among faculty, they can write in the sense that they can perform the tasks necessary for technically accurate use of language. Where they are lacking is in the realm of stylistic nuance and performance in regards to audience and context as well as delivery and the proper use of evidence. What this indicates is that students are lacking skills in, and would probably benefit from, a classical education in rhetoric as well as specific direction in terms of disciplinary conventions at the upper division.

RUBRIC C: It is recommended with respect to Rubric C of Effective Communication that although collaboration is a laudable learning outcome and a valuable skill to be promoted with students at UCA, that assessing this outcome in the manner currently employed cease. The collection of rubrics is a cumbersome process, it requires effort on the part of students, faculty, and staff, the results are unreliable and provide no guidance. Alternatives could include development opportunities for faculty who teach first-year students, since this outcome is primarily housed within first-year seminar courses.

In addition, there could be promotion of collaborative learning experiences and qualitative assessment of the outcomes in the form of surveys or some alternative mechanism.

Compliance continues to be an issue. The compliance rate fell from 41% to 37.87%. Poor compliance undermines the entire assessment cycle. Poor compliance means a skewed sample from which to derive data, which in turn means dirty data and corrupted results. Poor results lead to distrust that foments distaste for assessment reinforcing a self-fulfilling narrative of the lack of value of assessment. However, increased participation would lead to better results, more useful results, and thus increase support for and value in assessment. Hence, compliance is crucial. One way to assist in this matter is to continue to promote a culture of assessment through educational opportunities. Partnering with the CTE might be a beneficial way to do so. Related to the issue of deriving adequate samples from the population is assignment design. As noted in the comments (Appendix D) to the rubrics, often student artifacts failed to address the learning outcomes of the rubric under which they fell. Poor assignment design, unclear prompts or expectations, and in general poor alignment between assignments and the rubric leads to bad data, a poor window onto our students actual abilities within a competency. Again, educational opportunities are offered, but greater efforts could be made. Collaborating with the CTE would be beneficial in this regard as well.

# Aqua

# Outcome Performance Report: Effective Communication: (A) Oral

Filtering by		
Student Demographics	Gender	All
	Race/Ethnicity	All
	US Residency Status	All
	US Residency State	All
	Country of Origin	All
	Marital Status	All
	First Generation Student	All
	Transfer Student	All
	Pell Eligibility	All
	Major	All
	Minor	All
	Full-time or Part-time	All
	Degree Level	All
	Class Level	All
	Student Type	All
	GPA	All
	Credits Earned	All
Assignment Data	Assignment	All
Courses	Course	All
	Course Section	All

Viewing by C1 - Central Message





#### Outcome Performance Report: Effective Communication: (A) Oral Average by Performance chart details

#### Central Message

Average Score: 2.63 Number of Submissions: 243 Number of Scores: 295

#### Outcome Performance Report: Effective Communication: (A) Oral



#### SCORE DISTRIBUTION BY CRITERION

Score Range: 0-0.9 Number of Submissions: 0

Score Range: 1-1.9 Number of Submissions: 13

Score Range: 2-2.9 Number of Submissions: 97

Score Range: 3-3.9 Number of Submissions: 108

Score Range: 4 Number of Submissions: 25

# Aqua

# **Outcome Performance Report:** Effective Communication: (B) Written

Filtering by		
Student Demographics	Gender	All
	Race/Ethnicity	All
	US Residency Status	All
	US Residency State	All
	Country of Origin	All
	Marital Status	All
	First Generation Student	All
	Transfer Student	All
	Pell Eligibility	All
	Major	All
	Minor	All
	Full-time or Part-time	All
	Degree Level	All
	Class Level	All
	Student Type	All
	GPA	All
	Credits Earned	All
Assignment Data	Assignment	All
Courses	Course	All
	Course Section	All

