

Basic Communication Course Annual

Volume 21

Article 8

2009

Speech Evaluation Assessment: An Analysis of Written Speech Feedback on Instructor Evaluation Forms in the Basic Communication Course


Cheri J. Simonds
Illinois State University

Kevin R. Meyer
Illinois State University

Stephen K. Hunt
Illinois State University

Brent K. Simonds
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca>

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), [Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Commons](#), [Mass Communication Commons](#), [Other Communication Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Simonds, Cheri J.; Meyer, Kevin R.; Hunt, Stephen K.; and Simonds, Brent K. (2009) "Speech Evaluation Assessment: An Analysis of Written Speech Feedback on Instructor Evaluation Forms in the Basic Communication Course," *Basic Communication Course Annual*: Vol. 21 , Article 8.

Available at: <http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol21/iss1/8>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Communication at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Basic Communication Course Annual by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

Speech Evaluation Assessment: An Analysis of Written Speech Feedback on Instructor Evaluation Forms in the Basic Communication Course

Cheri J. Simonds

Illinois State University

Kevin R. Meyer

Illinois State University

Stephen K. Hunt

Brent K. Simonds

Illinois State University

Assessment is an important concern in higher education, particularly for general education courses. The educational reform movement of the 1980's gave rise to explicit mandates from institutions which expected assessment of the quality of instruction and student learning on a regular basis (Hay, 1989). Subsequently, state, regional, and national commissions, educational organizations and agencies, and journal articles have stressed the need for colleges and universities to provide clear measures of what they do and how well they do it. As Gardiner (1994) noted, "assessment is essential not only to guide the development of individual students but also to monitor and continuously improve the quality of programs" (p. 109). Operating from the most sanguine perspective, general education instructors and administrators realize that they must be prepared to respond to calls for comprehensive assessment of program objectives and student outcomes.

Volume 21, 2009

As an integral component of many general education programs (Allen, 2002; Cutspec, McPherson, & Spiro, 1999), assessment in the basic communication course is one of the most important issues facing basic course directors (Allen, 2002; Hunt, Simonds, & Hinchliffe, 2000; Morreale, Hanna, Berko, & Gibson, 1999). As Allen (2002) argued, assessment is the key to communication's place in general education, and the development of our discipline. Furthermore, assessment efforts provide critical insight into basic course pedagogy. As such, assessment can offer a response to calls by Sprague (1993) and Book (1989) that research regarding pedagogical practices unique to the communication discipline should be at the forefront of the research agenda.

Assessment has become a particularly salient issue at Illinois State University as a result of significant changes to the general education program. Beyond providing an indication of program quality, programmatic assessment efforts can play an important role in reinforcing the stature of the basic course within general education. The present study reports on a particular aspect of an ongoing large-scale assessment program. Specifically, this study focuses on the speech evaluation training program that was modified based on our previous assessment. It is important to note that this study does not attempt to measure student outcomes; rather, it focuses on the effectiveness of the training program and the measures used to evaluate student performance. Before assessment of student learning can take place, it is necessary to assess the quality of the program and the measures we use to assess students.

BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Portfolio Assessment

Student portfolios are a rich source of assessment data that can inform course directors about the quality of instructor training and student learning. In fact, student portfolios represent a combination of instruction and assessment. According to Farr and Trumbull (1997), a portfolio is “a process tool to link instruction and assessment that entails both teacher and student selection and evaluation of student work against criteria known to both and results in a structured collection of such work, gathered over time” (p. 258). In part, a portfolio is a collection of data about a student's progress over time (Aitken, 1994). Portfolios provide a snapshot of student performance at a specific point in time, thereby enabling students to improve their communication skills through an assessment of their performance (Jensen & Harris, 1999). Specifically, students report that the public speaking portfolio is helpful in developing communication skills because instructor comments guide future presentations (Jensen & Harris, 1999). Additionally, a portfolio is a reflection of how instructor training has translated into classroom instruction and practice. The developmental portfolio is pedagogically valuable because it provides a mechanism to systematically evaluate student learning outcomes (Jensen & Harris, 1999). Additional research is necessary to determine the utility of the speech evaluation materials from the portfolios for assessment purposes. According to Forrest (1990), “there is widespread intuitive belief among those interested in assessing general education that using portfolios might lead to better information about those pro-

