

**PROPOSAL TO
IUPUI Program Research and Assessment Committee
Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement
AO 140
IUPUI
355 N. Lansing Street
Indianapolis, IN 46202**

Title: Improving Student and Instructor Assessment in the R110 Gateway Course

Project Directors: Kate Thedwall
Department of Communication Studies
309 Cavanaugh Hall
IUPUI
425 N. University Blvd
Indianapolis, IN 46202
317.507.2549
kthedwal@iupui.edu

Maureen C. Minielli
Department of Communication Studies
309 Cavanaugh Hall
IUPUI
425 N. University Blvd
Indianapolis, IN 46202
317.201.0722
mminiell@iupui.edu

Project Period: March – December 2003

Amount Requested: **\$1492.12**

Date: February 15, 2003

Improving Student and Instructor Assessment in the R110 Gateway Course

Table of Contents

I.	Description of Project	3
II.	Aims, Objectives and Measurable Outcomes of the Proposed Project	4
III.	Description of Assessment Methods	4-7
	a. Measurement of Student Communication Apprehension in the R110 Gateway Course	4-6
	i. PRCA-24 Survey	
	ii. WTC Survey	
	b. R110 Student Portfolio Test Pilot	6-7
	c. R110 Instructor Assessment Program	7
IV.	How Will Findings Be Used for Program Improvement?	7-9
V.	Documentation of Proposed Schedule for Project Implementation	9-11
VI.	Itemized Budget	11-15
VII.	References	16-18
VIII.	Appendix A – Aims, Objectives and Measurable Outcomes of Proposed Project	19-25
	a. Measurement of Student Communication Apprehension in the R110 Gateway Course	19-21
	b. R110 Student Portfolio Test Pilot	21-23
	c. R110 Instructor Assessment Program	23-25
IX.	Appendix B - PRCA-24 Survey	26-27
X.	Appendix C – WTC Survey	28-29
XI.	Appendix D – Itemized Budget for ISU Visit – September 2003	30

Improving Student and Instructor Assessment in the R110 Gateway Course

I. Description of Project

This project encompasses several smaller projects designed to improve the overall assessment of students and instructors in the R110 Gateway Course. Specifically, we would like to accomplish the following three projects: (1) Measure student communication apprehension (CA) levels about public speaking by administering two different CA surveys at the beginning and end of each R110 course for the 2003 Summer I, Summer II and Fall sessions; (2) Test pilot the use of student portfolios in the R110 Gateway Course over the 2003 Summer I, Summer II and Fall sessions; and (3) Begin initial steps to create an R110 Instructor Assessment program using student portfolios during the Fall 2003 semester.

- A. **Measurement of Student Communication Apprehension in the R110 Gateway Course:** This project will administer the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension 24 (PRCA 24) and the Willingness to Communicate (WTC) surveys to approximately 1700 students enrolled in the 2003 Summer I, Summer II and Fall Communication Studies R110 Fundamentals of Public Speaking gateway course. The surveys are designed to measure the level of *communication apprehension* (CA) students may have regarding public speaking. The surveys will be administered twice during each semester, at the beginning of the semester, prior to the first public speaking assignment, and again at the semester's conclusion after the fifth and last speaking assignment. There are several independent goals for this project for R110 Students, the Department of Communication Studies, and the School of Liberal Arts. Maureen Minielli will be the primary researcher for this project.
- B. **R110 Student Portfolio Test Pilot:** This project will select 5 volunteer R110 sections during the 2003 Summer I and Summer II sessions each and ask 4 volunteer students per section to create R110 course portfolios. This will create a sample of approximately 5% of the overall R110 student population enrolled during each summer session (20/375 for Summer I session and 16/275 for Summer II session). These portfolios will be analyzed by a group of 9 volunteer R110 Instructors (5 from the Summer I session and 4 from the Summer II session) will analyze 4 portfolios each to determine levels of curriculum consistency between R110 sections. Results will be shared with all R110 instructors through a series of in-service workshops during the Fall 2003 semester. Ultimately, we would like to require all R110 students to create student portfolios starting with Fall 2004 semester (to coincide with the new R110 Student Coursebook). Kate Thedwall will be the primary researcher for this project.
- C. **R110 Instructor Assessment Program:** This project will entail using the 2003 Summer I and Summer II sessions R110 Student Portfolios (36 overall) to assess R110 Instructors regarding course content and speech grading in the Gateway course. During the Fall 2003 semester, 12 R110 Instructors each will be assigned 3 student portfolios each to assess how

individual R110 Instructors maintain consistency with the R110 course curriculum and evaluate student oral and written assignments. Through a series of in-service workshops, these groups will share their findings with the other R110 Instructor groups. Ultimately, we would like to identify key criteria that should be used by all R110 instructors when assigning course content and evaluating student assignments, and also we would like to create a formal R110 Instructor Assessment program that can be used to evaluate current and future R110 instructors. Kate Thedwall will be the primary researcher for this project.

- D.** In addition to applying for a PRCA Grant for this project, Researchers Thedwall and Minielli will apply for two additional grants to fund this project: (1) SLA's Small Grants for Faculty Research Using New Technology (*Tech Grant*) and (2) OPD's Gateway Course Special Focus Grant, (*Gateway Grant*), both due in March 2003.

II. Aims, Objectives and Measurable Outcomes of the Proposed Project – See Appendix A

III. Description of Assessment Methods

A. Measurement of Student Communication Apprehension in the R110 Gateway Course

- i. Two independent surveys will be administered during the Summer I and II, and Fall 2003 semesters to all R110 Gateway Courses. The two surveys are the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension-24 (PRCA-24) and the Willingness to Communicate (WTC). These surveys are based on the four primary CA student traits primarily examined by contemporary communication scholars: (1) communication apprehension; (2) shyness; (3) willingness to communicate; and (4) self-perceived communication competence (McCroskey, Richmond, and McCroskey, 2002). One half of the R110 classes will take the PRCA-24, and the other half will take the WTC.

ii. PRCA-24 Survey

1. The PRCA-24 Survey is a 24 question assessment instrument designed to measure student CA in four areas: group discussion, interpersonal communication, group meetings, and public speaking (McCroskey, 2000). **See Appendix B.**
2. The PRCA-24 Survey is a very popular CA measurement currently used by many North American college and universities (Silagyi-Rebovich, Rosso and Prus, 2001; Solomon and Knobloch, 2001). The PRCA-24 Survey has been proven to be a reliable, effective and valid measurement of CA (McCroskey, 1978).
3. The PRCA-24 Survey has been approved by the National Communication Association for use in the assessment of

oral communication (National Communication Association, 1998).

