

# Program Learning Outcome Assessment Plan Template

## General Information

Academic Year of Implementation: 2010 – 2011

**Academic Program / Discipline Area (for General Education) or Co-Curricular Program Area**

(Items Highlighted in red require primary attention in the planning process – not all highlighted areas need to be completed):

Communication: Speech

**Planning Team:**

| Planning Team Leader(s) <sup>1</sup> | Campus      | E-mail Address   | Phone Extension | Mail Code |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--|-----------------|-----------|
| Kim Long                             | East        | <a href="mailto:klong@valenciacollege.edu">klong@valenciacollege.edu</a>     |                 |           |
| Suzette Dohany                       | Winter Park | <a href="mailto:sdohany@valenciacollege.edu">sdohany@valenciacollege.edu</a> |                 |           |
| Planning Team Members <sup>2</sup>   | Campus      | E-mail Address   | Phone Extension | Mail Code |
|                                      |             |  |                 |           |
|                                      |             |  |                 |           |
|                                      |             |  |                 |           |

<sup>1</sup> Planning Team Leaders assume the responsibility for coordinating activities associated with the expectations for the design, approval and implementation of Assessment Plans. See the attached documents entitled **Program Outcome Assessment Plan Approval and Improvement Process** and **Program Outcome Assessment Plan Approval and Improvement Process – Student Affairs**

<sup>2</sup> Planning Team membership, whenever possible, should reflect the **Principles for selection of members for assessment plan work teams**. For faculty teams the principles include: Collegewide representation where possible; Full-time faculty from the respective program / discipline (tenured, tenure track, and Non-Tenure Earning 4 / 8 / 10 month faculty); Adjunct faculty when an adequate number of full-time faculty do not teach in the program / discipline; Faculty from both disciplines or programs when an outcome is assessed in two programs or a program other than the primary discipline. For plans developed in Student Affairs planning teams should include the following: Collegewide representation where possible; Staff from the targeted program area; Part-time Student Affairs professionals when an adequate number of full-time staff do not work in the targeted program area; Faculty / staff from other program / discipline areas working on the same or similar outcomes; Students representation when possible.

# Learning Outcomes and Performance Indicators

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Academic Program / Discipline Area (for General Education) or Co-Curricular Program Area:</b></p> <p>Speech Communication</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Targeted Program Learning Outcome:</b></p> <p>Develop, organize, and support the verbal message.<br/> <b>Communication Skills: Oral</b><br/> Engage in effective oral communication.</p>  | <p><b>Targeted Course(s), Co-Curricular Program or Student Activity associated with the Academic Program:</b></p> <p>SPC 1608</p>   |
|   | <p><b>Targeted Outcome(s) within the Course(s), Co-Curricular Program or Student Activity identified above:</b></p> <p>Extemporaneous delivery of informative speech.</p>   |
| <p><b>Performance Indicators for the Program Learning Outcome(s) selected:</b></p> <p><b>Organization</b><br/> <b>Language</b><br/> <b>Delivery</b><br/> <b>Supporting Material</b><br/> <b>Central Message</b></p>   | <p><b>Performance Indicators for Outcome(s) within the Course(s), Co-Curricular Program or Student Activity selected:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Student will be able to Encode clear messages using appropriate language, articulation, pronunciation, and paralinguistic qualities</li> <li>2. Student will be able to Effective preparation and inconspicuous use of speaker notes for extemporaneous delivery</li> <li>3. Student will be able to Present a structured message with an introduction, main points, useful transitions, and a conclusion</li> <li>4. Student will be able to Present clearly defined terms and concepts supported with a variety of supporting material</li> </ol> |
| <p><b>Common Assessment</b> (What assessment method (written assignment, speech, test, etc.) will you use to assess student ability related to the program / course outcome(s) selected): An embedded informative speech delivered extemporaneously will be assessed using a rubric.</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Description of the Proposed Common Assessment</b> (Common assessments should be designed to ensure a balance between (1) the need for a consistency within the program in order to ensure comparable student artifacts and (2) the need for reasonable flexibility in order to encourage faculty judgment in the design and</p> |   |

**delivery of learning activities):**

The embedded Informative Speech will be assessed using the AACU rubric. The course requirements of having a presentation visual and research will not be assessed at this time because faculty has the ability to accomplish that requirement in various learning activities. All SPC 1608 have the Informative Speech as a requirement in the course, so no change in curriculum was needed.

**Proposed Assessment Instrument (In some cases the assessment method may not need an associated assessment instrument – e.g., multiple choice tests):**

The Association of American Colleges and Universities Oral Communication VALUE rubric.

## Implementation Process

### Collection of Student Artifacts

**What information needs to be communicated to students concerning the assessment process (informed consent, etc.)?**

Informed consent will be given to all students.

**How will student artifacts or data associated with student performance be collected?**

Previously collected (2009-10) speech samples will be used to test the usefulness of the AACU rubric in assessing informative speeches and the program level outcomes. For more samples to be used in the future, instructors will collect a digital copy of the randomly selected speeches and upload them to VIMEO. Full directions will be given to all instructors that have randomly selected students. The VIMEO site is password protected.

**If student artifacts are to be collected based on a random sample of students registered for the course or participating in the program / activity, what characteristics should the sample include?**

Enrolled in SPC 1608 in term 201120. Students were randomly selected from FT and part time faculty as well as hybrid, online, and face to face delivery methods.

