

Bergen Community College
School of Arts, Humanities and Wellness
Department of Communication

Report on 2011 and 2012 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in COM 100
July 17, 2012

The Communication Department conducted an assessment of student learning outcomes in the Speech Communication COM 100 course in the Spring 2011 semester. The assessment was the second step in the College's two-year assessment cycle. The steps of the plan and the timeframes are:

Step I, Fall 2010: Establish goals, develop the assessment plan

Step II, Spring 2011: Conduct the assessment

Step III, Fall 2011: Analyze the results

Step IV, Spring 2012: Develop recommendations for improving student learning outcomes, determine what to measure in the next assessment cycle, and how.

This spring the Department accelerated the next cycle of assessment. We conducted Steps I and II of the new assessment cycle: we established goals, developed the assessment plan; and conducted the assessment.

Following is an overview of the steps and a summary of the assessment results, as tabulated and reported by the Center for Institutional Effectiveness. The CIE tables of results are attached.

Step I - Fall 2010

In the Fall 2010 semester, the Communication Department agreed on a plan to assess student learning outcomes in the COM 100 course. The assessment was designed to measure three COM 100 Course Objectives as stated in the Course Guide:

Objective # 3, "To help students develop confidence in their ability to speak in public situations"

Objective # 2, "To develop an ability to speak effectively in personal, social, academic and business situations,"

Objective # 1, "To improve individual communication skills."

The goal was for 80% of the students to demonstrate satisfactory or excellent skills on the eight categories of competence on the Competent Speaker Evaluation Form. The department decided to evaluate students after their first major speech and again after their final major speech of the semester.

The assessment instrument the department decided to use is "The Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Form," developed by the Speech Communication Association Committee for Assessment and Testing (1993). The instrument has been validated to provide a "statistically valid and reliable tool for the assessment of public speaking performance." The instrument consists of eight areas of competence related to public speaking, four having to do with preparing the speech and four with delivering it.

Step II - Spring 2011

In the Spring 2011 semester, faculty members in the Communication Department conducted the assessment. They were asked to fill out a questionnaire for each student in one section, after the first speech at the beginning of the semester ("pre-test") and after the last speech at the end of the semester ("post-test"). The evaluation form had a space for a unique code to identify students, so results could be compared.

The assessment form was designed to be easy to use. To code students' speeches, faculty members just had to fill in one of three bubble codes for each of the 8 areas of competence: "excellent," "satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory." The grading rubric was printed on the back.

Ten faculty members submitted 167 pre- and post-test student evaluations that could be matched and compared. An additional 165 student assessments were submitted for the pre-test, but the coding could not be matched pre-and post test. The coding for the three categories of instructors was separate so the assessments could be analyzed for each group. Out of the eligible pool of 31 faculty members and adjuncts who teach a COM 100 course, matched assessments were submitted by 4 tenured or tenure track professors, 4 lecturers and 2 adjunct instructors.

The data was collected and input into the department's Tk20 report.

Overall, at least 90% of the students demonstrated competence in each of the measures.

Step III – Fall 2011

Following is a summary of the results analyzed by CIE. More information on the CIE tables of results is provided in a separate attachment:

1. The scores in the post-test phase ranged from 90.7% to 99.4% of students evaluated as "satisfactory" or "excellent" on all 8 measures of competence. This exceeded the department's goal, which was for 80% of the COM 100 students to be evaluated as competent speakers on 8 measures, at the end of the semester.
2. The overall mean increase in competency, as measured by the percent increase in the composite score on each of the measures, ranged from 14.8% on #2 (communicates thesis) to 26.7% on # 8 (physical behaviors). (Table 3 on the Attachment). All percent changes from pre- to post-test were statistically significant.
3. The highest measured areas of competency pre-instruction were #1 ("chooses a topic"), # 2 ("communicates thesis"), and #5 ("uses appropriate language). They were the highest areas of competency post-instruction as well. Improvement in these three measures ranged from 14.8% (item # 2) to 17.3% (item # 5).
4. When looking specifically at the "excellent" rating, these three areas were the strongest competency areas both pre- and post-instruction. The percent change in these categories was: #1 topic selection, from 48% evaluated as excellent pre-instruction to 81.5% percent excellent post-instruction; #2 thesis, from 37.5% excellent pre- to 71.4% post-instruction, and #5, language, from 32% pre- to 71.3% excellent post-instruction.