4. The PRCA-24 will be administered to [() = rounded up number will be used]

Semester	1/2 of total R110 Instructors	½ of total R110 Sections	Total # of Students in each section	Total # of Students Tested
Summer I	5.5 (6)	7.7 (8)	25	200
Summer II	4	5.5 (6)	25	150
Fall	11.5 (12)	21	25	525
TOTAL	21 (22)	34.2 (35)	75	875

Semester	Total # Traditional R110 Sections	Total # UCol-linked R110 Sections	Total # Honors R110 Sections	Total # of Online R110 Sections
Summer I	15	0	0	0
Summer II	11	0	0	0
Fall	32	7	1	2
TOTAL	48	7	1	2

5. The numbers and types of sections asked to administer the PRCA-24 survey will depend on instructor staffing and types of course offerings for the 2003 Summer I, Summer II and Fall sessions.

iii. WTC Survey

1. The WTC Survey is a 20-question assessment instrument designed to measure student CA in seven areas: group discussion, group meetings, interpersonal conversations, public speaking, and communication with a stranger, acquaintance, and friend (McCroskey and Richmond, 1987).
2. As with the PRCA-24, the WTC has also been proven to be a reliable, effective and valid measure of CA (McCroskey, 1992).
3. The WTC Survey has been approved by the National Communication Association for use in the assessment of oral communication (National Communication Association, 1998). **See Appendix C.**
4. The WTC will be administered to [() = rounded down number will be used]

Semester	Total # of R110 Instructors	Total # of R110 Sections	Total # of Students in each section	Total # of Students Tested
Summer I	5.5 (5)	7.7 (7)	25	175
Summer II	4	5.5 (5)	25	125
Fall	11.5 (11)	21	25	525
TOTAL	21 (20)	34.2 (33)	75	825

Semester	Total # Traditional R110 Sections	Total # UCol-linked R110 Sections	Total # Honors R110 Sections	Total # of Online R110 Sections
Summer I	15	0	0	0
Summer II	11	0	0	0
Fall	32	7	1	2
TOTAL	48	7	1	2

5. The numbers and types of sections asked to administer the WTC survey will depend on instructor staffing and types of course offerings for the 2003 Summer I, Summer II and Fall sessions.
6. A formal report containing the results of these surveys will be included in our final PRAC report. The results will be shared with R110 instructors, the Department of Communication Studies, and the School of Liberal Arts.

B. R110 Student Portfolio Test Pilot

- i. 4 students from 5 R110 section during the 2003 Summer I session (20 total portfolios/375 overall students) and 4 students from 4 R110 Summer 2 session (16 total portfolios/275 overall students) will be asked to create portfolios consisting of the work generated during the semester.
- ii. The portfolio's contents will include:
 1. Speech outlines (including all rough drafts), audience analyses and peer responses, and instructor, peer, and self evaluations
 2. Quizzes
 3. Assessment tools like the PRCA-24 and the WTC surveys
 4. Homework, in-class, and extra credit assignments
 5. Course writing assignments and research examples
 6. Outside course assignments, like outside speaker reports
 7. Videotape of speeches
 8. Examples of group work
 9. Work conducted in the R110 Speakers Lab or the Writing Center and reports from Lab and/or Center's student mentor
 10. Work produced for the bi-annual R110 Speech Night

- iii. 5 volunteer R110 Instructors from the Summer I session and 4 instructors from the Summer II session will be asked to evaluate 4 student portfolios each. Instructors will evaluate the portfolios in terms of curriculum consistency between R110 sections.
- iv. A formal report containing the results of this test pilot will be included in our final PRAC report. The results will be shared with R110 instructors, the Department of Communication Studies, and the School of Liberal Arts.

C. R110 Instructor Assessment Program

- i. For one part of this project, researchers Thedwall and Minielli will review the Instructor Assessment Program at Illinois State University and adapt assessment strategies to will meet the needs of the Department of Communication Studies and the School of Liberal Arts.
- ii. Assessment strategies will be shared with Department faculty members and interested SLA parties as well as current R110 instructors.
- iii. For the other part of this project, 12 R110 Instructors will be assigned 3 student portfolios generated from the 2003 Summer I and Summer II sessions to assess how individual R110 instructors assign course content and evaluate student written and oral assignments.
- iv. Through a series of in-service workshops during the Fall 2003 semester, these instructors will share their findings with the other R110 Instructors.
- v. Results generated from the workshops will be used to identify key criteria that should be used by all R110 instructors when assigning course content and evaluating student written and oral assignments.
- vi. Results generated from the workshops will all be used to create a formal R110 Instructor Assessment program to evaluate current and future R110 instructors.
- vii. A formal report containing the results of our findings and a summary of program initiatives will be included in our final PRAC report. The results will be shared with R110 instructors, the Department of Communication Studies, and the School of Liberal Arts.

IV. How Will Findings Be Used for Program Improvement?

A. Measurement of Student Communication Apprehension in the R110 Gateway Course

- i. The surveys will be used to determine overall effectiveness of the R110 Gateway Course in reducing student communication apprehension about public speaking.
- ii. The surveys will be used to identify strengths and weaknesses of the R110 curriculum and point towards positive course changes for the Fall 2004 semester.

