DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:
From pre-admission to graduation, New Student Programs provides services and programs designed to empower students and their families to create a meaningful educational journey at Cal State Fullerton. New Student Programs connects students to the valuable learning opportunities necessary for this journey via campus tours, orientation programs, information and campus referrals, leadership development and welcome activities. As a result of program participation and service utilization, students develop character, critical thinking skills and the interpersonal competence requisite for lifelong learning. New Student Programs provides information and resources to parents so that they can serve as active partners in their students’ success; foster a sense of pride and community among parents and families of CSUF students; and cultivate fundraising opportunities among the growing Titan Parents network. NSP programs and services include: New Student Orientation (NSO), Transfer Orientation, Parent Programs, Campus Tours, Titan WOW, Student and Visitor Information Services, Ask the Titans, as well as Freshman Programs.

PROGRAM/SERVICE OVERVIEW:
Orientation Leader – Public Speaking Learning Outcomes Assessment
The public speaking skills of the Orientation Leaders are assessed using a rubric. The leaders are evaluated three times throughout their experience to help identify growth during their time in the position. To establish their base level presentation skills, their first presentation is given to New Student Programs staff (late May). The second rubric assessment is completed by one of their fellow Orientation Leaders halfway through their experience (mid June). The third and final assessment is completed by a CSUF faculty, staff or administrator at the end of the leader's experience (late June/early July).

TYPE OF ASSESSMENT:
(To check mark any box below, please double click on the square and select “checked”.)

- External Reports
- Needs Assessment
- Program Evaluation
- Student Learning Outcomes
- Student Satisfaction Assessment
- Student Success
- Utilization Data

DATA COLLECTION TIMEFRAME:

DATA COLLECTION METHODS:
Presentation observation; feedback is given through a standardized rubric

LIMITATIONS:
- Inter-rater reliability: While the rubric attempts to clarify each ranking with descriptive phrases, there is inconsistency in how each reviewer scores “expert” and “novice.”
- Room size inconsistency: The size of the group/room varies from one presentation to the next during the three evaluation periods. This variation makes it difficult to compare results (i.e., groups can vary from 10-150 people). Additionally, this variation may influence students’ performance.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS:
A total of 126 leaders have gone through the three-round evaluation process during the last six years. Each leader is assessed in 10 different areas with a scale ranging from “novice” to “expert.” During the first round of assessments, there were a total of 196 “expert” rankings given over the last six years. During the third round of assessments, there were a total of 881 “expert” rankings assigned. On average, the leaders increased their expert rankings by just over five (5.4) during the third round of assessments. The graph below indicates the increased number of expert rankings over the last five years.

In 2010, the first and second round evaluators were encouraged to have brief meetings with the leaders who they evaluated. Rather than provide general comments,
the evaluators were instructed to relate their feedback to the rubric categories in order to help the leaders enhance their skills in a more targeted way. As the graph below shows, this change may have enhanced the number of “expert” rankings assigned in the second and third round evaluations in 2010 – 2013.

Of the 126 leaders who completed the three rounds of evaluations, all but four leaders received an increased number of expert ratings from their first to third assessment. While the rubric attempts to clarify each ranking with descriptive phrases, there is inconsistency in how each reviewer scores “expert” and “novice.”

For example, in 2010, the data showed there was one first round evaluator who scored two presenters very high. The two presenters evaluated by this one individual received 10 out of 10 expert rankings during the first round. There was a similar first round evaluator in 2011 who ranked two presenters with nearly all “expert” rankings. In all four of these cases, the presenters received fewer expert rankings during their third round assessment, ultimately indicating that they had not increased their public speaking skills based on the rubric rankings. However, in their final evaluation meetings, the presenters themselves communicated that they had increased their skills and comfort level related to public speaking.

The challenge in this situation is the inter-rater reliability, particularly in relation to the first round evaluators. The two evaluators who gave a high number of “expert” rankings were Student Coordinators who used the rubric as an opportunity to encourage their staff instead of rating the leaders based on their demonstrated skill level.

To increase inter-rater reliability, a training was conducted in 2012 and 2013 for the first round evaluators. The purpose of this training was to establish a more common standard for an expert ranking. This training may explain the decrease in the expert rankings during the first round of evaluations in 2012 and 2013 as demonstrated in the graph.

**KEY FINDINGS:**

- 98.5% of Orientation Leaders demonstrated stronger public speaking skills (increased numbers of expert rankings) by the third round of assessments.
- On average, the Orientation Leaders received just over five (5.4) additional “expert” rankings by their third round of assessments.

**APPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS:** (Please be as specific as possible.)

1. In preparation for 2011-13, each Orientation Leader staff was trained on how to utilize the rubric. They gave presentations to each other and used the rubric as a tool to provide feedback. In previous years, the leaders found it challenging to give constructive feedback to their peers. After this training, the leaders were more conservative when assigning “expert” rankings. This adjustment seemed to enhance the inner-rater reliability of the second round of assessments, but did not focus on the first round evaluators. In response to this data, a training was conducted in 2012 and 2013 for both the first and second round evaluators. The Student Coordinators watched presentations given by Orientation Leaders and completed a rubric. The Senior Coordinator for New Student Programs reviewed the rubrics with the Student Coordinators, ensuring that they were comfortable using the rubric to give both positive and constructive feedback to a staff of their peers.
2. After completing the 2011 assessments, the data from 2010 and 2011 was disaggregated by the public speaking categories included within the rubric, and only the third round was examined. The results indicate that on average, leaders achieved “expert” ranking in 9 out of 10 areas assessed while on average leaders achieved an “intermediate” ranking on “Audience Engagement”. As a result, efforts were made in 2012 and 2013 to provide leaders with training on how to engage their audience and this has become a theme throughout training. Orientation Leaders also discussed tools to enhance audience engagement in their presentations and throughout the orientation day.

The graphs above indicate the distribution of rankings for the rubric category “Audience Engagement.” In response to the 2010-2011 assessment data, enhancements were made to the public speaking training in order to help Orientation Leaders find more creative ways to involve the audience in the presentation. The leaders used techniques to evaluate the level at which the audience was understanding the material presented (example: using a brief oral “pop-quiz” at the end of an important topic area). Role playing training techniques were also used to help the leaders respond to signs of disengagement in the audience. The staffs were motivated to enhance audience engagement, which resulted in a sharp increase in expert rankings during the 2012 and 2013 assessments.

3. When evaluating the 2013 assessment data, it was found that all ten categories had more expert rankings during the third round assessment, with the exception of the “Volume and Enunciation” category. In this section, the leaders scored equal number of expert and intermediate rankings. This is the first year that the “Volume and Enunciation” category scored this few expert rankings. The graph below indicates the distribution of rankings for the 2013 third round “Volume and Enunciation” category.
In every year of this assessment (2008-2013), the Senior Coordinator has waited until the end of the orientation season to enter and evaluate the data. In an attempt to strengthen the public speaking of the group, it may be beneficial to enter the data after each round of assessment. This may allow the staff to look at the public speaking trends of the group as a whole. If deficiencies are found in earlier rounds, it may be possible to provide mini-training sessions after each assessment round.

Overall, the public speaking learning outcomes assessment plan has provided validation that the New Student and Parent Programs staff is providing meaningful training and presentation opportunities that assist the Orientation Leaders in enhancing their public speaking skills.