5. The three lowest measured areas of competency pre-instruction were # 6 (“uses vocal variety...”), # 8 (“uses physical behaviors...”) and #3 (“provides appropriate supporting material...”). Students showed significant improvement in these areas. Post-instruction, the percent of students evaluated as unsatisfactory on competency #6 decreased from 29.5% in the pre-instruction to 4.4% post-instruction (a 25.9% change); the percent unsatisfactory on #8 decreased from 22.9% pre-instruction to 3.7% post-instruction (a 26.7% change), and the percent unsatisfactory on #3 decreased from 18.2% to 9.6% (a 15% change).
6. The percent of students evaluated as “unsatisfactory” at the end of the semester ranged from 9.6% on # 3 (“provides supporting material”) and # 4 (“uses appropriate organizational pattern”) to 0.7% on # 1(topic selection).
7. When looking at the adjuncts in comparison to the tenure track faculty and lecturers, the results show there is not much difference in the assessments of the adjuncts. Because the number of adjuncts is so small in comparison to the lecturers and tenure track faculty, the differences cannot be analyzed easily. The differences can be due to preparation, how the competencies are taught, and the ratings used. While the differences were small, there were some adjunct scores that showed variation from the other instructors. It seems the adjuncts overrated # 7 on the pre-test. In the post-instruction evaluations, the adjuncts’ percent difference scores on items #7 and 8 are lower.
8. When looking at the overall percent increase results for the mean composite scores, note that the scores are based on a scale of 1.0 to 3.0, with the difference being just 2. Note the average: if it falls closer to 3, then the evaluation is excellent to satisfactory; if it’s closer to 1, then the composite is closer to unsatisfactory.

Step IV – Spring 2012

In the next stage of the assessment cycle the department evaluated the results and identified how we can use these results in the classroom to improve student learning outcomes. We determined what to measure in the next cycle and how.

The department decided to accelerate the assessment cycle and undertook Steps I and II of the next cycle.

The department made the following recommendations for the next assessment cycle:

1. The department decided to evaluate two areas of competence in more depth and to add questions on a specific element(s) within an area of competence.
2. We chose to focus on what we think are the most important areas:

“Provides appropriate supporting material” and

“Uses an organizational pattern appropriate to the topic, audience and occasion.”

On both items, the percent of students who were evaluated as unsatisfactory at the end of the Spring 2011 semester was 9.6%. While this was an improvement from the pre-instruction evaluations of, respectively, 18.2% unsatisfactory and 11.4% unsatisfactory, those areas are where we can have the most impact.

3. We determined that we would use the same assessment instrument. We expanded the ratings categories from the 3 categories in the Spring2011 assessment, to 5. In addition to “Excellent,” “Satisfactory,” and “Unsatisfactory,” we added “Above Average” and “Below Average.” The 5 rating categories would be collapsed to allow for comparison with the Spring 2011 assessment. The institutional research group agreed that this would be possible.
4. We expanded the rubric to reflect the 5 categories.
5. We again used a confidential coding system to match students’ pre- and post- assessments. The assessments need to be confidential to protect the privacy of both students and faculty members.
6. The assessment again evaluated students’ competence after the first informative speech and the final persuasive speech. We decided this provides a typical representation of student growth.
7. An important element of the next assessment cycle is to “close the loop” and incorporate a model lesson plan for the areas that will be assessed in more detail. For example, if we are looking at “provides appropriate supporting material,” then a lesson plan on that topic could be provided to the faculty members who are participating. If the assessment results show the lessons are effective in improving learning outcomes, we could provide them to all faculty members and used more broadly.
8. The department decided to accelerate the assessment cycle and conduct the next assessment in the Spring 2012 semester.
9. While all faculty members were invited to participate, we determined that we could use a smaller sample for this iteration. A sample size of as few as 25 - 30 responses would provide sufficient data.

