2021 Fanuchånan Oral Communication Assessment Report

Assessing Graduating Seniors

Office of Institutional Effectiveness
303 University Drive
UOG Station, Mangilao, GU 96923
671-735-2646
oie@triton.uog.edu
www.uog.edu/oie

UNIVERSITY OF
GUAM
UNIBETSEDÅT GUÅHAN

Assessing Core Competencies: Results of Oral Communication Assessment

2021 Fanuchånan (Fall)

Table of Contents

2021 Fanuchånan Oral Communication Assessment Report

SUMMARY

In Fanuchånan (Fall) 2021, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness conducted the institutional assessment of undergraduate oral communication skills. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, seniors were to participate in the submission of self-recorded speeches as an administrative requirement for graduation. Results from the assessment indicate that the strongest criterion was Central Message. The weakest criterion was Supporting Materials.

METHODOLOGY

To measure the proficiency of oral communication skills, students were asked to submit a brief, three-to-five-minute response to one of two prompt questions. The questions were:

Option 1: What would you like your future employers to know about you that is not on your resume or grades? (31%)

Option 2: Describe your dream job and how your university education has prepared you for it? (69%)

As with the previous assessment of oral communication, the AAC&U Oral Communication Value Rubric was selected as the assessment instrument. Two faculty raters from Communication rated a sampling of the student artifacts. The criteria for evaluation are listed below:

- Organization Pattern
- Language
- Delivery Technique
- Speaker's Disposition
- Supporting Materials
- Central Message

A total of 161 graduating seniors submitted recordings to a secure OneDrive account. To compile ratings, QuestionPro was used to develop a survey to collect rubric scores and open-ended comments from raters. A sample 50 recordings was selected using random stratified sampling. Recordings were grouped by academic program and then randomly selected to match the proportion of the number of graduating seniors by program to that of the entire graduating population. 5 recordings were excluded from analysis due to incomplete ratings.

RESULTS

INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

At the institutional level, *Central Message* was the strongest criterion with 72% of rated artifacts at the capstone level. Conversely, *Supporting Materials* was the weakest criterion with 44% rated at the capstone level (Table 1).

Table 1. Percentage Distribution of Rubric Criteria

	N	Capstone Level	Milestones 3	Milestones 2	Meets Benchmark
Organization Pattern	45	61%	34%	4%	0%
Language	45	47%	49%	4%	0%
Delivery Technique	45	52%	30%	18%	0%
Speaker's Disposition	45	59%	34%	7%	0%
Supporting Materials	45	44%	50%	4%	0%
Central Message	45	72%	28%	0%	0%

Note: N refers to the number of student artifacts rated.

COLLEGE LEVEL

When disaggregated by college, SOE received the highest ratings in four out of the six rubric criteria categories (*Organization Pattern, Delivery Technique, Speaker's Disposition, and Central Message*). SBPA ranked the highest in *Language*. SENG ranked the highest in *Supporting Materials.* (See Tables 2.1-2.6).

Note: SOH results only include Social Work and Health Science majors given that Nursing typically does not confer degrees in the Fanuchånan semester.

Table 2.1 Percentage Distribution of Organization Pattern by College

	N	Capstone Level	Milestones 3	Milestones 2	Meets Benchmark
CLASS	5	60%	40%	0%	0%
CNAS	7	50%	36%	14%	0%
SBPA	21	67%	31%	2%	0%
SENG	4	63%	25%	13%	0%
SOE	6	67%	33%	0%	0%
SOH	2	25%	75%	0%	0%
UOG TOTAL	45	61%	34%	4%	0%

Table 2.2 Percentage Distribution of Language by College

	N	Capstone Level	Milestones 3	Milestones 2	Meets Benchmark
CLASS	5	50%	50%	0%	0%
CNAS	7	29%	64%	7%	0%
SBPA	21	57%	38%	5%	0%
SENG	4	25%	75%	0%	0%
SOE	6	50%	50%	0%	0%
SOH	2	25%	50%	25%	0%
UOG TOTAL	45	47%	49%	4%	0%

Table 2.3 Percentage Distribution of Delivery Technique by College

	N	Capstone Level	Milestones 3	Milestones 2	Meets Benchmark
CLASS	5	60%	30%	10%	0%
CNAS	7	43%	29%	29%	0%
SBPA	21	57%	29%	14%	0%
SENG	4	38%	38%	25%	0%
SOE	6	67%	17%	17%	0%
SOH	2	0%	75%	25%	0%
UOG TOTAL	45	52%	30%	18%	0%

