

General Education Communication Assessment THEA 261 Report

Goal:

The goal for this General Education Communication Assessment is to help students communicate effectively using verbal language.

Course Learning Objectives:

As part of their requirements to meet the oral competency component of the General Education Assessment, students were evaluated in six key areas, including the following:

- Organization
- Subject Knowledge
- Nonverbal Communication
- Mechanics When Appropriate*
- Speaker Engagement
- Elocution

*Because mechanics are not an issue in these performances, this category is not assessed for this course, resulting in an assessment on five key areas rather than six.

Instruments/Measures for Evaluation:

Students delivered prepared scripted scenes that were four to six minutes in length, working in pairs. The scene cuttings were selected for them by the instructor. Students had approximately two weeks to one month to rehearse and prepare their scenes after they were given the scripts. Upon delivering their speeches, students were evaluated using the rubric attached to this report as Appendix A. Each of the six competencies were evaluated on a four-point scale, where a four reflected a student achieving the highest competency and a one reflected a student failing to meet the competency.

Procedure:

Of the 40 students who take THEA 261 in the Spring 2019 semester, 8 students, or 20% of the total enrollment, were evaluated. Of the two sections of the course taught in the Spring, the instructor and another member of the Theatre performance faculty evaluated one class period's worth of performances using the rubric in Appendix A.

Criterion for Success:

In order for the outcome to be met and deemed successful, 80% of the students evaluated had to score a satisfactory score, which was defined as achieving 14 out of 20 possible points, or a 70%.

Findings:

In Spring of 2018, 8 of the 8 (100%) students assessed earned a score of 80% or higher. The areas of greatest strength among the assessed students was their organization and subject knowledge (as reflected in their ability to show an understanding of the circumstances of the scene, the relationship between characters, and the ability to perform the script as written (through memorization of the script). The areas of non-verbal communication, speaker engagement and elocution (while still met fairly strongly) were less consistent across the assessed population.

Summary of Findings:

While all students that were assessed in this academic year met the standard, we were only able to assess a narrow sample of students in the course. All students assessed were enrolled in a traditional 15-week delivery of the course, but we also offer the course on a compressed 7-week schedule. Moving forward, it will be important try to assess students in each semester of the course, as well as to include assessment of students on both delivery schedules. With that additional data, we can begin to draw some conclusions about ways to improve student skills in the execution of their scene work and to see more clearly what adjustments might be necessary to instructional methods/schedules for the compressed delivery version of the course.

Action Plan for Improvement:

Moving forward into the next academic year, we will strive to assess students on both delivery schedules of the course to see how the varied delivery methods impact student learning and success. A larger sample of assessment will also assist us in getting a clearer picture of the course's strengths and weaknesses, enabling a more considered discussion of potential changes to the course structure and schedule.

Appendix A:

	1	2	3	4	Total
Organization	Audience cannot understand presentation because there is no sequence of information	Audience has difficulty following presentation because student jumps around	Student presents material in logical sequence which audience can follow	Student presents material in logical, interesting sequence which audience can follow and easily learn from	
Subject Knowledge	Student does not have grasp of material; student cannot answer questions about subject	Student is uncomfortable with materials and is able to answer only rudimentary questions	Student is at ease with expected answers to all questions, but fails to elaborate	Student demonstrates full knowledge (more than required) by answering all class questions with explanations and elaboration	
Non-verbal communication	Student uses inappropriate or superfluous non-verbal communication	Student's non-verbal communication supports the main points of the presentation	Student's non-verbal communication relates to the main points the presentation in a clear and professional way	Students non-verbal communication reinforces and enhances the presentation in a clear and professional way	
Mechanics when appropriate	presentation has four or more spelling and/or grammatical and/or textual errors	Presentation has three or more spelling and/or grammatical and/or textual errors	Presentation has no more than two spelling and/or grammatical and/or textual errors	Presentation has no spelling and/or grammatical and/or textual errors	
Speaker engagement	Student appears to not be engaged	Student's engagement is inconsistent	Student maintains engagement most of the time	Student maintains full, thoughtful engagement throughout	
Elocution	Student mumbles, incorrectly pronounces terms, or speaks too quietly for students in the back of class to hear	Student's voice is too low, or student incorrectly pronounces terms. Audience members have difficulty hearing or understanding presentation	Student's voice is clear. Student pronounces most words correctly. Most audience members can hear presentation	Student uses a clear voice and correct, precise pronunciation of terms so that all audience members can hear presentation.	

				Total Points:	
--	--	--	--	----------------------	--