Spring 2012 Assessment Results

The scores on the post-test ranged from 92.3% to 100% students evaluated as Excellent, Above Average or Satisfactory on all 8 competencies. There were 4 areas where students (N = 2) were evaluated as below average. No students were evaluated as unsatisfactory on any of the competencies.

The 4 areas where 7.7% of students were evaluated as below average are:

- develops logical main points and sub points
- provides appropriate supporting material
- uses vocal variety
- uses physical behaviors that support the verbal message.

One reason for the absence of unsatisfactory, at the post-test is that students who cannot perform typically drop the course.

The analysis also reported on the overall percent increase in competency, based on the scale of 1 to 5. The 4 areas showing the greatest percent increase in competency:

34.7%	3A	Cites credible sources
24.9%	4	Uses appropriate organizational pattern
22.8%	3	Provides appropriate supporting material
21.5%	5	Uses appropriate language

The 4 areas showing the least percent increase in competency:

4.7%	8	Uses physical behaviors that support the verbal message
4.8%	1	Chooses and narrows a topic appropriately
5.3%	2A	Develops logical main points and sub-points that support the thesis
11.8%	6	Uses vocal variety
20.9%	7	Uses appropriate pronunciation, grammar and articulation

There were 6 areas where students were evaluated as below average on the pretest; at the post-test, no students were below average or unsatisfactory in these areas:

- Chooses and narrows a topic (#1)
- Communicates the thesis (#2)
- Cites credible sources (#3A)
- Uses appropriate organizational pattern (#4)
- Uses appropriate language (#5)
- Uses appropriate pronunciation, grammar (#7)

The two areas of competence we focused on in the Spring 2012 assessment were # 3, “Provides appropriate supporting material based on the audience and occasion” and item # 4, “Uses an organizational pattern appropriate to the topic, audience, occasion and purpose.

	% Unsatisfactory Item # 3		% Unsatisfactory Item # 4	
	Pre-Instruction	Post-Instruction	Pre-Instruction	Post-Instruction
2011	18.2%	9.6%	11.4%	9.6%
2012	0 %	0 %	0 %	0%

Attached are two summaries from the 2012 Center for Institutional Effectiveness: the “Communication Course Evaluations: Spring 2012” and the “Communication Course Evaluations: Spring 2011.”

Observations

In the 2011 assessment, for items # 3 and # 4, the percent of students who were evaluated post-instruction as unsatisfactory was 9.6%. This was an improvement from the pre-instruction evaluations of 18.2% (item # 3) and 11.4% unsatisfactory (item # 4). In the 2012 assessment, no students were evaluated as unsatisfactory in these two areas, either pre-or post-instruction. There are several possible explanations:

1. Teachers are paying more attentive to these areas, earlier in the semester. After analyzing the results of the previous year’s assessment of student learning outcomes, they are possibly teaching these topics earlier in the semester, and using more targeted material.

2. These are fundamental competencies. Students who cannot master these areas are more likely to understand that they will not be able to pass the class, and will drop the course.

Conclusions

The assessment of student learning outcomes in COM 100 is valuable in several ways:

1. It provides useful information for teachers as to the areas where students have the most trouble. With this information, it is possible to develop lesson plans, modify and adapt the course to focus on what students are struggling with.
2. The information helps teachers plan how and when to cover topics that students have problems with.
3. An advantage of administering the assessment broadly is that the results are more representative of all faculty members.

Next Steps

Step III – Fall 2012.

The department will analyze the results in more detail in the Fall 2012 semester. We will identify 1 or 2 areas of competence to concentrate on. We will canvass the department to develop model lesson plans that can be made available to all COM 100 teachers for them to use at their discretion. We will consider whether to recommend to adjuncts that they use the model lesson plans. Other departmental recommendations may result from a more detailed review of the assessments.