grams. However, most colleges and universities have little knowledge about or experience in using such an approach” (p. 1). The present study reveals important information about the use of portfolios for assessment of general education that should be of interest to faculty and administrators across institutions and various academic disciplines. In addition, because oral communication assessment has long been performance based, “it has considerable expertise to contribute to the present movement for alternative assessment” (Rubin, 1996, p. 2). Clearly, the present study could be beneficial to institutions and disciplines wishing to develop their own portfolio-based assessment strategies.

The Illinois State University portfolio project analyzed in this continued assessment effort is a collection of material accumulated over the semester that represents students' insights, observations, experiences, and reflections on communication. This portfolio includes students' speech materials (informative and persuasive speech outlines and evaluation forms), application essays (short written papers that link course concepts to communication phenomenon outside of class), and two short papers that require students to identify their goals for the course (Communication Improvement Profile) and reflect on their progress over the semester (Synthesis paper). The speech materials, and in particular the instructor evaluation forms, are the focus of the present study.

Previous Assessment Efforts

In order to develop an effective, authentic tool for course assessment, Hunt et al. (2000) analyzed the use

of student portfolios in the Illinois State University basic course and determined them to be an efficacious tool for assessment. In addition, portfolios were found to provide a multi-faceted view of student performance, experience, and reflection which reveal patterns of effectiveness and/or areas of concern in the basic course (Hunt et al., 2000; see also Jones et al., 2005). For example, the Hunt et al. (2000) study revealed concerns of grade inflation as well as inconsistencies between speech feedback, performance, and grades received. As a result, the basic course directors at Illinois State University implemented a comprehensive training program utilizing criterion-based grading with model performances via videotape as part of the Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) training program.

Evaluation fidelity. In a subsequent study, Stitt, Simonds, and Hunt (2003) found that the 2001 training program yielded significantly higher rater reliability on speech evaluations post-training. Specifically, instructors were able to grade speeches more consistently and more conservatively, as evidenced by lower grades, following training (Stitt et al., 2003). Since students in different sections of the basic course are likely to compare grades and feedback from various instructors (Stitt et al., 2003), evaluation fidelity is an essential goal for course directors managing large multi-section general education courses. After this study revealed improvement in rater reliability, the course directors made additional improvements to the instructor training program. First, the criteria were modified to include more low inference judgments for each behavior listed on the evaluation form. Second, a new training video session, which served as a model of expected performance, was

produced in light of the new criteria. The present study assesses the effectiveness of this new training by analyzing instructors' written feedback.

Written speech feedback. Another study resulting from the initial portfolio data collection (Reynolds, Hunt, Simonds, & Cutbirth, 2004) examined instructor feedback on student speeches in light of Brown and Levinson's (1967) facework theory. Reynolds et al. (2004) discovered that instructors tended to temper student feedback with positive politeness statements and that they should be trained to include more negative face threats which give students future direction for improvement. Students felt that instructors were too polite in their feedback and, instead, needed to specifically state what students should do to improve for the next speech (Reynolds et al., 2004). Importantly, students presumably demonstrate learning when they improve from one speech to the next (Reynolds et al., 2004). Written feedback provides the necessary means of assisting students in making improvements to and learning from speechmaking (Reynolds et al., 2004). Based on the results of these studies, the basic course directors at Illinois State University determined that more attention should be devoted to effective feedback during the instructor training program. Thus, the new training program focused on the type of feedback instructors provide and its relationship to student scores using criterion-based grading.