- iii. The surveys will provide statistical measures of R110's effectiveness with the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning, specifically the "Core Communication and Quantitative Skills" component.
- iv. The surveys will expand the Department of Communication Studies current assessment efforts (mainly qualitative) by incorporating a quantitative, statistical measure into the mix.
- v. The surveys will be made available to other Communication Studies performance courses for course and departmental assessment purposes.
- vi. The surveys will also allow us to compare the R110 Gateway course to other comparable basic public speaking courses at other U.S. colleges and universities.

B. R110 Student Portfolio Test Pilot

- i. The portfolios will be used as an additional assessment tool to expand and complement currently used tools in R110.
- ii. The portfolios will be used to identify strengths and weaknesses of the R110 curriculum and point towards positive course changes for the Fall 2004 semester.
- iii. The portfolios will provide qualitative measures of R110's effectiveness with the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning, specifically the "Core Communication and Quantitative Skills" component.
- iv. The portfolio will expand the Department of Communication Studies current assessment efforts by incorporating a comprehensive course assessment tool.
- v. The portfolios will serve as the test case for the Department of Communication Studies' assessment plans to incorporate student portfolios into the major curriculum.
- vi. The portfolios will allow us to compare the R110 Gateway course to other comparable basic public speaking courses using portfolios at other U.S. colleges and universities.

C. R110 Instructor Assessment Program

- i. The program will be used to create course criteria for curriculum and speech grading to be adhered to by all R110 instructors to maintain a level of consistency between R110 sections.
- ii. The program will be used to identify strengths and weaknesses of the R110 curriculum from the Instructor's viewpoint, and point towards positive curriculum changes for the Fall 2004 semester.
- iii. The program will provide qualitative measures of R110's effectiveness with the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning, specifically the "Core Communication and Quantitative Skills" component, from the Instructor's viewpoint.
- iv. The program will expand the Department of Communication Studies current Instructor assessment efforts and be used to create

assessment tools for the incoming Fall 2004 graduate teaching/research assistants.

- v. The program's results will be made available to other Communication Studies courses for course and departmental assessment purposes.
- vi. The program will allow us to compare Instructor assessment in the R110 Gateway course to other comparable instructor assessment programs at other U.S. colleges and universities.

V. Documentation of Proposed Schedule for Overall Project Implementation

A. CA = Measurement of Student Communication Apprehension in the R110 Gateway Course

B. SP = R110 Student Portfolio Test Pilot

C. IA – R110 Instructor Assessment Program

Project	Subject	Beginning Date	Ending Date
CA	Purchase computerized versions of PRCA-24 and WTC Surveys from NCA	March 2003	
CA	Submit PRCA-24 and WTC Surveys to IRB for approval	March 2003	May 2003
CA	Work with Oncourse Team to adapt PRCA-24 and WTC surveys to Oncourse software	March 2003	May 2003
SP	Identify volunteer Summer I and II R110 instructors willing to participate in Test Pilot for 2003 Summer I and Summer II R110 sessions	April 2003	April 2003
SP	Meet with Summer I volunteer R110 Instructors and discuss the objectives of the Student Portfolio Test Pilot	May 2003	May 2003
CA	Test Pilot PRCA-24 and WTC Surveys via Oncourse – Summer I Session;	May 2003; First Week of Summer I Session	June 2003; Last Week of Summer I Session
SP	Meet with Summer I student volunteers about the Student Portfolio Test Pilot	May 2003	May 2003
CA	Calculate PRCA-24 and WTC Pre and Post-Survey Scores	May 2003	June 2003
CA	Analyze Survey Scores	June 2003	July 2003
SP	Collect and Copy Summer I Student Portfolios	June 2003	June 2003
SP	Meet with Summer II volunteer	June 2003	June 2003

	R110 Instructors and discuss the objectives of the Student Portfolio Test Pilot		
CA	Test Pilot PRCA-24 and WTC Surveys via Oncourse – Summer II Session	June-July 2003; First Week of Summer II Session	August 2003; Last Week of Summer II Session
SP	Meet with Summer II student volunteers about the Student Portfolio Test Pilot	July 2003	July 2003
SP	Assign Summer I R110 Student Portfolios to Summer I R110 Instructors	July 2003	July 2003
CA	Calculate PRCA-24 and WTC Pre and Post-Survey Scores; calculate scores for	July 2003	August 2003
CA	Analyze Survey Scores	August 2003	September 2003
SP	Collect and Copy Summer II Student Portfolios	August 2003	August 2003
SP	Assign Summer II R110 Student Portfolios to Summer II R110 Instructors	August 2003	August 2003
SP	Meet with Summer I R110 Instructors to discuss findings of Student Portfolios and R110 Curriculum Assessment	August 2003	August 2003
IA	Select 12 Fall R110 Instructors, assign them Student Portfolios to analyze, and discuss the Student Portfolio/Instructor Assessment programs	August 2003	August 2003
CA	Administer PRCA-24 and WTC Pre-Test Surveys via Oncourse for Fall 2003 semester	August 2003	September 2003
SP	Meet with Summer II R110 Instructors to discuss findings of Student Portfolios and R110 Curriculum Assessment	September 2003	September 2003
CA	Calculate PRCA-24 and WTC Pre-Test Scores	September 2003	September 2003
SP and IA	Meet with R110 instructor groups in workshop to discuss Student Portfolios	September 2003	September 2003
IA	Visit Illinois State University to observe their Instructor Assessment Program	September 2003	September 2003
SP	Meet with R110 instructor groups	October 2003	October 2003

and IA	in workshop to discuss Student Portfolios		
SP and IA	Meet with R110 instructor groups in workshop to discuss Student Portfolios	November 2003	November 2003
CA	Administer PRCA-24 and WTC Post-Test Surveys via Oncourse for Fall 2003 semester	December 2003	December 2003;
SP and IA	Meet with R110 instructor groups in workshop to discuss Student Portfolios	December 2003	December 2003
CA	Calculate PRCA-24 and WTC Post-Survey Scores	December 2003	December 2003
CA	Analyze Survey Scores	December 2003	January 2004
	Write and Submit Final PRAC Report	December 2003	February 2004
	POST PRCA-GRANT	POST-PRCA GRANT	POST PRCA-GRANT
CA	Administer PRCA-24 and WTC Pre-Test Surveys via Oncourse for Spring 2004 Semester	January 2004	January 2004
IA	Meet with R110 instructor groups in workshop to discuss Student Portfolios	January 2004	January 2004
IA	Meet with R110 instructor groups in workshop to discuss Student Portfolios	February 2004	February 2004
IA	Meet with R110 instructor groups in workshop to discuss Student Portfolios	March 2004	March 2004
CA	Administer PRCA-24 and WTC Post-Test Surveys via Oncourse for Spring 2004 Semester	May 2004	May 2004