Table 2.4 Percentage Distribution of Speaker's Disposition by College

	N	Capstone Level	Milestones 3	Milestones 2	Meets Benchmark
CLASS	5	80%	10%	10%	0%
CNAS	7	36%	57%	7%	0%
SBPA	21	62%	31%	7%	0%
SENG	4	25%	63%	13%	0%
SOE	6	83%	17%	0%	0%
SOH	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
UOG TOTAL	45	59%	34%	7%	0%

Table 2.5 Percentage Distribution of Supporting Materials by College

	N	Capstone Level	Milestones 3	Milestones 2	Meets Benchmark
CLASS	5	40%	60%	0%	0%
CNAS	7	50%	43%	7%	0%
SBPA	21	43%	50%	5%	0%
SENG	4	63%	38%	0%	0%
SOE	6	50%	50%	0%	0%
SOH	2	0%	75%	25%	0%
UOG TOTAL	45	44%	50%	4%	0%

Table 2.6 Percentage Distribution of Central Message by College

	N	Capstone Level	Milestones 3	Milestones 2	Meets Benchmark
CLASS	5	80%	20%	0%	0%
CNAS	7	64%	36%	0%	0%
SBPA	21	74%	26%	0%	0%
SENG	4	63%	38%	0%	0%
SOE	6	83%	17%	0%	0%
SOH	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
UOG TOTAL	45	72%	28%	0%	0%

PROGRAM LEVEL

For this semester, results were disaggregated at the program level. With the sample size of 50, many programs have 2 or less student artifacts. For this reason, program level data should not be used for comparative purposes against other programs. Additionally, the data provided reflects 2 ratings per artifact, therefore, there may be instances where there is only one student that was rated at 2 different levels.

Table 3.1 Percentage Distribution of Organization Pattern by Program

	N	CAPSTONE LEVEL	MILESTONES 3	MILESTONES 2	MEETS BENCHMARK
ACCOUNTING	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION	13	62%	38%	0%	0%
CIVIL ENGINEERING	4	63%	25%	13%	0%
CRIMINAL JUSTICE	3	67%	17%	17%	0%
ENGLISH	3	50%	50%	0%	0%
SECONDARY EDUCATION	4	75%	25%	0%	0%
UOG TOTAL	45	61%	34%	4%	0%

Table 3.2 Percentage Distribution of Language by Program

	N	CAPSTONE LEVEL	MILESTONES 3	MILESTONES 2	MEETS BENCHMARK
ACCOUNTING	3	67%	33%	0%	0%
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION	13	65%	27%	8%	0%
CIVIL ENGINEERING	4	25%	75%	0%	0%
CRIMINAL JUSTICE	3	17%	83%	0%	0%
ENGLISH	3	33%	67%	0%	0%
SECONDARY EDUCATION	4	63%	38%	0%	0%
UOG TOTAL	45	47%	49%	4%	0%

Table 3.3 Percentage Distribution of Delivery Technique by Program

	N	CAPSTONE LEVEL	MILESTONES 3	MILESTONES 2	MEETS BENCHMARK
ACCOUNTING	3	67%	33%	0%	0%
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION	13	65%	23%	12%	0%
CIVIL ENGINEERING	4	38%	38%	25%	0%
CRIMINAL JUSTICE	3	17%	50%	33%	0%
ENGLISH	3	67%	33%	0%	0%
SECONDARY EDUCATION	4	75%	25%	0%	0%
UOG TOTAL	45	52%	30%	18%	0%

Table 3.4 Percentage Distribution of Speaker's Disposition by Program

	N	CAPSTONE LEVEL	MILESTONES 3	MILESTONES 2	MEETS BENCHMARK
ACCOUNTING	3	67%	33%	0%	0%
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION	13	69%	27%	4%	0%
CIVIL ENGINEERING	4	25%	63%	13%	0%
CRIMINAL JUSTICE	3	33%	50%	17%	0%
ENGLISH	3	83%	17%	0%	0%
SECONDARY EDUCATION	4	100%	0%	0%	0%
UOG TOTAL	45	59%	34%	7%	0%