Appendices:

CIE Communications Course Evaluations: Spring 2012

CIE Communications Course Evaluations: Spring 2011

The Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Form, Revised Spring 2012

The Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Form

Grading Rubric for The Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation, Revised Spring 2012

Grading Rubric for The Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation

Report submitted by:

Jane Phelps, Assistant Professor, Department of Communication

Elin Schikler, Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Communication

References

Morreale, Sherwyn P., Moore, Michael R., Taylorm, K. Phillip, Surges-Tatum, Donn and Hulbert-Johnson, Ruth, eds. "The Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Form. Washington, D.C.: National Communication Association, 1993.

BERGEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
CENTER FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
Communication Course Evaluations: Spring 2012

General Observations:

- The following data were received from 2 faculty members, who submitted pre- and post-test evaluations of 26 students. Students who did not complete one or either condition were not included in this analysis.
- During the second evaluation, no competency scores exceeded 8% Below-Average.
- The overall mean increase in competency, as measured by percentage increase in composite score (Table 2) was 17%.

Competency	Excellent		Above-Average		Satisfactory		Below-Average		Unsatisfactory	
	Pre-	Post	Pre-	Post	Pre-	Post	Pre-	Post	Pre-	Post-
1. Chooses and narrows a topic appropriately for the audience and occasion.	9 (34.6%)	7 (26.9%)	9 (34.6%)	17 (65.4%)	7 (26.9%)	2 (7.7%)	1 (3.8%)	0	0	0
2. Communicates the thesis/specific purpose in a manner appropriate for the audience and occasion.	2 (7.7%)	6 (23.1%)	11 (42.3%)	15 (57.7%)	12 (46.2%)	5 (19.2%)	1 (3.8%)	0	0	0
Develops logical main points and sub-points that support the thesis	2 (7.7%)	4 (15.4%)	11 (42.3%)	14 (53.8%)	13 (50%)	6 (23.1%)	0	2 (7.7%)	0	0
3. Provides appropriate supporting material based on the audience and occasion.	1 (3.8%)	8 (30.8%)	12 (46.2%)	16 (61.5%)	9 (34.6%)	0	0	2 (7.7%)	0	0
Cites credible sources when research is necessary and appropriate to elaborate on thesis	1 (3.8%)	2 (7.7%)	2 (7.7%)	15 (57.7%)	13 (50%)	9 (34.6%)	10 (38.5%)	0	0	0
4. Uses an organizational pattern appropriate to the topic, audience, occasion, and purpose.	5 (19.2%)	11 (42.3%)	4 (15.4%)	15 (57.7%)	14 (53.8%)	0	1 (3.8%)	0	0	0
5. Uses language that is appropriate to the audience, occasion, and purpose.	5 (19.2%)	15 (57.7%)	11 (42.3%)	11 (42.3%)	9 (34.6%)	0	1 (3.8%)	0	0	0
6. Uses vocal variety in rate, pitch, and intensity to heighten and maintain interest.	5 (19.2%)	8 (30.8%)	7 (26.9%)	14 (53.8%)	14 (53.8%)	2 (7.7%)	0	2 (7.7%)	0	0
7. Uses pronunciation, grammar, and articulation appropriate to the designated audience.	9 (34.6%)	20 (76.9%)	7 (26.9%)	4 (15.4%)	8 (30.8%)	2 (7.7%)	2 (7.7%)	0	0	0
8. Uses physical behaviors that support the verbal message.	9 (34.6%)	14 (53.8%)	10 (38.5%)	8 (30.8%)	6 (23.1%)	2 (7.7%)	1 (3.8%)	2 (7.7%)	0	0