VI. Overall Project Itemized Budget (In addition to applying for a PRCA Grant for this project, Researchers Thedwall and Minielli will apply for two additional grants to fund this project: (1) SLA's Small Grants for Faculty Research Using New Technology (*Tech Grant*) and (2) OPD's Gateway Course Special Focus Grant (*Gateway Grant*).

	<i>Item</i>	<i>PRCA Grant</i>	<i>Tech Grant</i>	<i>Gateway Grant</i>
CA	Assessing Motivation to Communicate: NCA Diagnostics Series (Computerized	\$41.01 (\$38.00 + \$3.04 tax)		

	PRCA-24 and WTC Surveys) from National Communication Association			
CA	Student Labor Wages – Oncourse Development of PRCA-24 and WTC Surveys		\$68.00 (8 hours x \$8.50/hour*)	
SP	Videotape Purchase for Summer I and II sessions	\$9.35 [\$8.82 (9 videotapes x \$0.98 each) + \$0.53 cents tax]		
SP	Student Labor Wages – Dubbing Summer I session Original Student Videotapes to newly purchased Videotapes	\$150.00 (20 hours [5 instructors x 4 student videotapes] x \$7.50/hour**)		
SP	Student Labor Wages – Dubbing Summer II session Original Student Videotapes to newly purchased Videotapes	\$120.00 (16 hours [4 instructors x 4 student videotapes] x \$7.50/hour**)		
SP	Copying Costs – Student Portfolios – Summer I and II	\$180.00 (36 student portfolios x 50 pages/portfolio x \$0.10/page)		
SP	Student Labor Costs – Copying Student Portfolios – Summer I and II	\$42.50 (5 hours x \$8.50/hour*)		
SP	Binders for Summer I and II student portfolios	\$38.04 [\$35.88 (12 x \$2.99/each) + \$2.16 tax]		
SP	Faculty Compensation for Summer I Student Portfolio Curriculum			\$500.00 (5 participants x \$100.00/participant)

	Assessment			
SP	Faculty Compensation for Summer II Student Portfolio Curriculum Assessment			\$400.00 (4 participants x \$100.00/participant)
IA	Faculty Compensation for August 2003 Instructor Assessment Workshop on Student Portfolios			\$400.00 (16 participants x \$25.00/participant)
IA	September 2003 ISU Visit (See Appendix D)	\$343.24		
CA	Student Labor Wages – Fall Semester PRCA-24 and WTC Pre-Survey Calculations/Results using Oncourse		\$340.00 (40 hours x \$8.50/hour*)	
IA	Videotape Purchase for Fall Semester	\$37.45 [\$35.28 (36 videotapes x \$0.98 each) + \$2.17 tax]		
IA	Faculty Compensation for September 2003 Instructor Assessment Workshop on Student Portfolios			\$400.00 (16 participants x \$25.00/participant)
IA	Faculty Compensation for October 2003 Instructor Assessment Workshop on Student Portfolios			\$400.00 (16 participants x \$25.00/participant)
IA	Faculty Compensation for November 2003 Instructor			\$400.00 (16 participants x \$25.00/participant)

	Assessment Workshop on Student Portfolios			
IA	Faculty Compensation for December 2003 Instructor Assessment Workshop on Student Portfolios			\$400.00 (16 participants x \$25.00/participant)
CA	Student Labor Wages – Fall Semester PRCA-24 and WTC Post-Survey Calculations/Results using Oncourse		\$340.00 (40 hours x \$8.50/hour*)	
IA	Student Labor – Dubbing Fall Semester Original Student Videotapes to newly purchased Videotapes	\$270.00 (36 hours [12 instructors x 3 student videotapes] x \$7.50/hour**)		
IA	Copying Costs – Student Portfolios	\$180.00 (36 student portfolios x 50 pages/portfolio x \$0.10 page)		
IA	Student Labor Costs - Copying Student Portfolios	\$42.50 (5 hours x \$8.50/hour*)		
IA	Binders for student portfolios	\$38.03 [\$35.88 (12 x \$2.99/each) + \$2.15 tax]		
	POST PRCA-GRANT	POST PRCA-GRANT	POST PRCA-GRANT	POST PRCA GRANT
CA	Student Labor Wages – Spring 2004 Semester PRCA-24 and WTC Pre-Survey Calculations/Results using Oncourse		\$340.00 (40 hours x \$8.50/hour*)	
IA	Faculty			\$400.00 (16

	Compensation for January 2004 Instructor Assessment Workshop on Student Portfolios (using Fall 2003 student videotapes)			participants x \$25.00/participant)
IA	Faculty Compensation for February 2004 Instructor Assessment Workshop on Student Portfolios (using Fall 2003 student videotapes)			\$400.00 (16 participants x \$25.00/participant)
IA	Faculty Compensation for March 2004 Instructor Assessment Workshop on Student Portfolios (using Fall 2003 student videotapes)			\$400.00 (16 participants x \$25.00/participant)
CA	Student Labor Wages – Spring 2004 PRCA-24 and WTC Post-Survey Calculations/Results using Oncourse		\$340.00 (40 hours x \$8.50/hour*)	
TOTAL		\$1492.12 PRCA Grant	\$1428.00 Tech Grant	\$4100.00 Gateway Grant

