Fall 2022 COM Assessment: Findings

assembled by Rick Fisher, Director of UW Communication across the Curriculum

In Fall 2022, UW offered 191 sections (taught by 126 distinct instructors) related to COM course delivery. Each instructor of COM course(s) received a request to submit assessment data for *one* of the COM courses they taught. A total of 60 submissions were received, representing a response rate of 47%.

Quantitative Results. Like previous semesters, this fall's approach asked each participating instructor to report *three* students' performance on either a written or oral assignment for the course; the total valid data set for this assessment was 175 individual pieces of student work. Evaluation of performance was based on AAC&U's 4-point VALUE rubric for Written Communication *or* Oral Communication. Average instructor evaluations scores are shown in Tables F22.1 and F22.2. Given the limited number of courses for which oral communication scores were submitted (n=13), averages for oral communication are not broken out by COM level.

Table F22.1. Average rubric scores of student written work by COM level					
	Context	Content	Conventions	Sourcing	Grammar
COM1	3.01	3.00	3.07	3.00	3.07
COM2	3.15	3.11	2.81	3.04	2.97
COM3	3.33	3.17	3.08	3.22	3.08

Table F22.2. Average rubric scores of student oral presentation					
	Organization	Language	Delivery	Support	Message
COM1-COM3	3.36	3.34	3.25	3.32	3.43

As with previous semesters, (1) there is a general trend for scores to be higher in COM3 courses than in COM1 and COM2 courses, and (2) scores for oral communication projects are typically higher than scores for written work.

Qualitative Feedback. Instructors were invited to provide additional comments alongside their rubric scores. Among the few who did, many expressed pleasure at overall student performance (especially for oral communication assignments):

- Students generally did well in the descriptive writing task. Two in particular went beyond mere physical description, invoking context and storyline to develop the message. (COM1)
- This assignment has really "grown up" with this class. At first, it was an in-person oral presentation, but then shifted to an online oral/video presentation when the class became asynchronous. There are challenges to both and I feel like every semester I tweak it to respond to either student feedback or deficiencies (and successes) that I notice. Glad it's a part of the curriculum. (COM2)
- My highest performing student in this random selection and my middle range student stayed this way all semester. However, it is my lowest performing student in this random selection who had the most growth in the class overall despite the rankings on this survey. (COM3)
- The students had opportunity for peer review of their oral presentation drafts and for practicing the delivery of their oral presentations. All students made significant improvements as they completed these stages of the assignment. Some made very significant improvements. (COM3)

One instructor also commented about the assessment task itself: "This is a good way to reflect on these assignments!" This feedback is a nice reminder that assessment is not only about the quantitative results!

Appendix: Previous COM Assessment Results

SPRING 2022

In Spring 2022, UW offered 202 course sections (taught by 128 distinct instructors) related to COM course delivery. Each instructor of a COM course received a request to submit assessment data for *one* of the COM courses they taught. A total of 88 submissions were received (a response rate of ~65%. The total data set for this assessment was 247 individual pieces of student work. Evaluation of performance was based on AAC&U's VALUE rubric for Written Communication *or* Oral Communication. Tables S22.1 and S22.2 provide average instructor evaluation scores.

Table S22.1. Average rubric scores of student written work by COM level					
	Context	Content	Conventions	Sourcing	Grammar
COM1	2.97	2.93	3.10	3.07	2.97
COM2	3.42	3.30	3.11	3.12	3.07
COM3	3.32	3.24	3.27	3.23	3.17

Table S22.2. Average rubric scores of student oral presentation by COM level					
	Organization	Language	Delivery	Support	Message
COM2	3.30	3.24	3.18	3.09	3.48
COM3	3.47	3.27	3.13	3.27	3.40

FALL 2021

In Fall 2021, UW offered 198 sections (taught by 131 distinct instructors) related to COM course delivery. Each instructor of COM course(s) received a request to submit assessment data for *one* of the COM courses they taught. A total of 92 submissions were received for a response rate of 70.2%. Each instructor who participated was asked to report *three* students' performance on either a written or oral assignment for the course. Thus, the total data for this assessment was approximately 275 individual pieces of student work. Evaluation of performance was based on AAC&U's VALUE rubric for Written Communication *or* Oral Communication. Average instructor evaluations scores are shown in Tables F21.1 and F21.2.

Table F21.1. Average rubric scores of student written work by COM level					
	Context	Content	Conventions	Sourcing	Grammar
COM1 (26)	3.09	2.87	2.86	2.84	2.97
COM2 (18)	3.17	3.04	2.91	3.02	2.98
COM3 (32)	3.25	3.20	3.11	3.06	3.04

Table 21.2. Average rubric scores of student oral presentation by COM level					
	Organization	Language	Delivery	Support	Message
COM2 (8)	3.50	3.54	3.50	3.25	3.50
COM3 (8)	3.50	3.50	3.38	3.42	3.67