Criterion-Based Training Changes

Following the initial round of portfolio data collection, several changes were made to the instructor

training program. As many basic communication courses are quickly becoming integral to general education programs across the country (Allen, 2002; Cutspec et al., 1999), course directors are finding themselves in the position of offering multiple sections taught by multiple instructors. Illinois State University offers approximately 75 sections of the basic course each semester taught by over 50 different instructors. Some instructors arrive on campus with experience in grading speeches, but most do not. Thus, instructor perceptions of what an “A” or “C” speech looks and sounds like varies. This leaves basic course directors with the challenge of creating an evaluation system that is fair, consistent, and reflective of actual student performance—regardless of who is grading the speech. At Illinois State University, multiple steps were followed to create a systematic speech evaluation process. The basic course directors started with an evaluation form, developed a criterion or level of expected performance for each skill, and created models of expected performance for both the students and instructors involved in the evaluation process.

Criterion-based assessment is defined as a tool that “measures the performance against an agreed set of criteria” in contrast to norm-referenced assessment which compares each student’s performance with the student’s peers (Miller, Imrie, & Cox, 1998, p. 110). Thus, criterion-based assessment provides a grading process that is consistent and fair across multiple sections of the basic course. As Stitt et al. (2003) maintain, criterion-based assessment facilitates a shared understanding between what is expected and what is performed. That is, instructors and students alike understand the differ-

ences between an A and C speech. With this in mind, qualitative low-inference judgments are provided for each behavior listed on the instructor evaluation form. In addition to training instructors to use the evaluation criteria, the instructors also train their students to use the evaluation criteria. Therefore, through criterion-based assessment, students are able to participate in their own learning since they know exactly what work is required to earn a particular grade (Dominowski, 2002).

An important step in the process following the initial round of portfolio assessment was to create a model of expected performance for both students and instructors based on the criteria. With the help of graduate students and mass media faculty, the basic course directors wrote and videotaped “A” and “C” speeches on an informative speech topic about the Roman Coliseum (we used the same presenter for both speeches). The C speech is intended to model an average level of performance for each behavior in the criteria. The same is true for the A speech. The A speech, however, is qualitatively different from the C speech. Whereas the C speech meets minimal expectations for the requirements of the assignment, the A speech is more creative, powerful, and effective along all behavioral sets. For example, a C speech might use language that is informal whereas an A speech uses language that is vivid, imaginative, and powerful. Outlines with references were produced for both speeches. These videotapes were used to train both instructors and students to see the qualitative differences between A and C speeches for each of the behaviors.

Types of Feedback

The next phase of our training process for the instructors was to discuss the types of feedback they should provide students. We wanted instructors to provide comments which give students a plan for improvement. In our initial analysis of a large number of instructor evaluations (based on the same data used in Reynolds et al., 2004), we found that instructors generally relied on the following four types of comments: positive non-descriptive, positive descriptive, negative, and constructive (see Appendix).

Positive non-descriptive comments indicate that the student did a good job but do not describe or detail how the task was accomplished. Examples include: *good eye contact, nice references, excellent visual aids, plus marks (+)*. Positive descriptive comments are those that demonstrate that the student did a good job, and specifically describe or detail what was liked about how the student accomplished their task. Examples include: *good job of engaging your audience through the use of facial expression and direct eye contact, nice job of incorporating full source citations into the flow of your presentation, your visual aids are very professionally produced and incorporated smoothly into the presentation.*

Negative comments criticize the speech without providing suggestions for improvement. Examples include: *poor eye contact, weak sources, visual aids need work, minus marks (-)*. Constructive comments acknowledge the need for improvement in the speech and provide specific direction or detail on how to improve. Examples include: *you need more direct eye contact, try using fewer note cards and gaze more directly with more of your audience, try to provide more complete information for*

each source, I would suggest putting complete information on your note-cards, your visual aids need to be larger and bolder, practice incorporating them into the flow of your speech.

