



2013 Summer Assessment Institute COMMUNICATION Summary Report

In August 2013, an institute was conducted to assess LCC student artifacts collected during the 2012-13 academic year for Communication. The institute consisted of eight faculty readers and a faculty coordinator. Artifacts were evaluated based on rubrics developed by Instructional Assessment Committee (with outcomes approved by the Instructional Council). Readers included: **Brad Benjamin, Merry Bond, Joan Herman, Amber Lemiere, Sean Martin, Audrey Petterson, Dan Schabot, and Adam Wolfer.** **Hiedi Bauer** served as faculty coordinator.

OVERVIEW

A total of 371 artifacts were submitted. Of the 371, 102 were evaluated by the readers. Each artifact was evaluated by a minimum of two and a maximum of nine readers. The elimination of the capstone degree requirement impacted the selection of artifacts, and likely negatively impacted the average scores as well. Artifacts were scored on a scale of 1 to 5, 5 being high. All artifacts submitted to the institute were in written form.

SCORES

Communication *Express* ideas and information in writing and speaking in a manner that is clear and appropriate to the audience, and read and listen effectively.

Outcome	Average. Score
A) Students will communicate in complete sentences, demonstrating use of grammar, mechanics, and word choice appropriate to context.	2.7
B) Students will develop and express their ideas clearly and reasonably for a unified purpose.	2.7
C) Students will demonstrate comprehension of a wide variety of materials.	2.6
D) Students will use credible evidence to support arguments and conclusions.	2.6
E) Students will document source information.	2.3
F) Students will use a style of delivery that is effective in communicating their message.	2.8

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- ▶ Overall, institute participants noted that the artifacts were very information-rich. Readers noted that they would like to see more synthesizing of information, and more unique ideas coming from the students.
- ▶ Outcome “C” regarding comprehension of a wide variety of materials was perhaps the most difficult to assess. Some participants felt that the written description of a “5” in this category was unclear. Also, there is some overlap with outcome “C” and outcome “D.” Additionally, there may be some overlap with Critical Thinking.
- ▶ Readers noted that for the most part, the writing was easy to understand. Many papers lacked appropriate editing, provided hasty generalizations, and seemed to have a lack of understanding regarding the audience. There were, however, some excellent examples of students responding well to assignments identifying and writing to a specific audience.
- ▶ Some possible topics for faculty discussion include:
 - How do we create strong assignments and “scaffolding” that produces better papers?
 - What should we expect students to do when they communicate to us?
 - Are there ways that we can better communicate our expectations to students?
 - What do we like about our students’ writing? What do we not like?
 - How can we develop assignments in ways that make students take the quality of their writing more seriously?
 - Does the quality of writing vary between short papers and long papers? Should we be more deliberate about the types of writing we assign?
 - What about assessment of verbal communication skills?
 - The lowest score at the institute was for outcome “E” – documentation of sources. What can we do to address this issue?