De Anza College

SLO Assessment Cycle for SPCH 1

Public Speaking SLO Modified: [05/23/2010]

Donna Stasio's Team Members:

1. Anu Khanna (x5787) ICS
2. Matt Abrahams (x8534) SPCH

Additional Team members not on list/notes about team:

Donna Stasio, Matt Abrahams, Edwina Stoll, Elaine Lee, Alex Kramer, Anu Khanna, Shagun Kaur, Kim Pearce, Mike Holler, and all Speech Communication faculty teaching spring 2010 classes including Ahern, Avera, Cano, Cnudde, Frances, Gainer, Gray, Hamilton, Hinerman, Hong, Isacson, Kaven, P. Lee, McDonnell, Morella, Payne, Sakahara, Tedford, Williams, Woods, and Young.

Additional Notes:

Assessment tool: Personal Report of Communication Apprehension PRCA-24 Survey. Institutional research ran results using SAS so we could evaluate communication apprehension across student demographics.

Outcomes:

Outcome 1: Statement Modified: [09/09/2010]

Develop original, organized informative and persuasive presentations that are personalized to the audience, developed with an effective plan and purpose, and uses information supported with quality sources that are accurately documented during the speech and in speech outlines.

General Notes for Outcome 1

Used a mixed-methods evaluative quasi-experimental study design conducted in a two-fold process with both quantitative and qualitative measures to assess outcomes 1 and 3.

Assessment Cycle Records:

Outcome 1: Assessment Planning Modified: [04/12/2011]

Assessment Strategy Used:
Quarter: Winter 2010
Assessors: Donna Stasio
Assessment Tools: Performances/Demonstrations • Papers/Essays • Pre- and Post- Outline scores, Rubric, Survey, Final Persuasive Speech Presentation/Performance
Sections being assessed: 05, 09, 10, 12

Outcome 1: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [05/23/2010]

Number of people involved in Phase III: 1

Changes:
The researcher conducted a pilot study to test the peer feedback process and the survey in a Fall 2009 SPCH 9 Argumentation class. Based on quantitative and qualitative pilot study findings, the peer feedback process was refined with specific instructor interventions. No modifications were made to the survey except to change wording of one open-ended question. Survey Monkey was used to run results for the pilot study. Institutional research ran results using SAS for the winter 2010 study.

Methods:
This study investigated the efficacy of written and oral peer feedback used as an instructional strategy to support student learning in speech outline development. Overall perceived learning benefits and four specific instructor intervention variables were measured: (1) creation of a safe space for collaboration, (2) student training on the characteristics of effective feedback, (3) student observations of instructor modeling of effective feedback, and (4) student training to engage in a carefully designed peer feedback active learning process. This was a mixed-methods evaluative quasi-experimental study conducted in a two-fold process with both quantitative and qualitative measures using rubric, pre- post- outline assessment, final persuasive speech performance scores, and survey results. This study was designed and conducted jointly by the instructor and a graduate student working on his thesis with support from De Anza institutional research to run results using SAS. The 75-page thesis, Transformative Pedagogy in Conversation:The Role of Instructor Interventions in Peer Feedback for Speech Outline Development, is in press.
.

Summary:
(1)Empirical data shows a significant increase between pre-post outline scores (academic performance) with a 27.7 percent overall average increase, but no significant differences across demographic groups emerged. This comparative demographic finding is noteworthy because it suggests that peer feedback positively affects outline development but that the teaching pedagogy, peer feedback interventions, and grading outcomes did not bias a particular group. In other words, there was no support for teaching bias in peer-centered processes or from evaluation with a standard rubric.

(2)Students consistently identified several substantial changes that they would make to their outlines based on peer feedback. On average each student identified 4.8 modifications in their open essay responses. The dominant thematic variable was to make arguments more substantive and persuasive by adding evidence, research, sources, statistics, depth, and counterargument (rank #1). Another notable theme indicated students planned to more directly follow an organizational pattern appropriate to persuasive speaking and add clear transitions to strengthen the structure of their speeches (rank #2/65%). Ranking 3, 4, and 5 respectively, students wanted to appeal more to the audience (58%), use examples and personal stories to make their speeches more interesting (52%), and clarify their positions (52%) in their outlines.

(3)Of note, ESL learners reported mean scores below non-ESL students on self-perceived benefits of instructor training interventions and easiness with group collaborative work. We found noteworthy that this self perception had no apparent effect on actual academic performance as measured against average course GPA. Making connections between these empirical results and anecdotal survey responses, it appears ESL students found active participation and exchanging ideas in the peer feedback process helpful, however most ESL learners had added difficulty writing their outlines (shown in pre-post outline scores), and they may have experienced added anxiety and fears of expressing themselves through written and oral critique methods on peer work. This appears to be more of a challenge for ESL learners who may have to work harder to find the words to make their ideas clear. ESL students were more likely to want additional time for peer review and several ESL students responded in open-ended survey responses that they would like the instructor to provide feedback on their draft outlines, thus expressing a preference for instructor vs. peer feedback.