Instructors were also trained to use feedback to determine scores. For example, C speeches are those that meet all of the requirements for the assignment and the criteria for a C speech. As a result, C speech evaluations should contain more constructive comments than positive descriptive comments. Conversely, A speeches are those that exceed the requirements for the assignment, meet the criteria for an A speech, and will contain more positive descriptive comments than constructive comments. Using language from the criteria form to provide elaboration, instructors were trained to examine the relationship between the types of comments provided (constructive/positive descriptive) and the score for each graded category (outline, introduction, body, conclusion, deliver, impression). Finally, instructors were trained to use the grading scale for each category to determine student speech scores.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

A primary concern for basic course directors should be the ability of instructors to effectively evaluate speeches (Stitt et al., 2003). Certainly, one aspect of effective evaluation is the written feedback provided by instructors. While previous studies have assessed the consistency of instructor grades (Stitt et al., 2003) and the influence of written feedback on students (Reynolds et al., 2004), the intersection of written feedback and

speech grades has yet to be explored. Thus, the present study seeks to examine the previously unexplored link between instructor evaluation training and actual instructor feedback as well as the link between instructor feedback and student performance. Consequently, the present study represents a continuation of previous assessment efforts begun by the course directors, as well as an exploration of the effects of the instructor training program on speech feedback and the effects of that feedback on student improvement. Importantly, it is necessary to assess the effectiveness of instructor training prior to assessing student outcomes since effective programmatic assessment must not only hold students accountable for learning outcomes, but must also hold instructors accountable for their role in the learning process.

Ideally, instructor feedback would serve as a springboard for student learning. Certainly, instructors hope that students take previous feedback into account as they prepare for future speeches. If criterion-based training programs aimed at improving instructor feedback work as they are intended to do, it seems logical to conclude that a relationship should exist between instructor feedback and student performance. Portfolio assessment specifically provides a mechanism through which to measure both the nature of instructor feedback as well as student performance. Thus, the following research question is posed for the present study:

RQ₁: What is the relationship between the type of instructor feedback and students scores on the informative and persuasive speeches?

Second, following the revision of specific criteria for instructor evaluation of student speeches, the creation of videotaped example speeches, and the implementation of speech evaluation training, we sought to determine if instructors were using the language in the criteria as part of their written feedback to students:

RQ₂: Are instructors using language from the criteria for evaluating speeches in their feedback to students? If so, how are instructors using language from the criteria?

METHOD

Portfolio Sample

Speech evaluation materials were collected at the close of the Fall 2004 semester from all students ($N = 360$) enrolled in communication courses taught by all first-year GTAs ($n = 16$) who were the recipients of the latest version of the criterion-based speech evaluation training program. Approximately 50% ($n = 180$) of these students gave us permission and informed consent to use their portfolios for analysis. Speech materials were then pulled from those portfolios for the current study. Some of the speech materials were not present in all the student portfolios; thus, only complete sets of speech materials (including instructor evaluation forms for both the informative and persuasive speeches) were included in this study ($n = 154$).

Coding Procedures

Speech evaluation. Speech evaluation materials were content analyzed using the objective and systematic procedures described by Kaid and Wadsworth (1989). Accordingly, the researchers defined the categories by which the data were analyzed using the types of comments described earlier in this manuscript. To answer the first research question, a code book was designed to record the number of each type of comment (*positive non-descriptive, positive descriptive, negative, constructive*) for each category of evaluation (outline, introduction, body, conclusion, delivery, overall impression) for each speech (informative and persuasive). Scores for each category of evaluation and total scores for each speech were recorded on a code sheet for speech evaluation.