Viewing by All Criteria

#### Outcome Performance Report: Effective Communication: (B) Written



#### Outcome Performance Report: Effective Communication: (B) Written Average by Criterion chart details

#### Central Message

Average Score: 2.36 Number of Submissions: 507 Number of Scores: 550

#### Organization

Average Score: 2.39 Number of Submissions: 578 Number of Scores: 633

# Supporting Material /Evidence

Average Score: 2.23 Number of Submissions: 568 Number of Scores: 622

#### Context and Audience Average Score: 2.33

Number of Submissions: 585 Number of Scores: 640

#### Control of Syntax and Mechanics Average Score: 2.64 Number of Submissions: 586 Number of Scores: 641

#### Outcome Performance Report: Effective Communication: (B) Written



#### SCORE DISTRIBUTION BY CRITERION

#### Central Message

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 507

#### Organization

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 578

#### Supporting Material /Evidence

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 568

#### Context and Audience

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 585

#### Control of Syntax and Mechanics

#### Central Message

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 507

#### Organization

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 578

#### Supporting Material /Evidence

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 568

#### **Context and Audience**

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 585

#### Control of Syntax and Mechanics

#### Central Message

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 507

#### Organization

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 578

#### Supporting Material /Evidence

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 568

#### Context and Audience

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 585

#### Control of Syntax and Mechanics

#### Central Message

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 507

#### Organization

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 578

#### Supporting Material /Evidence

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 568

#### Context and Audience

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 585

#### Control of Syntax and Mechanics

#### Central Message

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 507

#### Organization

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 578

#### Supporting Material /Evidence

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 568

#### Context and Audience

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 2 Number Of Submissions: 585

#### Control of Syntax and Mechanics

# Aqua

# **Outcome Performance Report:** Effective Communication: (C) Collaboration

Filtering by		
Student Demographics	Gender	All
	Race/Ethnicity	All
	US Residency Status	All
	US Residency State	AII
	Country of Origin	All
	Marital Status	All
	First Generation Student	All
	Transfer Student	All
	Pell Eligibility	All
	Major	All
	Minor	All
	Full-time or Part-time	AII
	Degree Level	All
	Class Level	All
	Student Type	All
	GPA	All
	Credits Earned	AII
Assignment Data	Assignment	All
Courses	Course	MSIT4325: DISCIPLINARY LITERACY, HIST4398: The Politics of Sex and Sexuality in Modern East Asia
	Course Section	HIST4398-22692, MSIT4325-12562, MSIT4325-12569, MSIT4325-21423, MSIT4325-29913, MSIT4325-32246

Viewing by All C



# Outcome Performance Report: Effective Communication: (C) Collaboration

# Outcome Performance Report: Effective Communication: (C) Collaboration Average by Criterion chart details

Individual Contributions Average Score: 3.83 Number of Submissions: 99 Number of Scores: 103

Fosters Constructive Team Climate Average Score: 3.78 Number of Submissions: 99 Number of Scores: 103

# Outcome Performance Report: Effective Communication: (C) Collaboration



#### Individual Contributions

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 4 Number Of Submissions: 99

#### Fosters Constructive Team Climate

#### Individual Contributions

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 4 Number Of Submissions: 99

#### Fosters Constructive Team Climate

#### Individual Contributions

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 4 Number Of Submissions: 99

#### **Fosters Constructive Team Climate**

#### Individual Contributions

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 4 Number Of Submissions: 99

#### Fosters Constructive Team Climate

#### Individual Contributions

Maximum Score: 4 Minimum Score: 1 Median Score: 4 Number Of Submissions: 99

#### **Fosters Constructive Team Climate**

#### Appendix D

#### Scorer Feedback, Rubric A:

Delivery - no visual aid; not appropriately dressed; not enough eye contact, a lot of verbal fillers and lack of awareness of body movements"

No resources or references cited in the presentation.

The video recorder was moving and it made it hard to watch and the video was blurry.

Delivery - visible note cards, not very conversational, reading at times from notes

No visual aid..."

Student unprepared and 0 is dedicated for the performance in all Student Learning Outcome areas.

Delivery - Video too long, nervous, articulation problems"

video is only 5 seconds long

very informal presentation- more of a oral draft of data collected

Extremely difficult to hear the speaker. Visual aid/power point unable to view.

this is an informational presentation, this rubric is for a "formal" presentation, biggest issue is central message needs to be explicitly stated- not inferred

because of the assignment, the central message is unstated. For purposes of this rubric a statement to clarify the goal of the assignment is needed. Or instructions to the students, submitted would be helpful. Additionally the rubric requires a "professional" talk, which this assignment appears to be more informational (less of an organized) presentation.

I was not able to score this presentation well since it did not following the rubric. The assignment may need to be changed.

