

SPRING 2010 REPORT

COMMUNICATION

Written:

ENGL 1301, 1302

Oral:

COMS 1300, 2300, 3358

CFAS 2300

MGT 3373

COMMUNICATION

The objective of a communication component of a core curriculum is to enable the student to communicate effectively in clear and correct prose in a style appropriate to the subject, occasion, and audience.

Exemplary Educational Objectives

- To understand and demonstrate writing and speaking processes through invention, organization, drafting, revision, editing, and presentation.
- To understand the importance of specifying audience and purpose and to select appropriate communication choices.
- To understand and appropriately apply modes of expression, i.e., descriptive, expository, narrative, scientific, and self-expressive, in written, visual, and oral communication.
- To participate effectively in groups with emphasis on listening, critical and reflective thinking, and responding.
- To understand and apply basic principles of critical thinking, problem solving, and technical proficiency in the development of exposition and argument.
- To develop the ability to research and write a documented paper and/or to give an oral presentation.

SOURCE: http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/AAR/UndergraduateEd/fos_assumpdef.cfm

Communication Competency Statement

Students graduating from Texas Tech University should be able to demonstrate the ability to specify audience and purpose and make appropriate communication choices.

Student Learning Outcomes

- Demonstrate the ability to specify audience and purpose and make appropriate communication choices.
- Demonstrate the ability to apply appropriate form and content in written, visual, and oral communication.
- Demonstrate the ability to apply basic principles of critical thinking, problem solving and technical proficiency in the development and documentation of exposition and argument.

- **National Direct Assessment**
 - College Learning Assessment (CLA)
 - Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) [to be administered]
- **National Indirect Assessment** (selected items related to writing and speaking)
 - National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) [not included in this report]
 - College Senior Survey (CSS) [not included in this report]
- **Local Direct Assessment**
 - ENGL 1301 and 1302:
 - Students scoring C or better on all assignments; Average grade on all assignments (brief assignments, essay drafts, peer critiques, and writing reviews) prior to late penalties; Students submitting all assignments (attrition gauge)
 - A comparison of scores on start-of-semester and end-of-semester grammar diagnostic examinations.
 - COMS 1300, 2300, and 3358; CFAS 2300, MGT 3373
 - Percentage of all students scoring C or better on the final speech assignment.
 - A comparison of scores on first speech and final speech.
- **Local Indirect Assessment** (selected items related to writing and speaking)
 - TTU's IRIM Graduating Student Survey [not included in this report]

Collegiate Learning Assessment

Analytic Writing Task

- Make-an-Argument
- Critique-an-Argument

Performance Task

Collegiate Learning Assessment

Analytic Writing Task

- Make-an-Argument

“In our time, specialists of all kinds are highly overrated. We need more generalists -- people who can provide broad perspectives.”

Directions: In 45 minutes, agree or disagree and explain the reasons for your position.

Collegiate Learning Assessment

Analytic Writing Task

- Critique-an-Argument

“Butter has now been replaced by margarine in Happy Pancake House restaurants throughout the southwestern United States. Only about 2 percent of customers have complained, indicating that 98 people out of 100 are happy with the change. Thus, to avoid the expense of purchasing butter, the Happy Pancake House should extend this cost-saving change to its restaurants in the southeast and northeast as well.”

Directions: In 30 minutes, discuss how well-reasoned you find the argument.

Collegiate Learning Assessment

Performance Task

In the following real-world scenario, students have 90 minutes to advise the mayor on crime reduction strategies and evaluate two potential policies:

1. Invest in a drug treatment program or
2. Put more police on the streets.

Students are provided with a Document Library, which includes different types of information sources, such as memos, news reports, websites, graphs, data tables, crime statistics, and research briefs.

Collegiate Learning Assessment
Seniors

2008-2009

Adjusted Percentile Rank

Performance Level

Total CLA Score

89

Above

Performance
Task

84

Above

Analytic Writing
Task

83

Above

Make-an
Argument

67

At

Critique-an-
Argument

93

Well Above

Spring 2010

ENGL 1301

Assignment Title	Average Grade (w/o late penalty)	Percentage of students scoring above 70%	# of students turning in assignment
Brief Assignment 1: Pre-Semester Diagnostic	95	96.44	394
Brief Assignment 2: Summary	73	72.14	403
Brief Assignment 3: Article Evaluation	73	71.31	374
Brief Assignment 4: Paraphrase	70	63.61	393
Brief Assignment 5: Developing Thesis Statements	74	68.63	358
Brief Assignment 6: Integrating and Evaluating Quotations	78	80.80	323
Brief Assignment 7: Revisions of Introductions	81	87.46	319
Brief Assignment 8: Revisions of Conclusions	81	87.93	324
Brief Assignment 9: Revisions at the Sentence Level	80	89.21	315
Critique 1.1a	81	86.75	337
Critique 1.1b	81	87.97	319
Draft 1.1 Analysis	71	65.51	375
Draft 1.2: Revised Rhetorical Analysis	77	80.63	318
Final Writing Review	88	95.26	274
All assignments	78.78571429	80.97	348
1301 Pre-Semester Diagnostic Average	76		
1301 Post-Semester Diagnostic Average	80		