Enhancement (Part I):
(1)Working collaboratively from a bottom-up approach, the students, instructor and researcher designed specific criteria in the form of a rubric written in easy-to-understand language giving ownership to students and making grading transparent and consistent. The rubric included evaluative criteria, clear definitions, and a scoring strategy, all key components of rubric design. The instructor has integrated this rubric review/revision process into her instructional design.

(2)The instructor, D. Stasio, has integrated this outline peer review process into her instructional design and has shared the peer review process with colleagues.

Enhancement (Part II):

Outcome 2: Statement Modified: []

Display increasing confidence in speaking extemporaneously.

General Notes for Outcome 2

Speech Communication faculty conducted PRCA-24 assessments for all Speech courses/sections during spring quarter 2010.

One of the goals of the Speech Communication Department at DeAnza is to help our students gain confidence by reducing their communication apprehension across all contexts (interpersonal, groups, meetings, public speaking). We took a theme approach to measure communication apprehension in all sections of Public Speaking, Fundamentals of Oral

Outcome 2: Assessment Planning Modified: [05/20/2010]

Assessment Strategy Used:
Quarter: Spring 2010
Assessors: Donna Stasio, Alex Kramer, Shagun Kaur, Kim Pearce and all Speech Communication faculty teaching spring 2010 SPCH 1 classes including Ahern, Avera, Cano, Cnudde, Frances, Gainer, Hinerman, Hong, Isacson, P. Lee, McDonnell, Morella, and Sakakhara.
Assessment Tools: *No tools assigned*.
Sections being assessed: 01, 02, 03, 04

Outcome 2: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [05/23/2010]

Number of people involved in Phase III: 17

Communication, Critical Decision Making In Groups, Interpersonal Communication, Argumentation, and Effective Organizational Communication.

Changes:
Winter 2010 all full-time faculty assessed communication apprehension using PRCA-24 assessment survey. We added an open ended question asking students "What activities/ assignments/ speeches etc. during this quarter helped you reduce your communication apprehension?".

Spring 2010 all full- and adjunct faculty assessed communication apprehension using PRCA-24 assessment survey.

Methods:
McCroskey's Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24)

IMPORTANT COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION SURVEY (instructions to students)
One of the goals of the Speech Department at DeAnza is to help our students gain confidence by reducing their communication apprehension. To give us both an idea of your level of communication apprehension at the beginning of the course, please complete The Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24) by the end of this week (April 18). It is an online survey designed to help you get a sense of your level of communication apprehension (in a speech; during group work etc.). The results of this PRCA-24 survey will be used primarily to help improve instructional activities and student learning while class is still in progress. ALL STUDENT INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THIS SURVEY IS CONFIDENTIAL and the results will in no way be linked to grades. You should easily be able to complete the survey in 15 minutes or less. Please go to
http://www.research.fhda.edu/cgi-bin/rws3.pl?FORM=PRCA_24
In order to gain the maximum benefit from this survey, please read the instructions carefully and answer the questions truthfully.
Additional information required
DeAnza Student Id:
Instructor's last name:

Summary:
1) Statistically significant differences were found between pre and post, with no group effect or interaction. In other words, communication apprehension was reduced across all contexts (public speaking, group, meetings, interpersonal), and there were no notable differences among the various demographics (gender, basic skills, minority status).

2) Students reported high levels of communication apprehension in the public speaking context, and low levels of communication apprehension in group discussion, meetings, and interpersonal contexts.

3) The most significant pre- post- change across contexts was a decrease in the level of fear while giving a speech, and conversely, an increase in confidence at the prospect of giving a speech.

4) Anecdotal responses indicate various kinds of group activities prior to presenting speeches play a key role in helping individuals overcome their speaking anxiety.

5) Many other activities helped individuals overcome their speaking anxiety (although listed less frequently than group activities), including practice, preparation, impromptu speaking, learning new speaking techniques, giving several progressively more challenging speeches, facilitating, writing reflection essays, relaxation and visualization. This is only a partial list of open ended responses to the question "What activities/ assignments/ speeches etc. during this quarter helped you reduce your communication apprehension?"

Enhancement (Part I):
Conducting the PRCA-24 assessment raised awareness for students and faculty about the impact of communication apprehension on student perceived anxiety and actual performance. The results clarified for faculty what classroom practices work best to reduce speaking anxiety--thus informing and transforming our teaching practices. Colleagues have and will continue to discuss PRCA-24 results as well as best practices for reducing communication apprehension. Sixteen faculty participated in our first workshop of the year focused on speech anxiety management. Faculty will build in more scaffolding and

integrate more interpersonal and group activities to prepare students to present speeches.