Table 1: Pre- and Post-Test Tabulations

Table 2: Mean Composite Score* Overall Percent Increase

Competency	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Percent Change
1.Chooses and narrows a topic appropriately for the audience and occasion.	4.00	4.19	4.8%
2.Communicates the thesis/specific purpose in a manner appropriate for the audience and occasion.	3.54	4.04	14.1%
Develops logical main points and sub-points that support the thesis	3.58	3.77	5.3%
3.Provides appropriate supporting material based on the audience and occasion.	3.38	4.15	22.8%
Cites credible sources when research is necessary and appropriate to elaborate on thesis	2.77	3.73	34.7%
4.Uses an organizational pattern appropriate to the topic, audience, occasion, and purpose.	3.54	4.42	24.9%
5. Uses language that is appropriate to the audience, occasion, and purpose.	3.77	4.58	21.5%
6. Uses vocal variety in rate, pitch, and intensity to heighten and maintain interest.	3.65	4.08	11.8%
7. Uses pronunciation, grammar, and articulation appropriate to the designated audience.	3.88	4.69	20.9%
8. Uses physical behaviors that support the verbal message.	4.04	4.23	4.7%

*Composite scores are based on 26 students for whom data was available, according to the following scale:

Excellent = 5.00, Above Average = 4.00, Satisfactory = 3.00, Below Average = 2.00, Unsatisfactory = 1.00

BERGEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE, CENTER FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Communication Course Evaluations: Spring 2011

General Observations:

- The following data were received from 10 faculty members, who submitted pre- and post-test evaluations of 167 students. Students who did not complete one or either condition were not included in this analysis.
- During the post-test phase, no competency scores exceeded 10% Unsatisfactory.
- The overall mean increase in competency, as measured by percentage increase in composite score (Table 2) was 15%. All percent changes from pre- to post-test were statistically significant.

Table 1: Pre- and Post-Test Tabulations

Competency	Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory		Excellent	
	Pre-	Post-	Pre-	Post	Pre-	Post
1. Chooses and narrows a topic appropriately for the audience and occasion.	14 (8.4%)	1 (0.6%)	65 (38.9%)	29 (17.7%)	88 (52.7%)	134 (81.7%)
2. Communicates the thesis/specific purpose in a manner appropriate for the audience and occasion.	15 (9.0%)	2 (1.2%)	77 (46.1%)	43 (26.2%)	75 (44.1%)	119 (72.6%)
3. Provides appropriate supporting material based on the audience and occasion.	28 (16.8%)	15 (9.3%)	90 (53.9%)	59 (36.4%)	49 (29.3%)	88 (54.3%)
4. Uses an organizational pattern appropriate to the topic, audience, occasion, and purpose.	23 (13.8%)	15 (9.3%)	91 (54.5%)	48 (29.6%)	53 (31.7%)	99 (61.1%)
5. Uses language that is appropriate to the audience, occasion, and purpose.	11 (6.6%)	2 (1.2%)	93 (56%)	44 (27.0%)	62 (37.3%)	117 (71.8%)
6. Uses vocal variety in rate, pitch, and intensity to heighten and maintain interest.	52 (31.1%)	7 (4.5%)	74 (44.3%)	75 (48.4%)	41 (24.6%)	73 (47.1%)
7. Uses pronunciation, grammar, and articulation appropriate to the designated audience.	34 (20.5%)	7 (4.2%)	84 (50.6%)	64 (38.8%)	48 (28.9%)	94 (57.0%)
8. Uses physical behaviors that support the verbal message.	34 (20.4%)	6 (3.8%)	96 (57.5%)	59 (36.9%)	37 (22.2%)	95 (59.4%)

Table 2: Mean Composite Score* Overall Percent Increase

Competency	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Percent Change
1. Chooses and narrows a topic appropriately for the audience and occasion.	2.44	2.81	15.2%
2. Communicates the thesis/specific purpose in a manner appropriate for the audience and occasion.	2.36	2.71	14.8%
3. Provides appropriate supporting material based on the audience and occasion.	2.13	2.45	15.0%
4. Uses an organizational pattern appropriate to the topic, audience, occasion, and purpose.	2.18	2.52	15.6%
5. Uses language that is appropriate to the audience, occasion, and purpose.	2.31	2.71	17.3%
6. Uses vocal variety in rate, pitch, and intensity to heighten and maintain interest.	1.93	2.43	25.9%
7. Uses pronunciation, grammar, and articulation appropriate to the designated audience.	2.08	2.53	21.6%
8. Uses physical behaviors that support the verbal message.	2.02	2.56	26.7%

