

Goal 2 Assessment Record

Goal 2 is as follows: Students will communicate effectively and responsibly through listening and speaking.

Background

All institutions in the South Dakota Board of Regents system adhere to a common set of General Education Goals and Outcomes and policies governing General Education. (See <https://www.sdbor.edu/policy/documents/2-7.pdf>). The Goals are as follows:

GOAL #1: Students will write effectively and responsibly and will understand and interpret the written expression of others.

GOAL #2: Students will communicate effectively and responsibly through listening and speaking.

GOAL #3: Students will understand the organization, potential, and diversity of the human community through study of the social sciences.

GOAL #4: Students will understand the diversity and complexity of the human experience through study of the arts and humanities.

GOAL #5: Students will understand and apply fundamental mathematical processes and reasoning.

GOAL #6: Students will understand the fundamental principles of the natural sciences and apply scientific methods of inquiry to investigate the natural world.

From the mid-1990s to 2017, all “rising juniors” (i.e., students on the verge of entering their junior year) took the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) exam. Students had to pass all sections (i.e., math, writing, science reasoning, and reading) of the exams based on ‘cut scores’ set for the SD system in order to remain enrolled and complete their undergraduate degrees.

CAAP scores and sub-scores were therefore generated for ALL students and served as the system-wide assessment for the attainment of general educational outcomes.

Goals 1 and 2 are considered so critical to the professional preparation of STEM students, the faculty teaching composition, technical writing, and speech collaborate each year to conduct additional assessments.

Goals 3 and 4 are not adequately assessed via the CAAP exam in the view of SDSMT faculty members; therefore, instructors of humanities, history, psychology, and social science courses collaborate regularly to conduct additional assessments.

In 2016, the SD system ceased using the CAAP and developed an artifact-and-rubric-based assessment process that entails system-wide coordination. Implementation begins in fall 2017.

What this Document Contains

[Goal 2 assessment for 2010-2011](#)

[Goal 2 assessment for 2011-2012](#)

Assessment of GOAL 2: Oral Communication (2010)

Students will communicate effectively and responsibly through listening and speaking.

Student Learning Outcomes: As a result of taking courses meeting this goal, students will

1. Demonstrate speaking competencies including choice and use of topic, supporting materials, organizational pattern, language usage, presentational aids, and delivery.
2. Demonstrate listening competencies summarizing, analyzing, and paraphrasing ideas, perspectives, and emotional content.
3. Prepare and deliver speeches for a variety of audiences and settings.

Measures for Goal 2	Method of Analysis—if applicable	Metrics or standards of achievement
Select scores from the National Survey of Student Engagement, including questions 1a, 1b, 11d,		To be set—late February 2010
Employer Survey:	2007-2009: Career Services interviews employers at bi-annual career fairs about student skills and compiles the results of the 9-10 questions asked. Results given to departments and reported centrally	
Rubric-based assessment performed by the writing faculty (43 students in ENGL 279 [fall/spring 2008-09] and 38 students in Speech 101 [fall/spring 2008-09])	Mines Oral Presentation rubric (created in 2004) was used in a pre- and post-assessment for the first attempt at a speech and the final version of the same speech. Six dimensions of rubric scored (i.e., content, organization, style/tone, preparation, presentation, and ethics). Each dimension evaluated on a scale from Unacceptable to Strong .	Needs to be decided upon

Data / Results for GOAL 2: Oral Communication

Measures for Goal 2	Data / results
Select scores from the National Survey of Student Engagement, including questions 1a, 1b, 11d,	1a, 1b, 11d (see below)
Rubric-based assessment performed by the writing faculty	Detailed results are archived; however, the following was noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the <u>first try</u> at their speech, all students in all 4 classes rated as “unacceptable” in the dimensions of “preparation” and “presentation.” • All students improved between the first and second try at their speeches (i.e., between the pre-assessment and post-assessment). • By the post-assessment, all students scored as “Strong” in all dimensions <u>except</u> for “preparation” and “presentation.” • Roughly 1/3 of all ENGL 279 and not quite ½ of all Speech 101 students achieved no higher than “Acceptable” on their final, end-of-semester speech.
Employer Survey at Career Fairs	Q2-How would you rate the communication skills of the SDSM&T students you interviewed? Q3-How would you rate the communication skills of SDSM&T students compared to students from other colleges? (see below)

Analysis / Conclusions Regarding Improvements for Goal 2: Oral Communication

Observations and Discussion:

- Differences in Spcm 101 and Engl 279 scores may be attributed to the following reason: Engl 279 students are generally a year older and may have had more experience giving oral presentations in other gen ed courses.
- Acceptable scores for most criteria on the practice speech in all four sections might be attributed to the students having received instruction on how to organize their speeches.
- Unacceptable scores for preparation and presentation on the practice speech in all four sections might be attributed to the students knowing they would be given a second opportunity to improve the presentation.
- Unacceptable scores for presentation may represent student immaturity at the sophomore level.
- “Preparation” is a persistent and seemingly intractable problem

Suggestions for Future Assessment of Goal 2:

- Revise the rubric: Style/Tone seems to overlap with presentation.
- When preparing students for speaking assignments, emphasize “authority” of voice first, then presentation skills.
- Have a student who has completed the course come in and model effective presentation skills.
- Share the results of this assessment with students.
- Ways of improving preparation included the following:
 - The strong modeling of effective speaking by invited speakers from amongst former students with exemplary oral presentation skills
 - Raising the quality (i.e., the ‘intellectual weight and content’) of topics selected for speeches
 - Creating instances for students to speak in class with more frequency. This needs to be done for ALL classes in which asking students to speak—even briefly—is feasible.
 - Providing more practice opportunities for interviewing
 - Sending these observations to all faculty members across campus to raise their awareness of their role in reinforcing oral communication skills and to solicit their help in better preparing students.

Results for questions 1a, 1b, 11d from NSSE 2008 compared to engineering students nationally (N= 11,000), engineering *and* science students nationally (N= 22,000), and also students in all institutions under Carnegie class 4/year public.

School of Mines compared with:

				School of Mines	ENG + SCI			ENG		
	Variable	Benchmark	Class	Mean ^a	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c
1. Academic and Intellectual Experiences										
<i>In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following? 1=Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Very often</i>										
a.	Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions	CLQUEST	ACL	2.46	2.58	*	-.14	2.51		-.06
			SR	2.77	2.79		-.02	2.66		.12
b.	Made a class presentation	CLPRESEN	ACL	2.12	2.03		.12	2.05		.10
			SR	2.65	2.47	***	.22	2.51	*	.17

For question 11.d: To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?
1=Very little, 2=Some, 3=Quite a bit, 4=Very much

11.d.	Speaking clearly and effectively	GNSPEAK	FY	2.48	2.60	-.12	2.59	-.11
			SR	2.79	2.73	.06	2.76	.04

**Career Fair Surveys of Employers and Employer Representatives
From 2007 through fall 2009 (5 events)**

Question 2: How would you rate the communication skills of the SDSM&T students you met? (n=158)

- 34 excellent
- 100 good
- 24 average

Comments accompanying Question 2 responses

Communication skills overall were average. Some students were excellent while others were just okay.
This year's candidate pool was very inconsistent as far as verbal communication. We chose interviews based more on resumes this year than last. Usually, we can get a lot of information about a student's communication skills at the career fair. There were a couple of surprisingly quiet interviewees and even a few who impressed me more once they started talking. Overall, though, SDSM&T students can put together complete answers and give good detail.
Effective communication is the most important asset a student can have to make a favorable impression
Need more personality and emphasis on this in classes, especially the grad students
Most of them were pretty good, some could use a little more practice.
Communications skills were average/comparable with most students. Prior research by students on companies would present a stronger image
Seemed like the students were really good at being able to talk to me, or very poor at it, but not a lot of "average" students.
Students could definitely benefit from some advice/training on how to sell themselves. Great talking about projects and technical but still need to improve on selling themselves.
Some students were not sure what to ask, but we did talk to a lot of younger candidates for internships.
There are several very strong candidates for summer internships, as well as some strong prospects for future full time hires.
Students used good manners, dressed appropriately and acted professionally

Question 3: How would you rate the communication skills of SDSM&T students compared to students from other colleges? (n=168)

- 23 excellent
- 114 good
- 28 average

Comments accompanying Question 3 responses

Resumes are generally good coming from SDSM&T. Occasionally a wayward engineer doesn't include enough "roundedness" (outside activities, leadership positions). We used resumes more than usual this year, so the detail and sellability of a candidate on paper made a big difference in who we chose to interview. Those with concise, specific detail and a balanced listing of their activities (from school to work to hobbies) were more likely to get an interview.

It is always good to list the goal (internship or full-time), the major, and expected graduation date. This information is very helpful.