**How will information about faculty / staff participation in the assessment project be communicated?**

The Deans were contacted to schedule a meeting on each campus. The meeting was used to discuss the process of assessing general education outcomes and then 2 sample speeches were assessed using the AACU rubric. Discussion then took place as to how each instructor assessed the speeches. That leveling exercise was done to find a rubric that can be used to assess program level outcomes for the informative speech. For additional sampling, an email outlining the process and complete information about the informed consent, uploading, and eventual assessment was sent to all instructors that had a randomly selected student in the collection group. A group meeting was scheduled to view the next set of randomly selected speeches and use the AACU rubric again.

**Who will be responsible for coordinating the collection of student artifacts?**

Kim Long

**At what point in the academic year / semester will the student artifacts be collected?**

Spring semester 2011.

**Program Level Assessment / Evaluation of Student Artifacts and Analysis of Results**

**When will student artifacts be assessed / evaluated?**

The original assessment took place over a period of time from January 2011 to April of 2011. Each campus was visited by Kim Long and Suzette Dohany. The purpose of these visits was to work with the AACU rubric and gather feedback on its usefulness.

**Which faculty or staff from the program/discipline will evaluate student artifacts?**

All FT tenure, tenure track, 8 and 4 month, and adjunct faculty were invited to participate.

What training / preparation / information will faculty or staff need in order adequately assess / evaluate the student artifacts collected?

No additional training beyond the discussion of General Education Assessment was needed.

When will the results / data associated with the assessment plan be analyzed?

Assessment day 2011 was used to discuss the AACU rubric and how it works as an assessment for general education outcomes of oral communication. An excellent discussion was had after viewing several student speeches and using the AACU rubric. The group decided on minor wording changes in the rubric so as to make it more reflective of meeting the program level assessment needs in assessing oral communication. There were 10 out of 14 FT speech faculty present for a vote. All 10 present voted favorably (71%) for using the AACU rubric (with suggested minor wording changes) for assessing program level outcomes for Oral Communication.

What training / preparation / information will faculty or staff need in order to analyze the results data associated with this assessment plan?

None

What additional sources of data might allow faculty / staff to better understand and act on the results of this assessment plan?

None

In order to ensure curricular and programmatic alignment, who else should be included in this conversation (e.g., faculty from related discipline areas in General Education)?

The Deans of Communication on all campuses have been involved and informed along the process.

How will the assessment results be disseminated to stakeholders (Faculty, Staff, Advisory Boards, etc.)?

All FT faculty that have voice in curricular issues were be emailed the results of the campus visits and large group discussion of the rubric. Communication Deans also received the results.

**Approval Process**

| <b>Activities Associated with the Approval of Assessment Plans</b>   | <b>Completion Date</b> | <b>Person Responsible</b>    | <b>Results</b>   |
|--|------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Draft assessment plan is circulated for input to reviewers appropriate to the program / discipline (including Deans / Directors responsible for supporting and promoting the work necessary for the implementation of the Assessment Plan) | 2010                   | Suzette Dohany<br>Amy Bosley | A different rubric needed to be found or developed.  |
| College-wide live or e-mail / Blackboard discussion will be coordinated to consider input received (if needed)   | 2011                   | Kim Long<br>Suzette Dohany   | The AACU rubric was agreed upon as a general education program level assessment tool for Informative Speeches and the Oral Communication competency.   |
| Draft assessment plan is revised to reflect input  | 2011                   | Kim Long                     | Done on assessment day, the rubric was accepted with minor changes.  |
| Faculty vote on the Assessment Plan using the Current voter eligibility list for curriculum ( <a href="http://valenciacollege.edu/faculty/forms/voterlists/">http://valenciacollege.edu/faculty/forms/voterlists/</a> )                    | 2011                   | Kim Long<br>Suzette Dohany   | A verbal vote was taken on Assessment Day. The required percentages of possible voters were present and the vote was 100% favorable to use the AACU revised rubric for program level assessment. |

## Dean / Director Support

The Dean(s) / Directors (for Librarians) responsible for supporting and promoting the work necessary for the implementation of the Assessment Plan need to indicate their support for the plan.

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Della Paul: East Dean<br>Michele McArdle: WPK Dean<br><br>Dean / Director East / Winter Park Campus        | Signature |
| Jenni Campbell: Osceola Dean<br>Michael Bosley: Lk Nona Dean<br>Dean / Director Osceola / Lake Nona Campus | Signature |
| Elizabeth Renn: West Dean<br>Dean / Director West Campus   | Signature |

## Improvement Plan and the Use of Assessment Results (To be completed after the implementation of the initial Assessment Plan and the review of student artifacts)

What do the results of this assessment plan suggest about changes / improvements needed within the curriculum (Specific recommendations for improvement, targeted course(s), co-curricular program or student activity)?

The rubric needed some minor changes in wording to be clearer in the expectations being assessed.

What changes to the common course outlines, if any, need to be considered?

None

|  |
|--|
|  |
| <p>What do the results of this assessment plan suggest about changes / improvements to the program assessment process?</p> <p>The process worked well, faculty were involved and able to discuss and come to agreement on the common assessment tool for program level assessment of oral communication.</p> |
| <p>Individual(s) Responsible leading the implementation of recommendations</p> <p>Kim Long<br/>Suzette Dohany</p>  |
| <p>Stakeholders Impacted by the recommendations for improvement</p> <p>SPC faculty</p>   |

DRAFT