Next, a group of coders was trained by the researchers to implement the coding process. Specifically, nine coders (in three groups of three) were trained by the researchers. The coders were all taking part in a graduate seminar on communication assessment during the Spring of 2005. As this course offered an educational experience where students needed to learn the process of using content analysis to conduct portfolio assessment, it was important to group the coders in order to offer the pedagogical benefits of learning in groups as well as to avoid the limitations associated with having too many coders. While the groups could discuss decisions made within their group, no discussions took place across the three groups. As such, the groups of coders independently analyzed 10% of the sample sets ($n = 16$) to assess intercoder reliability for all categories. Reliabilities for individual categories ranged from .80 to .94

with an overall reliability of .84. Importantly, a coding reliability coefficient, measured with Cohen's kappa, of .75 or greater is considered excellent (Fleiss, 1981; Neuendorf, 2002). Pearson product moment correlations were then calculated for each type of comment and overall score.

Language from the criteria. To answer the second research question, a separate analysis of the language used in instructor feedback that came from the grading criteria was conducted. For this portion of the study, three coders, who were not involved in the speech evaluation analysis, were trained by the researchers. The coders were provided with a code book for language from the criteria and a code sheet to record the results. The three coders met initially to discuss the rules for unitizing and categorizing the data. The coders agreed on the substantive words from the criteria for evaluating informative and persuasive speeches that would be considered when coding instructor feedback. For this analysis, we used the categories of descriptive and prescriptive. Descriptive comments used language from the criteria to indicate the student's current level of performance (this is what student did); whereas, prescriptive comments used language from the criteria to offer advice for future direction (this is what student could or should do). A total of 15 sets of informative and persuasive speech instructor evaluation forms were coded for intercoder reliability. Reliabilities for individual categories, using Cohen's kappa, ranged from .36 to 1.00 with an overall reliability of .80. A total of 69 sets of informative and persuasive instructor speech forms then were coded independently by the three coders from 17 differ-

ent sections of the basic course, representing a total of 15 different instructors' classrooms.

RESULTS

Speech Evaluation

The first research question examined the relationship between the type of instructor feedback and student scores on informative and persuasive speeches. The results indicated a positive linear relationship between positive (non-descriptive and descriptive) instructor comments and students' speech scores. That is, as the number of positive comments increased, so did the student scores. Likewise, a negative linear relationship was found to exist between negative/constructive instructor comments and students' speech scores. Thus, a greater number of negative instructor comments was correlated with lower speech scores (see Table 1 for all correlation coefficients).

Table 1
Correlations between Instructors Feedback
and Students' Speech Scores

	Positive Non- Descriptive	Positive Descriptive	Negative	Constructive
Informative Speech Score	.34	.21	-.26	-.33
Persuasive Speech Score	.41	.32	-.26	-.29

Note: All correlations were significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

Language from the Criteria

The second research question examined instructor use of language from the criteria in feedback to students. Instructors averaged 4.81 total comments from the criteria on the informative speech ($SD = 4.58$) and 4.19 total comments from the criteria on the persuasive speech ($SD = 4.80$). Table 2 provides the descriptive statistics for instructor comments by type. When instructors used language from the criteria, more descriptive comments were made than prescriptive comments. Descriptive comments were operationalized as simply reflecting behaviors of the speaker. Examples include: *cited the required number of sources, used gestures, provided counterarguments, used statistics*. Prescriptive comments provided clear courses of action for the students to take to make improvements. Examples include: *add qualifications of authors to your oral citations in order to enhance the credibility of your evidence, use descriptive gestures that help illustrate your points, take a couple steps between your main points to help the audience visualize your outline, remove one hand from your note cards and use it to make gestures*. Indeterminate comments used language which lacked a clear tense or linking verbs. Examples include: *fluency, direct eye contact, APA style, signposts*. In cases of indeterminate language use, the coders could not determine if the instructor comment referenced a student behavior that the speaker actually did during the speech or if the comment referenced a recommendation for future speaker behavior.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for Instructor Written Speech
Feedback

Speech	Comment Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Informative	Descriptive	2.68	3.59
	Prescriptive	1.55	1.67
	Indeterminate	.58	1.31
Persuasive	Descriptive	2.17	3.11
	Perscriptive	1.25	1.24
	Indeterminate	.77	1.73

Note. Mean scores represent the average number of instructor comments.