Enhancement (Part II):
We need access to Survey Monkey as well as ongoing support from institutional research to manage full-scale assessment for all speech sections.

Outcome 3: Statement Modified: []

Collaborate with peers to reflect on the effectiveness of presentations to provide positive, growth-producing feedback.

General Notes for Outcome 3

Used a mixed-methods evaluative quasi-experimental study design conducted in a two-fold process with both quantitative and qualitative measures to assess outcomes 1 and 3.

Outcome 3: Assessment Planning Modified: [05/21/2010]

Assessment Strategy Used:
Quarter: Winter 2010
Assessors: Donna Stasio
Assessment Tools: Performances/Demonstrations • Papers/Essays • Pre- and Post- Outline scores, Rubric, Survey, Final Persuasive Speech Presentation/Performance
Sections being assessed: 05, 09, 10, 12

Outcome 3: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [05/26/2010]

Number of people involved in Phase III: 1

Changes:
The researcher conducted a pilot study to test the peer feedback process and the survey in a Fall 2009 SPCH 9 Argumentation class. Based on quantitative and qualitative pilot study findings, the peer feedback process was refined with specific instructor interventions. No modifications were made to the survey except to change wording of one open-ended question. Survey Monkey was used to run results for the pilot study. Institutional research ran results using SAS for the winter 2010 study.

Methods:
This study investigated the efficacy of written and oral peer feedback used as an instructional strategy to support student learning in speech outline development. Overall perceived learning benefits and four specific instructor intervention variables were measured: (1) creation of a safe space for collaboration, (2) student training on the characteristics of effective feedback, (3) student observations of instructor modeling of effective feedback, and (4) student training to engage in a carefully designed peer feedback active learning process. This was a mixed-methods evaluative quasi-experimental study conducted in a two-fold process with both quantitative and qualitative measures using rubric, pre- post- outline assessment, final persuasive speech performance scores, and survey results. This study was designed and conducted jointly by the instructor and a graduate student working on his thesis with support from De Anza institutional research to run results using SAS. The 75-page thesis, Transformative Pedagogy in Conversation:The Role of Instructor Interventions in Peer Feedback for Speech Outline Development, is in press.

Summary:
(1)Empirical data shows a significant increase between pre-post outline scores (academic performance) with a 27.7 percent overall average increase, but no significant differences across demographic groups emerged. This comparative demographic finding is noteworthy because it suggests that peer feedback positively affects outline development but that the teaching pedagogy, peer feedback interventions, and grading outcomes did not bias a particular group. In other words, there was no support for teaching bias in peer-centered processes or from evaluation with a standard rubric.

(2)Students consistently identified several substantial changes that they would make to their outlines based on peer feedback. On average each student identified 4.8 modifications in their open essay responses. The dominant thematic variable was to make arguments more substantive and persuasive by adding evidence, research, sources, statistics, depth, and counterargument (rank #1). Another notable theme indicated students planned to more directly follow an organizational pattern appropriate to persuasive speaking and add clear transitions to strengthen the structure of their speeches (rank #2/65%). Ranking 3, 4, and 5 respectively, students wanted to appeal more to the audience (58%), use examples and personal stories to make their speeches more interesting (52%), and clarify their positions (52%) in their outlines.

(3)Of note, ESL learners reported mean scores below non-ESL students on self-perceived benefits of instructor training interventions and easiness with group collaborative work. We found noteworthy that this self perception had no apparent effect on actual academic performance as measured against average course GPA. Making connections between these empirical results and anecdotal survey responses, it appears ESL students found active participation and exchanging ideas in the peer feedback process helpful, however most ESL learners had added difficulty writing their outlines (shown in pre-post outline scores), and they may have experienced added anxiety and fears of expressing themselves through written and oral critique methods on peer work. This appears to be more of a challenge for ESL learners who may have to work harder to find the words to make their ideas clear. ESL students were more likely to want additional time for peer review and several ESL students responded in open-ended survey responses that they would like the instructor to provide feedback on their draft outlines, thus expressing a preference for instructor vs. peer feedback.

(4)Peer feedback strategies can be used to counter demotivation and underachievement.

Enhancement (Part I):
(1)Working collaboratively from a bottom-up approach, the students, instructor and researcher designed specific criteria in the form of a rubric written in easy-to-understand language giving ownership to students and making grading transparent and consistent. The rubric included evaluative criteria, clear definitions, and a scoring strategy, all key components of rubric design. The instructor has integrated this rubric review/revision process into her instructional design.

(2)The instructor, D. Stasio, has integrated this outline peer review process into her instructional design and has shared the peer review process with colleagues.

Enhancement (Part II):

[Number of Outcomes for SPCH 1: **3**]