* Student Worker Wages earned in the Department of Communication Studies

** Student Worker Waged earned in the Communication Technology Laboratory, School of Liberal Arts

References

- Bouris, J. and Allen, M. (1992). Meta-analysis of the relationship between communication apprehension and cognitive performance. *Communication Education*, 41, 68-76.
- Carlson, R. E. and Smith-Howell, D. (1995). Classroom public speaking assessment: Reliability and validity of selected evaluation instruments. *Communication Education*, 44, 87-97.
- Cochrane, J., Fox, K, and Thedwall, K. (2002). *The R110 Student Coursebook to accompany The Art of Public Speaking* Dubuque, IA: McGraw-Hill Custom Publishing, p. 3.
- Department of Communication Studies, California State University, Long Beach. (2001, Spring). Student learning objectives and outcomes assessments. Retrieved on January 14, 2003 from http://www.csulb.edu/web/projects/wasc/goals/Communication_Studies_Goals.pdf
- Department of Speech and Theatre Arts, Shippensburg University. Student handbook for majors and minors. Retrieved on January 14, 2003 from <http://www.ship.edu/~speech/handbook.htm>
- Department of Speech Communication, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville. Speech communication portfolio. Retrieved on January 14, 2003 from http://www.siu.edu/SPC/SPC_Portfolio/about.html
- Dutt-Doner, K. and Gilman, D.A. (1998, Spring). Students react to portfolio assessment. *Contemporary Education* Retrieved January 8, 2003 from EBSCOHost.
- Hayes, E. (1997). Portfolio assessment in adult basic education: A pilot study. *Adult Basic Education* Retrieved on January 8, 2003 from EBSCOHost.
- IUPUI School of Liberal Arts (2002). Communication Studies Department 2001-2002 PRAC~CUL Report. Retrieved on January 14, 2003 from <http://www.planning.iupui.edu/prac/01-02schoolreports/liberalarts/communicationstudies.html>
- IUPUI University College (2003). IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning. Retrieved on January 13, 2003 from <http://www.universitycollege.iupui.edu/UL/Principles.htm>
- Kansas State University (2000). Basic Skills Assessment – 2000. Retrieved on January 23, 2003 from <http://www.ksu.edu/apr/basicskills/Basic%20Skills.2000.bor.doc>

Kempton, J. (2002, January-February). Putting the fear of God into us – public speaking. *inCite* Retrieved on January 15, 2003 from EBSCOHost.

Jensen, K.K. and Harris, V. (1999). The public speaking portfolio. *Communication Education*, 48, 211-227.

McCroskey, J. C. (1978). Validity of the PRCA as an index of oral communication apprehension. *Communication Monographs*, 45, 192-203.

McCroskey, J. C. (1982). *An introduction to rhetorical communication* (4th Ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

McCroskey, J.C. (1984). The communication apprehension in perspective. In J.A. Daly and J.C. McCroskey, (Eds.), *Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension* (pp. 13-38). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McCroskey, J.C. (1992). Reliability and validity of the willingness to communicate scale. *Communication Quarterly*, 40, 16.25.

McCroskey, J.C. (2000). *An introduction to rhetorical communication* (8th Ed). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

McCroskey, J.C. and Richmond, V.P. (1987). Willingness to communicate. In J.C. McCroskey and J.A. Daly (Eds). *Personality and interpersonal communication* (pp. 119-131). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McCroskey, L.L., Richmond, V.P., and McCroskey, J.C. (2002). The scholarship of teaching and learning: Contributions from the Discipline of Communication. *Communication Education*, 51, 383-391.

Menzel, K.E. and Carrell, L.J. (1994). The relationship between preparation and performance in public speaking. *Communication Education*, 43, 17-26.

National Communication Association (1998). Criteria for assessment of oral communication. Retrieved on January 15, 2003 from <http://www.natcom.org/Instruction/assessment/Assessment/CriteriaAssessment.htm>

Rosenfeld, L.B., Grant III, C. H., and McCroskey, J.C. (1995). Communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence of academically gifted students. *Communication Education*, 44, 79-86.

Rubin, R. B. (1990). Evaluating the product. In J.A. Daly, G.W. Friedrich, & A. L. Vaangelisti (Eds.), *Teaching communication: Theory, research, and methods* (pp. 379-401). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Scaredy cats. (1997, October). *American Demographics*, Retrieved on January 15, 2003 from EBSCOHost.

Silagyi-Rebovich, J., Rosso, L. and Prus, L. (2001, July 19). Oral communication assessment: A general education assessment initiative preliminary report 2000-2001. Retrieved on January 14, 2003 from http://www.winthrop.edu/acad_aff/assessment/oral.htm

Solomon, D.H., and Knobloch, L.K. (2001, October 1). The impact of Communication Arts 100: Introduction to speech composition on communication, writing, and library anxiety. Retrieved on December 17, 2001 from <http://www.wisc.edu/provost/assess/reports00/verbalappendixc.html>

Stiggins, R. J., Backlund, P.M., & Bridgeford, N.J. (1985). Avoiding bias in the assessment of communication skills. *Communication Education*, 34, 135-141.

Tilton, J.E. (2002, February). Adventures in *public speaking*. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*. Retrieved on January 15, 2003 from EBSCOHost.