*Composite scores are based on 167 students for whom data was available, according to the following scale:

Excellent = 3.00, Satisfactory = 2.00, Unsatisfactory = 1.00

Bergen Community College
Spring 2012 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in COM 100:
The Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Form (Revised Feb. 2012)

Student Alphanumeric ID number _____

Date _____

Assign a number to each student. Keep a log of the number you assign to each student so you can use the same numbers for the post-instruction evaluation. This way the pre-and post-evaluations can be compared. You will be the only person who knows this number: the evaluations are completely anonymous.

Please fill in the appropriate bubble for each competency using this 5-point scale. The grading rubric is on the reverse side.

Competency	Excellent 5	Above Average 4	Satisfactory 3	Below Average 2	Unsatisfac- tory 1
1. Chooses and narrows a topic appropriately for the audience and occasion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Communicates the thesis/specific purpose in a manner appropriate for the audience and occasion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Develops logical main points and sub-points that support the thesis.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Provides appropriate supporting material based on the audience and occasion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cites credible sources when research is necessary and appropriate to elaborate on thesis.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Uses an organizational pattern appropriate to the topic, audience, occasion, and purpose.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Uses language that is appropriate to the audience, occasion, and purpose.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Uses vocal variety in rate, pitch, and intensity to heighten and maintain interest.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Uses pronunciation, grammar, and articulation appropriate to the designated audience.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Uses physical behaviors that support the verbal message.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Form
Spring 2011

Student Alphanumeric ID number _____

Date _____

Please fill in the appropriate bubble for each competency. .

Competency	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1. Chooses and narrows a topic appropriately for the audience and occasion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Communicates the thesis/specific purpose in a manner appropriate for the audience and occasion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Provides appropriate supporting material based on the audience and occasion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Uses an organizational pattern appropriate to the topic, audience, occasion, and purpose.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Uses language that is appropriate to the audience, occasion, and purpose.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Uses vocal variety in rate, pitch, and intensity to heighten and maintain interest.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Uses pronunciation, grammar, and articulation appropriate to the designated audience.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Uses physical behaviors that support the verbal message.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Spring 2012 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in COM 100: Grading Rubric for *The Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Form*