Spring 2010

ENGL 1302

Assignment Title	Average Grade (w/o late penalty)	Percentage of students scoring above 70%	# of students turning in assignment
Brief Assignment 1: Pre-Semester Grammar Diagnostic	96	98.13	1771
Brief Assignment 2: Theoretical Framework of Language	80	89.00	1730
Brief Assignment 3: Language and Argument	78	81.72	1708
Brief Assignment 4: Analysis of Literature Reviews	79	83.94	1639
Brief Assignment 5	82	92.49	1518
Brief Assignment 6	82	91.44	1519
Brief Assignment 7	81	88.03	1479
Brief Assignment 8	83	93.59	1483
Brief Assignment 9	84	93.32	1452
Critique 1.1	88	98.00	1507
Critique 2.1a	85	93.97	1615
Critique 2.1b	87	96.78	1498
Draft 1.1: Literature Review	70	60.58	1611
Draft 1.2: Revised Literature Review	75	75.60	1574
Draft 2.1: Classical Argument	71	66.27	1524
Draft 2.2: Revised Classical Argument	75	77.72	1484
Writing Review	87	96.52	1383
All assignments	81.35	86.89	1559
1302 Pre-Semester Diagnostic	76		
1302 Post-Semester Diagnostic	74		

Spring 2010

Analysis of findings on ENGL 1301 and 1302:

1. While 80% of 1301 students and 86.8% of 1302 students who submitted assignments scored 70% or better on those assignments, again, we see that first-year students have more difficulties with longer (1200 – 2000 word) writing assignments. In 1301, 65% and 80% of students scored above a 70% on the major assignments—clearly, more of these students were able to improve their writing on the second draft, but the problems with the first draft still indicate deficiencies with longer assignments. In 1302, 60% and 66% of students, respectively, scored better than 70% on their initial draft of the literature review and classical argument. The second drafts of each showed marked improvement, with 75% and 77%, respectively, scoring above a 70%.
2. The attrition rate from the highest number of students turning in assignments (which occurs with either the first or second assignment submitted) to the last major draft is approximately 19% in ENGL 1301 and 16% in ENGL 1302. As in the fall, both courses experienced an additional drop in the turn-in rate for the final assignment, a review of the semester's writing. Hypothesis for this drop is that students who realized that their course grade was determined and that neither submission or non-submission of the final assignment would change their final grade chose not to complete the final assignment.
3. Scores on the diagnostic rose 4 points in ENGL 1301 and dropped 2 points in ENGL 1302.

Resulting adjustments to ENGL 1301 and 1302:

1. We are considering applying a stiff penalty (perhaps a full letter grade deduction) for students who do not turn in the final assignment. It is a unique assignment of value to students, and we'd like students to do the work.
2. We are revising the diagnostics to make them even more skill-focused. We have also revised the custom textbook's section on style and are incorporating sections from Joseph Williams' *Style: Ten Lessons in Clarity and Grace*, a standard for such instruction.

Spring 2010

COMS 1300	
• students scoring C or better on final speech assignment	88.9%
• comparison of scores on first speech and final speech	+1.7%
COMS 2300	
• students scoring C or better on final speech assignment	92.9%
• comparison of scores on first speech and final speech	+3.9%
COMS 3358	
• students scoring C or better on final speech assignment	95%
• comparison of scores on first speech and final speech	-1.7%

Spring 2010

CFAS 2300 <ul style="list-style-type: none">students scoring C or better on final speech assignment	95%
<ul style="list-style-type: none">comparison of scores on first speech and final speech	-1.6%
MGT 3373 <ul style="list-style-type: none">students scoring C or better on final speech assignment	96%
<ul style="list-style-type: none">comparison of scores on first speech and final speech	+1.3%

Spring 2010

Resulting adjustments to COMS 1300, 2300, 3358:

As a result of the decrease in first-last scores in Spring 2010 for COMS 3358, the evaluation criteria (i.e., the evaluation sheets and the point values contained within them) for both speeches will be reviewed.

Resulting adjustments to CFAS 2300:

No changes are necessary at this time.

Resulting adjustments to MGT 3373:

No changes are necessary at this time.