Still room for improvement here

students were much more likely to approach us instead of us approaching them

Some I saw were very impressive while others were almost blank. I really liked the resumes submitted on the firmer paper. Also I wouldn't say we hire to GPA, but it is something we look at right away so ensure that is in a location that is easy to spot.

If the student's hands-on experience is with some of the extra-curricular activities, input in resume as they would have a job. Provides more detail for the recruiter on what exactly that extra-curricular activity is & what hands-on experience they have.

SDSM&T is the first stop on our recruiting venture

With all the templates available making good resumes is easy. It would be nice to have a picture of the person, especially since I remember faces better than names.

The common format used by the students is really good. They were easy to read and skim through. They were actually better than most of the schools we go to.

Too many two- and three-page resumes. A few did not have resumes at all, or were poorly formatted. Also, GPA is a must! I was surprised at how many lacked this critical piece of information.

Mostly good. Some students could use some help in the resume-building department.

It is always helpful if they list the engineering courses they have taken/are currently taken.

Cliffs received 125 resumes from SDSMT students at Career Day. Since we can't interview them all, but do consider them all for full-time jobs and internships, it is critical that they have these items: major, GPA (overall), graduation month/yr, applying for full time or internship. Also, It would help if student name badges contained engineering degree & graduation date.

I see a lot of resumes and these were very good. No changes required - your career services staff resume clinics are doing a good job with the students.

Some resumes were not clear on an expected graduation date. But overall, they were well written.

Students were often not prepared to answer questions or ask questions.

Some were naturally stronger verbally than others. About 4 or 5 out of the 12 we interviewed on site the following day really struggled to get their points across.

Would like students to research our company before coming to the career fair.

Assessment of Goal 2 (Oral Communication) (2011)

The faculty of the departments of Humanities and Social Sciences report the following general education assessment activities for 2010.

GOAL 2 ASSESSMENT

Goal 2: Students will communicate effectively and responsibly through speaking and listening.

Goal 2 assessment in 2010 continued to focus on Outcome 2: Demonstration of speaking competencies. Assessment had previously been conducted in two sections of Engl 279—Technical Communications I and two sections of Spcm 101—Fundamentals of Speech, over a four semester period from Fall 2007 through Spring 2009.

The range results for the four courses were as follows:

Course	High Range	Medium Range	Low Range	Total # Students
Spcm 101	7	8	4	19
Spcm 101	6	6	7	19
Engl 279	10	6	4	20
Engl 279	10	10	3	23

During summer 2010, assessment was conducted in one section of **Engl 289—Technical Communications II**. As in the earlier assessments, students were asked to deliver the same oral presentation twice. Students received feedback for improving the presentation following the first, or practice, attempt. The university's Oral Presentation Rubric was used to assess both presentations.

The instructor used a "control" approach in assessing the practice presentation, assigning each student 8 out of 24 possible points. Following the second presentation, the instructor subtracted the points earned on the first presentation from the total earned on the second presentation, in order to identify high, medium, and low ranges of speaking competency.

The range results are as follows for Summer 2010:

Course	High Range	Medium Range	Low Range	Total # Students
ENGL 289	18	0	0	18

The rubric results were also reviewed in terms of the six criteria stated on the oral presentation rubric: **content** is effective; speech is well **organized**; speaker's **style and tone** are effective; speaker demonstrates **preparation**; speaker's **presentation** is appropriate for the intended audience; speech demonstrates the **ethics** governing speaking.

In the summer 2010 section, the students' **preparation** and **presentation** were identified as the primary areas of weakness in the practice presentation.

Observations and Discussion:

- The results suggest that by their second tech comm course, Engl 289 students have had significantly more opportunities for oral presentations and are thus stronger presenters.
- Acceptable scores for most criteria on the practice speech might be attributed to the students having received instruction on how to organize their speeches.
- Unacceptable scores for preparation and presentation on the practice speech might be attributed to the students knowing they would be given a second opportunity to improve the presentation.
- Unacceptable scores for presentation may represent student immaturity at the sophomore level.

Suggestions for Future Assessment of Goal 2:

- Revise the rubric: Style/Tone seems to overlap with presentation.
- When preparing students for speaking assignments, emphasize “authority” of voice first, then presentation skills.
- Have a student who has completed the course come in and model effective presentation skills.
- Share the results of this assessment with students.

Action for 2010:

English faculty will meet in spring semester 2011 to discuss further assessment of Goal 2.