Appendix A - Aims, Objectives and Measurable Outcomes of the Proposed Project

A. Measurement of Student Comprehension in the R110 Gateway Course

i. Aims

1. As evidenced by several commercial and general public periodicals, the fear of speaking in public, or CA, has been identified as the number one fear of Americans (American Demographics, 1997; Kempton, 2002; Tilton, 2002). CA is defined as “an individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons” (McCroskey, 1984).
2. At the post-secondary education level, CA can pose significant problems and challenges to students, including poor academic and cognitive preparation and performance (Bouris and Allen, 1992; Menzel and Carrell, 1994; Rosenfeld, Grant, and McCroskey, 1995; McCroskey, Richmond and McCroskey, 2002).
3. To date, the R110 Course Objectives (Cochrane, Fox and Thedwall, 2002) or the Communication Studies Department 2001-2002 PRAC-CUL Report (School of Liberal Arts 2001-2002 PRAC-CUL Report, 2002) and its predecessors do not address CA as a measurable outcome of the R110 Gateway Course. As a result, R110 students do not have a statistical measure of their CA level pre- and post-R110 class.
4. If students are able to self-assess their individual CA levels at the beginning of the course, they can use the course curriculum to work on areas that need improvement.
5. Statistical measures of CA may assist us in determining if CA levels of students differ from the sections they are enrolled like the University College (Learning Communities and Learning Blocks)-linked R110 sections, traditional R110 sections, Honors R110 sections, and the online R110 sections.
6. A CA measurement will also allow the Department of Communication Studies to better evaluate its efforts with the “Core Communication and Quantitative Skills” component of the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning by identifying to students what aspects of their CA could be improved upon so they can more effectively “communicate orally in one-on-one and group settings” (IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning, 2003).
7. Using a statistical measurement will allow the Department of Communication Studies to further diversify its R110 assessment attempts, and provide the School of Liberal Arts with additional assessment tools for its reaccreditation reports.

8. This assessment tool is in congruence with the National Communication Association's "Criteria for Assessing Students' Achievement of Communication Competence" (2003).

ii. Objectives

1. To increase the Department of Communication Studies' assessment measures of the R110 Gateway course by including a R110 goal of reducing student CA in the R110 Course Objectives, and incorporate a related CA statistical measure to provide quantifiable data about R110 student CA reduction.
2. To offer students the ability to self-assess their own CA at the beginning and end of the R110 Gateway Course to determine if the course has helped them feel more comfortable with public speaking and identify any strengths and weaknesses with their public speaking skills.
3. To modify or change R110 pedagogy assignments to better achieve student learning outcomes.
4. To offer the Communication Studies Department an additional quantitative assessment tool to complement our existing qualitative and quantitative assessment measurements.
5. To offer the School of Liberal Arts with additional assessment tools for its accounting and reaccreditation reports.
6. To continue with IUPUI's mission towards continual self-improvement.

iii. Measurable Outcomes

1. Identify student CA prior to substantive R110 public speaking coursework at the beginning of a semester.
2. Identify student CA post-substantive R110 public speaking coursework at the end of a semester.
3. Identify any correlations between CA reduction and overall student academic performance.
4. Identify in quantitative format the effectiveness of the R110 Gateway Course in reducing student CA levels.
5. Compare scores from traditional R110 courses to the UCol-linked R110, honors R110 and online R110 sections.
6. One potential area we would like to work on is examining the CA scores of native and international students to ensure we are meeting the pedagogical needs of our foreign students.
7. Provide statistical measures of R110's effectiveness with the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning, specifically the "Core Communication and Quantitative Skills" component.

8. Compare IUPUI CA reduction with to student CA scores from other U.S. colleges and universities.

B. R110 Student Portfolio Test Pilot

i. Aims

1. Student portfolios are a growing academic trend (Hayes, 1997), especially in the field of communication studies. In our field, these portfolios take the traditional paper (Student Learning Objectives and Outcome Assessments, California State University, Long Beach) and electronic forms (Speech Communication Portfolio, 2002).
2. “A portfolio is a carefully constructed compilation representing the student’s communication experiences over time. Artifacts and evaluations ought to represent different stages of growth, permitting both student and teacher with the opportunity to evaluate progress throughout the student’s collegiate experience” (Student Handbook for Majors and Minors, 2003).
3. Student portfolios are common at IUPUI. For example, English W131 and W132 both require students to generate portfolios. An R110 portfolio will put the “oral communication” component of the General Education requirements on equal footing with the English (written) communication component since both will be requiring portfolios from its students.
4. The R110 Gateway currently course does not have a formal portfolio assignment. Instead, some instructors ask that students keep their work in one folder, but this is not a common practice for all R110 instructors as a whole.
5. Student portfolios offer numerous academic benefits, like helping students become more “mindful” of their efforts to develop their communication skills over the course of a semester, assist with their individual “self-expression” as public speakers, help focus students on future as well as immediate and present goals, and promote instructor-student and peer-to-peer interaction (Jensen and Harris, 1999).
6. The portfolio will also allow for “the on-going process of self-evaluation and reflection. Portfolios assist student integration of theory, practice, critical thinking, and self-assessment. They also help to provide a solid foundation for goal setting, introspection, and future development” (Student Handbook for Majors and Minors, 2003).
7. In general, portfolios offer additional benefits, like “more concrete evidence of student progress, enhanced student self-direction, and responsibility for learning, and greater integration of assessment and instruction” (Hayes, 1997).

8. Students themselves recognize the importance of portfolios. According to Dutt-Doner and Gilman (1998), students “feel the portfolio experience has helped them develop a great deal of knowledge about themselves as well as about teaching. The portfolio process helped developed self-confidence, better relationships between instructor and students, organizational skills, professional attitudes, knowledge about the teaching profession, job interviewing skills, and beliefs and a knowledge base for teaching practice.”
9. The student portfolio will allow students to track their performances and observe their improvement over the course of a semester.
10. Students will also be able to easily refer back to previous assignments, projects, quizzes as they work on current projects, assignments and quizzes.
11. A test pilot of student portfolios in the public speaking course at Texas Tech University demonstrated excellent student reception to using portfolios to assist their educational experience. (Jensen and Harris, 1999).
12. Student portfolios will allow for a better fulfillment of the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning, specifically the “communicate orally in one-on-one and group settings components” by demonstrating student learning and communication skill development (Speech Communication Portfolio, 2002).
13. This assessment tool is in congruence with the National Communication Association’s “Criteria for Assessing Students’ Achievement of Communication Competence” (2003).

ii. Objectives

1. To create a more formal system of collecting and maintaining R110 assignments and evaluations into one comprehensive package.
2. To provide students with the opportunity to mindfully review their progress in the R110 course.
3. To modify or change R110 pedagogical assignments to better achieve student learning outcomes.
4. To provide an additional qualitative assessment tool for the R110 Gateway course.
5. To provide better consistency within the IUPUI General Education requirements/Communication Core with English W131 and W132, which already requires its students to create course portfolios.
6. To begin initial work within the Department of Communication Studies with student portfolios in

preparation for the proposed University-wide e-portfolio project currently under review.

