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A pilot review session for Oral Communication took place on December 12, 2016. A group of faculty and staff met to discuss the use of the AAC&U Oral Communication VALUE rubric and calibrated two artifacts. Members of the group were:

Jun Watabe

Judy Williams

Jeanine Howe

Suzanne Lay

Laureen Cantwell

Ann Gillies

Bette Schans

The artifacts consisted of speeches from one ESSL 200 course. The session took approximately two hours to complete. Results from the data were compiled and are as follows:

Performance Indicator Average

Organization 2.32

Language 2.32

Delivery 2.11

Supporting Materials 2.33

Central Message 2.11

Total Rubric Average 2.23

The group decided that the VALUE rubric, in its original form, was appropriate to use for assessment of Oral Communication at CMU. The scores of the performance indicators place the speeches in the lower level milestone category. A full review will be conducted at the end of the spring, 2017 semester.

Report of Oral Communication Review

Spring, 2017

A full review session on Oral Communication took place on May 1, 2017. Again, a group of faculty and staff met to calibrate the OC rubric and receive artifacts from five Speech faculty. Members of the group were:

Laureen Cantwell

Ann Gillies

Suzanne Lay

Tim Pinnow

Bette Schans

Judy Williams

There were approximately 65 artifacts distributed to pairs of faculty for assessment. Score sheets were submitted and data compiled. Each criteria score was averaged and the results are as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Rating | Organization | | Language | | Delivery | | Supporting Material | | Central Message | |
| Rating | 1 | 5 | 4% | 1 | 1% | 14 | 12% | 16 | 14% | 6 | 5% |
| Frequency | 2 | 54 | 46% | 49 | 42% | 66 | 56% | 39 | 33% | 50 | 42% |
|  | 3 | 45 | 38% | 63 | 53% | 34 | 29% | 49 | 42% | 57 | 48% |
|  | 4 | 14 | 12% | 5 | 4% | 4 | 3% | 14 | 12% | 5 | 4% |
| Average | a | 2.35 |  | 2.35 |  | 1.90 |  | 2.00 |  | 2.30 |  |
| Rating by | b | 2.44 |  | 2.67 |  | 2.56 |  | 2.72 |  | 2.39 |  |
| Reviewer | c | 2.70 |  | 2.60 |  | 2.20 |  | 2.75 |  | 2.75 |  |
|  | d | 2.80 |  | 2.80 |  | 2.25 |  | 2.85 |  | 2.75 |  |
|  | e | 2.30 |  | 2.35 |  | 1.90 |  | 2.25 |  | 2.25 |  |
|  | f | 2.85 |  | 2.90 |  | 2.65 |  | 2.55 |  | 2.65 |  |
| Overall Average |  | 2.58 |  | 2.61 |  | 2.24 |  | 2.52 |  | 2.52 |  |

Average scores for this review were higher than the scores on the pilot session. The method of recording the speeches had improved from the first session and may have lent itself to improved quality for the reviewer.

Kripendorf’s Alpha was again used to determine inter-rater reliability. The indicators with the highest reliability were Organization, Supporting Materials and Central Message. This also corresponds to the highest correlation analysis of the five indicators.