Table 3.5 Percentage Distribution of Supporting Materials by Program

	N	CAPSTONE LEVEL	MILESTONES 3	MILESTONES 2	MEETS BENCHMARK
ACCOUNTING	3	83%	17%	0%	0%
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION	13	46%	50%	0%	0%
CIVIL ENGINEERING	4	63%	38%	0%	0%
CRIMINAL JUSTICE	3	0%	83%	17%	0%
ENGLISH	3	33%	67%	0%	0%
SECONDARY EDUCATION	4	50%	50%	0%	0%
UOG TOTAL	45	44%	50%	4%	0%

Table 3.6 Percentage Distribution of Central Message by Program

	N	CAPSTONE LEVEL	MILESTONES 3	MILESTONES 2	MEETS BENCHMARK
ACCOUNTING	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION	13	73%	27%	0%	0%
CIVIL ENGINEERING	4	63%	38%	0%	0%
CRIMINAL JUSTICE	3	50%	50%	0%	0%
ENGLISH	3	67%	33%	0%	0%
SECONDARY EDUCATION	4	100%	0%	0%	0%
UOG TOTAL	45	72%	28%	0%	0%

RECOMMENDATIONS

Due to the low sample size of 50 recordings, a large percentage of programs include 1 or 2 recordings in the analyses. This low number of recordings per program make comparisons of oral communication results at the program level less reliable due to potential bias. Increasing the sample size per program will allow for a more accurate comparison of program performance and will lead to the inclusion of more programs in the program-level section of the final report. Rating the entire population of graduating seniors will yield stronger assessment results and allow for enhanced opportunities for addressing oral communication deficiencies.

CONCLUSION

At the institutional level, *Central Message* was the strongest criterion while *Supporting Materials* was the weakest criterion. When disaggregated at the college level, graduating seniors from SOE had the strongest oral communication proficiencies with the highest scores in 4 out of 6 rubric categories.

ORAL COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can by shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

The type of oral communication most likely to be included in a collection of student work is an oral presentation and therefore is the focus for the application of this rubric.

Definition

Oral communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.

Framing Language

Oral communication takes many forms. This rubric is specifically designed to evaluate oral presentations of a single speaker at a time and is best applied to live or video-recorded presentations. For panel presentations or group presentations, it is recommended that each speaker be evaluated separately. This rubric best applies to presentations of sufficient length such that a central message is conveyed, supported by one or more forms of supporting materials and includes a purposeful organization. An oral answer to a single question not designed to be structured into a presentation does not readily apply to this rubric.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- Central message: The main point/thesis/"bottom line"/"take-away" of a presentation. A clear central message is easy to identify; a compelling central message is also vivid and memorable.
- Delivery techniques: Posture, gestures, eye contact, and use of the voice. Delivery techniques enhance the effectiveness of the presentation when the speaker stands and moves with authority, looks more often at the audience than at his/her speaking materials/notes, uses the voice expressively, and uses few vocal fillers ("um," "uh," "like," "you know," etc.).
- Language: Vocabulary, terminology, and sentence structure. Language that supports the effectiveness of a presentation is appropriate to the topic and audience, grammatical, clear, and free from bias. Language that enhances the effectiveness of a presentation is also vivid, imaginative, and expressive.
- Organization: The grouping and sequencing of ideas and supporting material in a presentation. An organizational pattern that supports the effectiveness of a presentation typically includes an introduction, one or more identifiable sections in the body of the speech, and a conclusion. An organizational pattern that enhances the effectiveness of the presentation reflects a purposeful choice among possible alternatives, such as a chronological pattern, a problem-solution pattern, an analysis-of-parts pattern, etc., that makes the content of the presentation easier to follow and more likely to accomplish its purpose.
- Supporting material: Explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities, and other kinds of information or analysis that supports the principal ideas of the presentation. Supporting material is generally credible when it is relevant and derived from reliable and appropriate sources. Supporting material is highly credible when it is also vivid and varied across the types listed above (e.g., a mix of examples, statistics, and references to authorities). Supporting material may also serve the purpose of establishing the speakers credibility. For example, in presenting a creative work such as a dramatic reading of Shakespeare, supporting evidence may not advance the ideas of Shakespeare, but rather serve to establish the speaker as a credible Shakespearean actor.

ORAL COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

Association of American Colleges and Universities

Definition

Oral communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone 4	Milestones 3	Milestones 2	Benchmark 1
Organization	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation.
Language	Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, 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	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable.
Supporting Material	A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) 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 (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) 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 (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.