DISCUSSION

The results of the present study suggest several implications for student assessment, instructor training programs, and overall course assessment. Importantly, our findings indicate that criterion-based training is an effective means of preparing instructors, but should be continuously refined to better meet course outcomes. While we did find that the nature of the comments were related to students' grades, results suggest that training could be improved to stress the importance of providing more prescriptive comments. Additionally, our findings suggest that the speech evaluation instrument is a valid means of measuring student performance in meeting learning objectives. Thus, based upon these results, the

next step in our programmatic assessment efforts will focus on student outcome assessment.

Speech Evaluation

The first research question examined the relationship between the type of instructor feedback and student scores on informative and persuasive speeches. The results indicate that instructors were able to apply the types of feedback appropriately to determine student scores. That is, negative and constructive comments were associated with lower scores, and positive-non-descriptive and positive-descriptive comments were associated with higher scores. However, the results also suggest that instructors could be more descriptive and constructive in their comments. Instructors use feedback to inform students of changes that are necessary for improvement in future speeches (Reynolds et al., 2004). Thus, instructor comments that were coded as negative are problematic for students, since the feedback is vague about what to do in order to improve. Likewise, comments that are positive but non-descriptive do not provide any future direction for what students should continue to do for similar success next time. We also need to train our instructors to write their feedback in the future tense to enhance the descriptive and constructive nature of their comments.

Language from the Criteria

The second research question examined instructor use of language from the criteria in feedback to students. Criterion-based rubrics communicate to students

what is to be valued in a speech performance. By using language from the established criteria, instructors signal to students the extent to which their performance matched the expected performance. While the results indicate that instructors are using language from the criteria, we would like to see it more prominently used in the overall evaluation. The findings for research question two also indicate that clarity of feedback is a concern. Instructors should clarify whether a given comment is in reference to a behavior that the speaker did during the speech or if the comment is in reference to a recommendation for future behavior that the speaker should try to implement. Previously, Reynolds et al. (2004) found that vague comments by instructors were perceived as confusing and frustrating by students. According to students, the more specific the feedback, the better. For example, instructors can be more prescriptive than descriptive by offering specific recommendations for how students can alter or change elements of their speeches. Thus, the criterion-based training program could be further refined to stress the importance of using and, to model the practice of, writing prescriptive comments.

Recommendations for Training and Written Feedback

This study assessed the effectiveness of our current speech evaluation training program and explored areas in need of improvement. Specifically, the results indicate that instructors need to be more constructive and descriptive with their feedback, write comments that provide future direction and purpose, and rely more on

the language from the criteria. Taken as a whole, this assessment effort indicates areas for future emphasis in speech evaluation training and the instructor training program. Armed with the results of the data from this round of portfolio assessment, the course directors plan to address issues related to quality of feedback to help students improve their presentations. Based on the results of our long term assessment efforts, we offer the following systematic speech evaluation training program:

- Start with an evaluation form,
- Decide on a criterion or level of expected performance for each skill,
- Develop models of expected performance using the criteria,
- Train instructors to use positive descriptive and constructive comments to determine student scores,
- Train instructors to use the language from the criteria to provide future direction for student improvement.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

As the course directors continue to make modifications to the basic course curriculum and instructor training program, future assessment efforts will be required to monitor the progress of instruction and student learning. The course directors developed new evaluation training based on qualitative data from two previous studies in hopes of increasing the quality of speech evaluation language (Hunt et al., 2000; Reynolds et al., 2004). Previous portfolio data revealed that there

was a discrepancy between instructor comments and student scores. For example, Reynolds et al. (2004) found that less than 50% of the students interviewed felt that their evaluations provided them necessary explanations for improvement. In this study, the researchers were pleased to note high correlations between the type of instructor comments and student scores. However, since the evaluation criteria did not exist in its present form in the previous studies there is no way to make direct comparisons with the earlier portfolio data. In addition, anecdotal evidence suggests that the low rate at which students submitted their portfolios to the researchers (approximately 50%) was due in part to positive affect for their portfolio work. For example, two entire sections chose not to participate because the students valued and wanted to keep their portfolios. The course directors also noted that the GTAs in these sections received abnormally high student evaluations. Perhaps the portfolios examined in this study have an inherent bias that skews the results in some way. The effects of this possible bias are unknown and should be considered in future studies.