7. To increase the Department of Communication Studies' assessment initiatives of the R110 Gateway course by creating a formal project synthesizing the assignments and evaluations of the course.
8. To continue with IUPUI's mission towards continual self-improvement.

iii. Measurable Outcomes

1. Assist students with the qualitative identification of their progress in the R110 Gateway course.
2. Compare student progress between different types of R110 Gateway courses (traditional, honors, University College-linked, and web-based) to determine levels of consistency and grading.
3. Identify strengths and weaknesses in the R110 Gateway course curriculum.
4. Provide qualitative evidence of R110's effectiveness with the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning, specifically the "Core Communication and Quantitative Skills" component.
5. One potential area we would like to work on is comparing our student portfolios with student portfolios from other comparable public speaking courses at other U.S. college and universities.

C. R110 Instructor Assessment Program

i. Aims

1. General consistency with course curriculum and evaluation between instructors teaching multiple sections of the same course, within reason, is highly desirable. For example, in Communication Studies, rater bias in public speaking assessment has been researched in depth and is acknowledged as a significant obstacle to consistent public speaking evaluation (Carlson, and Smith-Howell, 1995).
2. Rater training is one way of achieving general consistency with course curriculum and evaluation between instructors teaching multiple sections of the same public speaking course (Rubin, 1990, Stiggins et al, 1985).
3. Public speaking/basic course instructor assessment programs are in place at several U.S. colleges and universities (for example, California State University – Long Beach, Illinois State University, and Kansas State University).
4. Currently the R110 Gateway course offers a common curriculum to be taught by all R110 Instructors (Cochrane, Fox and Thedwall, 2002).

5. In addition, the R110 Gateway course offers common speech evaluation instruments for R110 instructors to use (Cochrane, Fox and Thedwall, 2002), but it is unknown if all R110 instructors use these instruments.
6. Currently there are few assessment measures of R110 instructors available:
 - a. Teacher Evaluations by students
 - b. Classroom visits by the R110 course director and the associate course director
 - c. Informal evaluation of R110 Instructor speech evaluations of student competitors in the bi-annual R110 Speech Night
7. Instructor assessment will provide more assessment options for the R110 course, the Department of Speech Communication, and the School of Liberal Arts.
8. Portfolio assessment will also allow new instructors to learn from the veteran instructors.
9. This project will allow the R110 directors to lay down the framework for future R110 instructor assessment initiatives
10. This assessment tool is in congruence with the National Communication Association's "Criteria for Assessing Students' Achievement of Communication Competence" (2003).

ii. Objectives

1. To participate in a meeting with members of the Communication Studies Department at Illinois State University to identify how that department uses portfolios for student and instructor assessment.
2. To identify common criteria for course content and evaluation to be utilized by all R110 instructors.
3. To identify the usage rates of R110 Gateway course common speech evaluation forms used by R110 instructors.
4. To modify or change R110 pedagogical assignments to better achieve student learning outcomes.
5. To collect assessment ideas suitable for IUPUI R110 instructor measurement.
6. To establish our own instructor assessment program tailored to the IUPUI R110 instructors.
7. To establish an assessment foundation for potential graduate teaching assistants in the Department of Communication Studies.
8. To continue with IUPUI's mission towards continual self-improvement.

iii. Measurable Outcomes

1. Identify qualitatively instructor preparation and evaluation in the R110 Gateway course.

2. Create course criteria for curriculum and speech grading to be adhered to by all R110 instructors to maintain a level of consistency between R110 sections.
3. Compare instructor preparation and evaluation between different types of R110 Gateway courses (traditional, honors, University College-linked, and web-based).
4. Identify strengths and weaknesses of the R110 curriculum from the Instructor's viewpoint, and point towards positive curriculum changes for the Fall 2004 semester.
5. Provide qualitative evidence of R110's effectiveness with the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning, specifically the "Core Communication and Quantitative Skills" component from the perspective of the R110 instructors.
6. Compare instructor preparation and evaluation with instructors in similar evaluation programs at other U.S. colleges and universities.

Appendix B – PRCA-24 Survey

Directions: This instrument is composed of twenty-four statements concerning your feelings about communication with other people. Please indicate in the space provided the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Are Undecided, (4) Disagree, or (5) Strongly Disagree with each statement. There are no right or wrong answers. Many of the statements are similar to other statements. Do not be concerned about this. Work quickly; just record your first impression.

- _____ 1. I dislike participating in group discussions.
- _____ 2. Generally, I am comfortable while participating in group discussions.
- _____ 3. I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions.
- _____ 4. I like to get involved in group discussions.
- _____ 5. Engaging in a group discussion with new people makes me tense and nervous.
- _____ 6. I am calm and relaxed while participating in group discussions.
- _____ 7. Generally, I am nervous when I have to participate in a meeting.
- _____ 8. Usually, I am calm and relaxed while participating in meetings.
- _____ 9. I am very calm and relaxed when I am called upon to express an opinion at a meeting.
- _____ 10. I am afraid to express myself at meetings.
- _____ 11. Communicating at meetings usually makes me uncomfortable.
- _____ 12. I am very relaxed when answering questions at a meeting.
- _____ 13. While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous.
- _____ 14. I have no fear of speaking up in conversations.
- _____ 15. Ordinarily I am very tense and nervous in conversations.
- _____ 16. Ordinarily I am very calm and relaxed in conversations.
- _____ 17. While conversing with a new acquaintance, I feel very relaxed.
- _____ 18. I am afraid to speak up in conversations.
- _____ 19. I have no fear of giving a speech.
- _____ 20. Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while giving a speech.
- _____ 21. I feel relaxed while giving a speech.
- _____ 22. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.
- _____ 23. I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.
- _____ 24. While giving a speech, I get so nervous I forget facts I really know.

