The Process
The Office of Assessment and Accreditation Support (OAAS) had Media Services videotape senior presentations from Creative Activity & Research Day (CARD), as well as from courses populated by graduating seniors in the College of Arts & Sciences (CAS), the School of Management (SOM), and the School of Nursing & Health Professions (SONHP). Presentations were collected from six programs across the three discipline areas in CAS—Arts & Humanities, Math & Sciences, and Social Sciences—that graduated the highest percentages of students in 2017, as well as the BS Business Administration and BS Nursing programs.

This resulted in the collection of 65 artifacts—45 individual and 20 group presentations—for a total of 104 presenters. Three of these artifacts were used for calibration—1 individual and 2 group presentations—for a total of 7 presenters. Prior to scoring, the expectation at least 75% of student artifacts were expected to meet or exceed standards set by faculty.

Faculty Raters
Fifteen faculty served as raters for the initial oral communication scoring session on June 23, 2017. School of Nursing & Health Professions presentations were scored at a later date. Two faculty scored each presentation. In the cases in which consensus was not achieved, one faculty evaluated the presentation to help reach consensus.

The Rubric
Faculty raters scored student work using an oral communication rubric developed by Rhetoric & Language faculty (see appendix). Oral communication was composed of three criteria: central message and organization, delivery techniques and language, and content. Raters scored each artifact using a 4-pt. scale (1 = Unsatisfactory, 4 = Exemplary). Artifacts met or exceeded standards when rated as competent or exemplary.
ORAL COMMUNICATION

Average Performance Level
The figure on the following page depicts the average performance level of students within each event, area, or school on the three oral communication criteria. Across the criteria:

- CARD presenters scored an average of 3.27, with means ranging between 3.40 (central message and organization) and 3.60 (content).
- Arts & Humanities presenters scored an average of 3.04, with means ranging between 2.50 (delivery techniques and language) and 3.38 (content).
- Math & Sciences presenters scored an average of 2.76, with means ranging between 2.63 (delivery techniques and language) and 3.86 (content).
- Social Sciences scored an average of 2.80, with means ranging between 2.50 (delivery techniques and language) and 2.96 (central message and organization).
- School of Management scored an average of 2.80, with means ranging between 2.67 (delivery techniques and language) and 2.89 (central message and organization).
- School of Nursing & Health Professions scored an average of 2.64, with means between 2.50 (central message and organization) and 2.79 (content).
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Overall Performance Level
The figure below depicts the percentage of each performance level for USF. Artifacts met or exceeded standards when rated competent or exemplary.

- Overall, 93% of the presenters met or exceeded standards for **central message and organization**, 77% met or exceeded standards for **delivery techniques and language**, and 87% met or exceeded standards for **content**.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Level</th>
<th>Central Message &amp; Organization</th>
<th>Delivery Techniques &amp; Language</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Level by Event, Area, or School
The figures on the following pages depict the percentage of each performance level for oral communication broken down by event, area, or school. Artifacts met or exceeded standards when rated competent or exemplary.

- **100%** of the CARD presenters met or exceeded standards for **central message and organization**, **80%** met or exceeded standards for **delivery techniques and language**, and **100%** met or exceeded standards for **content**.
- For Arts & Humanities, **100%** of the presenters met or exceeded standards for **central message and organization**, **50%** met or exceeded standards for **delivery techniques and language**, and **100%** met or exceeded standards for **content**.
- For Math & Sciences, **84%** of the presenters met or exceeded standards for **central message and organization**, **71%** met or exceeded standards for **delivery techniques and language**, and **87%** met or exceeded standards for **content**.
- For Social Sciences, **79%** of the presenters met or exceeded standards for **central message and organization**, **67%** met or exceeded standards for **delivery techniques and language**, and **83%** met or exceeded standards for **content**.
- For the School of Management, **86%** of the presenters met or exceeded standards for **central message and organization**, **71%** met or exceeded standards for **delivery techniques and language**, and **75%** met or exceeded standards for **content**.
- For the School of Nursing & Health Professions, **86%** of the presenters met or exceeded standards for **central message and organization**, **86%** met or exceeded standards for **delivery techniques and language**, and **100%** met or exceeded standards for **content**.
Inter-rater Reliability
As agreed upon during our calibration session, consensus was achieved when agreement was perfect or within one point. Inter-rater reliability across artifacts was high. On average, raters reached consensus 97% of the time. Agreement ranged from 94% for Social Sciences presentations to 100% for CARD, Arts & Humanities, and School of Nursing & Health Professions presentations (tie).

Inter-rater reliability across criteria was high, too. Agreement ranged from 96% for content to 99% for central message and organization.
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

• At the institutional level, USF met or exceeded standards for all oral communication criteria. However, delivery techniques and language emerged as a particular weakness for USF compared to the other two criteria. Future curriculum changes should focus on improving students’ delivery techniques and language use.

REFLECTION

Strengths
• Web-based delivery was effective.
• Calibration was productive and consensus was achieved after vigorous discussion of the rubric.
• Inter-rater reliability was very high.
• Rhetoric & Language faculty created a succinct rubric that could be applied to student presentations across disciplines.

Limitations
• Small number of artifacts from CARD, the Arts & Humanities area in the College of Arts and Sciences, and the School of Nursing & Health Professions limit the ability to generalize.
• Some students in the group presentations were difficult to score due to the brevity of their remarks.
• Faculty expressed disappointment that critical thinking and ethics were not integrated into the rubric.

Moving Forward
• Review the rubric to see if critical thinking and ethics should be integrated into existing rubric.
• Develop a schedule to institutionalize the assessment of oral communication.
• Provide program chairs and faculty with more notice to inform students their presentations will be recorded.
# ORAL COMMUNICATION RUBRIC

**University of San Francisco**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Message and Organization</strong></td>
<td>Central message and organization are focused, consistent, and responsive to the assigned task. Organizational pattern enhances the central message and is structured for ease of audience comprehension.</td>
<td>Central message and organization are clear and responsive to the assigned task. Organization pattern is coherent and consistent.</td>
<td>Central message is responsive to the assigned task and can be deduced but is not explicitly stated. Organizational pattern is intermittently observable.</td>
<td>No central message and/or does not have an observable organizational pattern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Techniques and Language</strong> (vocal expressiveness, movement, gestures, eye contact)</td>
<td>Delivery techniques enhance connections with audience and understanding of central message. Language is engaging, conversational, and appropriate for audience and situation.</td>
<td>Delivery techniques support connections with audience and understanding of central message. Language is mostly conversational and appropriate for audience and situation.</td>
<td>Delivery techniques are inconsistent in supporting connections with audience and understanding of central message. Language is minimally conversational and somewhat appropriate for audience and situation.</td>
<td>Delivery techniques detract from central message and audience comprehension. Language is not conversational and/or not appropriate for audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong> (e.g. ideas, arguments, research, information)</td>
<td>Content is developed to enhance audience engagement and acceptance. Uses supporting material that is relevant, appropriate, and sufficient, given the purpose and assigned task.</td>
<td>Content is developed to engage audience. Uses supporting material that is mostly relevant, appropriate, and sufficient, given the purpose and assigned task.</td>
<td>Content is not adequately developed. Supporting material is not fully relevant, appropriate or sufficient given the assigned task.</td>
<td>Content is not developed. If used, supporting material is not relevant, sufficient, and appropriate given the assigned task.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>