No references or resources were cited/stated. Therefore, I could not score Evidence.

hard to determine supporting material as the background white noise is loud and visual aids are not on camera.

Poor sound quality and if visual aids were used could not see them.

The student was hard to hear due to the buzzing of the mike.

"It appears that the assignment consists of going over a power point that students are following along with. It would be helpful to see powerpoint.

Scored low on Supporting material because I didn't hear any sources - they could be noted on the slides but should also be cited orally."

Mostly reading from slides I am unable to view

No references or resources cited. Could not score evidence since this was apparently an interview of an organization.

Resources/ references is limited or absent due to it being an interview of a corporation.

Central message is unclear- its probably very apparent to the audience who have the assignment instructions.

Student is referencing images that cannot be seen in this artifact. To fairly assess this assignment, the assessor should be able to see the images that accompany the presentation.

"Very difficult to hear with background noise. Screen and visual is unable to be seen. reading from a slide

#### Scorer Feedback, Rubric B:

No central message can be deduced; it's a series of disconnected answers to various questions.

No central message can be deduced; it's a series of answers to various questions.

No central message can be deduced. This seems to be a series of answers to assigned questions.

No central message can be deduced. It's just a series of disconnected statements about the Core.

There is no central message that can be deduced here; it seems to be just answers to a series of questions.

There is no central message--this just seems to be disconnected answers to assigned questions.

No central message can be deduced; it's a series of answers to various questions.

The assignment is not designed to be assessed by the effective communication writing rubric.

This appears to be a reflection/series of answers to assigned questions. No central message can be deduced.

No central message can be deduced; it's a series of answers to various questions.

Central message cannot be deduced--this appears to be some kind of reflection on another assignment, and I can't tell what the other assignment focused on. There's a car being built? But participants eat it?

No central message can be deduced; it's a series of answers to various questions.

There is no clear central message--this appears to be a reflection/series of responses to assigned questions.

There is no central message; this appears to be a reflection with no single, specific communication goal.

No central message can be deduced; this just seems to be a response to assigned questions.

The file appears contain only one page of a multi-page paper, but I felt I had enough information to evaluate the artifact. Other artifacts addressing this assignment have contained the same three-paragraph structure, which means a majority of the work is likely presented.

Part of the last page was unreadable as a result of a scanning error, but I feel that I saw enough of this artifact to score it accurately. It's a good specimen of written communication!

There is no central message--it's just a series of answers to some assigned questions.

These are answers of two questions instead of an essay. It is hard to use the rubrics to assess the assignment.

No central message can be deduced; it's a series of answers to assigned questions.

There is no one central message here.

No central message can be deduced; it's a series of answers to various questions.

There is no clear central message here; it's a series of answers to assigned questions

No central message can be deduced; it's a series of answers to assigned questions.

There is no one central message--it's just a series of answers to various questions.

There is no central message here. It's a series of disconnected answers to questions. There is also no organizational pattern here--the nature of the assignment itself seems to preclude it.

No central message can be deduced. It's just a series of disconnected responses to assigned questions

The assignment is not suitable to be assessed by the writing effective communication Rubric B.

No central message can be deduced; it appears to be a series of answers to various questions but I'm not sure.

No central message can be deduced; it's a series of answers to various questions.

There is no central message here. This seems to be short answers to questions on an assigned video. There is also no organizational pattern. The assignment appears to not require/encourage it.

The essay doesn't cite enough details about each dashboard to support its arguments. I had to look at the pictures and think about them myself.

This assignment is trying to analyze the user interface of a brand of security robots, but the writer has no access to information about the user interface.

There were two artifacts associated with this student. The rubric scores were more applicable or representative of the first artifact than the second.

There were three artifacts of varying quality associated with this student. The rubric evaluation mainly applied to the file Meaning of Life Paper 1.doc.

There are a number of key phrases, sentence, and passages in this essay that I have read in a previous artifact for this class. The Aqua system does not allow us to go back and see things we've already scored, so I can't investigate further. However, I think either the system has sent me back the same paper, or the content of these papers is based so heavily on lecture notes that it calls into question whether they are effective artifacts for assessing the criteria on Rubric B.

This paper describes a day in the student's life but does not contain a central message I could discern.