Scoring:

The PRCA-24 permits computation of one total score and four subscores. Subscores relate to communication apprehension in each of four common contexts – group discussions, meetings, interpersonal conversations, and public speaking. To compute your scores, merely add or subtract your scores for each item as indicated below.

Subscore Desired and Scoring Formula

Group discussion: $18 + (\text{scores for items 2, 4, \& 6}) - (\text{scores for items 1, 3, \& 5})$

Meetings: $18 + (\text{scores for items 8, 9, \& 12}) - (\text{scores for items 7, 10, \& 11})$

Interpersonal: $18 + (\text{scores for items 14, 16, \& 17}) - (\text{scores for items 13, 15, \& 18})$

Public Speaking: $18 + (\text{scores for items 19, 21, \& 23}) - (\text{scores for items 20, 22, \& 24})$

Group Discussion Score: _____ Interpersonal Score: _____

Meetings Score: _____ Public Speaking Score: _____

To obtain your total score for the PRCA, simply add your sub scores together. _____
Scores can range from 24-120. Scores below 51 represent people who have very low CA.
Scores between 51-80 represent people with average CA. Scores above 80 represent
people who have high levels of trait CA.

NORMS FOR THE PRCA 24

Mean Standard Deviation High Low

For Total Score 65.6 15.3 > 80 < 51

Group: 15.4 4.8 > 20 < 11

Meeting: 16.4 4.2 > 20 < 13

Dyad (Interpersonal): 14.5 4.2 > 18 < 11

Public: 19.3 5.1 > 24 < 14

Sources

McCroskey, J. C. (1982). *An introduction to rhetorical communication* (4th Ed).
Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

McCroskey, J.C. (2000). *An introduction to rhetorical communication* (8th Ed). Boston:
Allyn and Bacon.

Appendix C - Willingness To Communicate (WTC) Survey

Directions: Below are twenty situations in which a person might choose to communicate or not to communicate. Presume you have completely free choice. Indicate the percentage of times you would choose to communicate in each type of situation. Indicate in the space at the left what percent of the time you would choose to communicate. (0 = Never to 100 = Always)

- _____ 1. Talk with a service station attendant.
- _____ 2. Talk with a physician.
- _____ 3. Present a talk to a group of strangers.
- _____ 4. Talk with an acquaintance while standing in line.
- _____ 5. Talk with a salesperson in a store.
- _____ 6. Talk in a large meeting of friends.
- _____ 7. Talk with a police officer.
- _____ 8. Talk in a small group of strangers.
- _____ 9. Talk with a friend while standing in line.
- _____ 10. Talk with a waiter/waitress in a restaurant.
- _____ 11. Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances.
- _____ 12. Talk with a stranger while standing in line.
- _____ 13. Talk with a secretary.
- _____ 14. Present a talk to a group of friends.
- _____ 15. Talk in a small group of acquaintances.
- _____ 16. Talk with a garbage collector.
- _____ 17. Talk in a large meeting of strangers.
- _____ 18. Talk with a spouse (or girl/boyfriend).
- _____ 19. Talk in a small group of friends.
- _____ 20. Present a talk to a group of acquaintances.

Scoring

Group Discussion: Add scores for items 8, 15, & 19; then divide by 3.

Meetings: Add scores for items 6, 11, & 17; then divide by 3.

Interpersonal Add scores for items 4, 9, & 12; then divide by 3.

Public Speaking Add scores for items 3, 14, & 20; then divide by 3.

Stranger Add scores for items 3, 8, 12, & 17; then divide by 3.

Acquaintance Add scores for items 4, 11, 15, & 20; then divide by 3.

Friend Add scores for items 6, 9, 14, & 19; then divide by 3.

To compute the total WTC scores, add the sub scores for stranger, acquaintance, and friend.

Then divide by 3.

Norms for WTC Scores

Group discussion >89 High WTC, <57 Low WTC

Meetings >80 High WTC, <39 Low WTC

Interpersonal conversations >94 High WTC, <64 Low WTC

Public Speaking >78 High WTC, <33 Low WTC

Stranger >63 High WTC, <18 Low WTC

Acquaintance >92 High WTC, <57 Low WTC

Friend >99 High WTC, <71 Low WTC

Total WTC >82 Higher Overall WTC, <52 Low Overall WTC

Sources:

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1987). Willingness to communicate. In J. C. McCroskey & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Personality and interpersonal communication* (pp. 119-131). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McCroskey, J. C. (1992). Reliability and validity of the willingness to communicate scale. *Communication Quarterly*, 40, 16-25.

Appendix D – Itemized Budget for ISU Visit – September 2003 (Overnight Visit)

Item	Mileage	Cost	Tax	Overall
Hotel – Normal Illinois – 1 night		\$64.00 ¹	\$5.44 ²	\$69.44
Per Diem for Kate Thedwall		\$34.00 ³ /day		\$68.00
Per Diem for Maureen Minielli		\$34.00 ⁴ /day		\$68.00
Mileage for Personal Vehicle	380 miles ⁵	0.36.mile ⁶		\$136.80
Parking		\$1.00 ⁷		\$1.00
TOTAL		\$337.80	\$5.44	\$343.24

¹ Price acquired through <http://www.policyworks.gov/org/main/mt/homepage/mtt/perdiem/perd03d.doc> using Rockford, IL as equivalent to Normal, IL

² Tax acquired from <http://216.239.51.100/search?q=cache:UNi4JYiUpFYC:www.siu.edu/~ap/Down.pdf+normal+illinois+hotel+tax+rate&hl=en&ie=UTF-8>

³ Price acquired through <http://www.policyworks.gov/org/main/mt/homepage/mtt/perdiem/perd03d.doc> using Rockford, IL as equivalent to Normal, IL

⁴ Price acquired through <http://www.policyworks.gov/org/main/mt/homepage/mtt/perdiem/perd03d.doc> using Rockford, IL as equivalent to Normal, IL

⁵ Mileage acquired from <http://www.mapquest.com>

⁶ Mileage rates acquired through <http://www.indiana.edu/%7Etravel/car.html>

⁷ Price acquired from http://www.parking.ilstu.edu/visitor_parking.htm