Hopefully, researchers at other institutions can make use of the lessons learned at Illinois State University when conducting their own large-scale program assessments. Some important notions to keep in mind when conducting an evaluation of any program is to begin with specific, measurable criteria that will be markers of excellence, and to realize that research results are not meant primarily to “prove” success or failure, but to guide future decisions for improvement. Assessment results and program revisions based on these results

communicate to administrators a commitment to curricular improvement.

Research methodologies of the communication discipline such as content analysis are well-suited to the task of university program assessment and evaluation using portfolios. Perhaps communication researchers can continue to share their expertise throughout the university community and help other programs with their own assessment and accountability efforts. Research is needed at other institutions to demonstrate a more universal validation of our discipline's vital role in the education of undergraduate students. For instance, future lines of research could be constructed to assess the development of students' information literacy, critical thinking, and civic engagement skills—all of which are highly valued by higher education administrators, directors of general education, and basic course instructors.

Critical theorists might argue that assessment should be driven by the perspective of students. Since the end result of the present analysis is to improve the clarity of feedback to students, it is reasonable to contend that the present assessment effort seeks to empower students. However, expanding the present assessment effort to include the perspective of students would help to better understand learning in the basic course. While Reynolds et al. (2004) found that students reported instructor feedback to be helpful, students felt that the feedback lacked explanatory power. Future rounds of portfolio assessment ought to revisit student perceptions of instructor feedback to determine if the quality of feedback has improved as a result of changes in the instructor-training program.

REFERENCES

- Aitken, J.E. (1994, August). *Assessment in specific programs: Employment, program, and course student portfolios in communication studies*. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Summer Conference, Alexandria, VA.
- Allen, T.H. (2002). Charting a communication pathway: Using assessment to guide curriculum development in a re-vitalized general education plan. *Communication Education, 51*, 26-39.
- Benander, R., Denton, J., Page, D., & Skinner, C. (2000). Primary trait analysis: Anchoring assessment in the classroom. *The Journal of General Education, 49*, 279-302.
- Book, C.L. (1989). Communication education: Pedagogical content knowledge needed. *Communication Education, 38*, 315-321.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Cutspec, P.A., McPherson, K., & Spiro, J.H. (1999). Branching our to meet the needs of our students: A model for oral communication assessment and curriculum programs. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 11*, 133-163.
- Dominowski, R.L. (2002). *Teaching undergraduates*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Farr, B.P., & Trumbull, E. (1997). *Assessment alternatives for diverse classrooms*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.
- Fleiss, J.L. (1981). *Statistical methods for rates and proportions*. New York: Wiley.
- Forrest, A. (1990). *Time will tell: Portfolio-assisted assessment of general education*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education Assessment Forum.
- Gardiner, L.F. (1994). *Redesigning higher education: Producing dramatic gains in student learning (Report No. 7)*. Washington, DC: Graduate School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.
- Hay, E.A. (1989). Educational reform and speech communication. In P.J. Cooper & K.M. Galvin (Eds.), *The future of speech communication education* (pp. 12-16). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.
- Hay, E.A. (1992). A national survey of assessment trends in communication departments. *Communication Education, 41*, 247-257.
- Hunt, S., Simonds, C., & Hinchliffe, L. (2000). Using student portfolios as authentic assessment of the basic communication course. *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching, 11*(1), 57-77.
- Jensen, K.K., & Harris, V. (1999). The public speaking portfolio. *Communication Education, 48*, 211-227.
- Jones, A.C., Simonds, C.J., & Hunt, S.K. (2005). The use of application essays as an effective tool for assess-

ing instruction in the basic communication course. *Communication Education*, 54, 161-169.