Objective/ Criteria	Performance Indicators Excellent 5 points	Above Average 4 points	Satisfactory 3 points	Below Average 2 points	Unsatisfactory 1 point
Topic Selection	The speaker presents a topic and a focus that are exceptionally appropriate for the purpose, time constraints and audience.	The speaker presents a topic and focus that are excellent for the purpose, time, constraints and audience.	The speaker presents a topic and a focus that are appropriate for the purpose, time constraints and audience.	The speaker presents a topic and focus that are below average in appropriateness for the purpose, time or audience.	The speaker presents a topic and a focus that are not appropriate for the purpose, time or audience.
Thesis/Specific Purpose	The speaker communicates a thesis/specific purpose that is exceptionally clear and identifiable .	The speaker communicates a thesis/specific purpose that is above average in clarity.	The speaker communicates a thesis/specific purpose that is adequately clear and identifiable .	The speaker communicates a thesis/purpose that is below average in clarity.	The speaker does not communicate a clear and identifiable thesis/ specific purpose.
Supporting Material	The speaker uses supporting material that is exceptional in quality and variety.	The speaker uses supporting material that is above average in quality and variety.	The speaker uses supporting material that is appropriate in quality and variety.	The speaker supporting material is below average in quality and variety.	The supporting material is not appropriate in quality and variety.
Organizational Pattern	The speaker uses an exceptional introduction and conclusion and provides exceptionally clear and logical progression within and between ideas.	The speaker uses an above average introduction and conclusion and provides above average logical progression within and between ideas.	The speaker uses an appropriate introduction and conclusion and provides a reasonably clear and logical progression within and between ideas.	The speaker uses an introduction and conclusion that are below average and/or provides below average logical progression within and between ideas.	The speaker fails to use an introduction or conclusion and fails to provide a reasonably clear and logical progression within and between ideas.
Language Use	The speaker uses language that is exceptionally clear, vivid and appropriate.	The speaker uses language that is above average in clarity, vividness and appropriateness.	The speaker uses language that is reasonably clear, vivid and appropriate.	The speaker uses language that is below average in clarity, vividness or appropriateness.	The speaker uses unclear or inappropriate language.
Vocal Variety	The speaker makes exceptional use of vocal variety in a conversational mode.	The speaker is above average in using vocal variety in a conversational mode.	The speaker makes acceptable use of vocal variety in a conversational mode.	The speaker is below average in using vocal variety in a conversational mode.	The speaker fails to use vocal variety and fails to speak in a conversational mode.
Pronunciation/ Grammar/ Articulation	The speaker has exceptional articulation, pronunciation and grammar .	The speaker is above average in articulation, pronunciation, and grammar .	The speaker has acceptable articulation, with few pronunciation or grammatical errors .	The speaker is below average in articulation, pronunciation and grammar .	The speaker fails to use acceptable articulation, pronunciation and grammar .
Physical Behaviors	The speaker demonstrates exceptional posture, gestures, bodily movement, facial expressions, eye contact, and dress .	Speaker uses above average posture, gestures, bodily movement, eye contact and facial expressions and dress .	The speaker demonstrates acceptable posture, gestures, facial expressions, eye contact and dress .	The speaker demonstrates below average posture, gestures, facial expressions, eye contact and dress .	Speaker fails to use acceptable posture, facial expressions, eye contact, gestures, and dress .

Spring 2011 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in COM 100: Grading Rubric for
The Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Form

<u>Objective/Criteria</u>	<u>Performance Indicators</u> Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Topic Selection	The speaker presents a topic and a focus that are exceptionally appropriate for the purpose, time constraints and audience.	The speaker presents a topic and a focus that are appropriate for the purpose, time constraints and audience.	The speaker presents a topic and a focus that are not appropriate for either the purpose, time constraints or audience.
Thesis/Specific Purpose	The speaker communicates a thesis/specific purpose that is exceptionally clear and identifiable .	The speaker communicates a thesis/specific purpose that is adequately clear and identifiable .	The speaker does not communicate a clear and identifiable thesis/specific purpose.
Supporting Material	The speaker uses supporting material that is exceptional in quality and variety.	The speaker uses supporting material that is appropriate in quality and variety.	The speaker uses supporting material that is inappropriate in quality and variety.
Organizational Pattern	The speaker uses an exceptional introduction and conclusion and provides exceptionally clear and logical progression within and between ideas.	The speaker uses an appropriate introduction and conclusion and provides a reasonably clear and logical progression within and between ideas.	The speaker fails to use an introduction or conclusion and fails to provide a reasonably clear and logical progression within and between ideas.
Language Use	The speaker uses language that is exceptionally clear, vivid and appropriate.	The speaker uses language that is reasonably clear, vivid and appropriate.	The speaker uses unclear or inappropriate language.
Vocal Variety	The speaker makes exceptional use of vocal variety in a conversational mode.	The speaker makes acceptable use of vocal variety in a conversational mode.	The speaker fails to use vocal variety and fails to speak in a conversational mode.
Pronunciation/ Grammar/ Articulation	The speaker has exceptional articulation, pronunciation and grammar .	The speaker has acceptable articulation , with few pronunciation or grammatical errors.	The speaker fails to use acceptable articulation, pronunciation and grammar .
Physical Behaviors	The speaker demonstrates exceptional posture, gestures, bodily movement, facial expressions, eye contact, and use of dress .	The speaker uses acceptable posture, gestures, facial expressions, eye contact and dress .	The speaker fails to use acceptable posture, gestures, facial expressions, eye contact, and dress .