Kaid, L.L., & Wadsworth, A.J. (1989). Content analysis. In P. Emmert & L.L. Barker (Eds.), *Communication measurement procedures* (pp. 197-217). New York: Longman.

Miller, A.H., Imrie, B.W., & Cox, K. (1998). *Student assessment in higher education: A handbook for assessing performance*. London: Kogan Page Limited.

Morreale, S.P., Hanna, M.S., Berko, R.M., & Gibson, J.W. (1999). The basic communication course at U.S. colleges and universities: VI. *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 11, 1-36.

Neuendorf, K.A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Reynolds, D., Hunt, S.K., Simonds, C.J., & Cutbirth, C.W. (2004). Written speech feedback in the basic communication course: Are instructors too polite to students? *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 16, 36-70.

Rubin, D.L. (1996). A preface relating alternative assessment, test fairness, and assessment utility to communication. In S.P. Morreale & P.M. Backlund (Eds.), *Large scale assessment of oral communication: K-12 and higher education* (pp. 1-4) (2nd ed). Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, English, and Communication.

Sprague, J. (1993). Retrieving the research agenda for communication education: Asking the pedagogical

questions that are “embarrassments to theory.”
Communication Education, 42, 106-122.

Stitt, J.K., Simonds, C.J., & Hunt, S.K. (2003).
Evaluation fidelity: An examination of criterion-
based assessment and rater training in the speech
communication classroom. *Communication Studies*,
54, 341-353.

APPENDIX

TYPES OF SPEECH FEEDBACK

Definition	Examples
<p><i>Constructive</i></p> <p>Constructive comments acknowledge the need for improvement in the speech and provide specific direction or detail on how to improve. These comments may give students some advice and/or future direction. These comments make a request of the student to do something different next time, and are low-inference in nature; you can assume that the student would reasonably know specific behaviors to engage in based on the feedback.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You need more direct eye contact. Try using fewer note-cards and gaze more directly with more of your audience. • Try to provide more complete information for each source. I would suggest putting complete information on your note-cards. • Your Visual Aids need to be larger and bolder. Practice incorporating them into the flow of your speech. • Read less. • Be confident.
<p><i>Positive Descriptive</i></p> <p>Positive Descriptive comments are those that say that the student did a good job, and specifically describe or detail what was liked about how the student accomplished their task (going above and beyond what is listed as a skill in the behavior set). These comments may give students some advice and/or future direction. These comments may indicate repeatable behaviors for continued success, and are also low inference in nature.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good job of engaging your audience through the use of facial expression and direct eye contact. • Nice job of incorporating full source citations into the flow of your presentation. • Your Visual Aids are very professionally produced and incorporated smoothly into the presentation. • Cool quote to close. • Nice energy and enthusiasm in your closing remarks.

Positive Non-Descriptive

Positive Non-Descriptive comments say that the student did a good job but do not describe or detail how the task was accomplished. These comments generally identify which behavior is performed well, but lack any specificity. When feedback is high inference in nature, it is non-descriptive.

- Good Eye Contact
- Clear Thesis
- Thorough Development
- Excellent Visual Aids
- Plus Marks (+)
- Happy Faces (☺)
- Yes
- Funny (high inference)

Negative

Negative comments criticize the speech without providing suggestions for improvement. These comments generally identify which behavior is present, lacking, or performed poorly, but lack any specificity (or are high inference in nature).

- Poor Eye Contact
 - Only heard 2 sources
 - Conclusion not stated
 - Visual Aids need work
 - Minus marks (-) or Check marks
 - No
 - Neutral statements (present, adequate, fine, ok, sufficient, appropriate)
-