**Project in Detail:**

**Peer instruction, using a 12 point “communication abilities,” rubric strategically developed into an innovative video learning tool for instructors and students.**

Assessing communication abilities across all disciplines is important as communication skills are necessary in any field.   The Benefits of Peer learning, suggests peer learning may be a technique we cultivate as an instructional strategy not ever to replace the professor yet, as with all “instructional strategies, peer learning works when it is selected purposefully, when its use is planned carefully, and when the learning is evaluated” (Weimer, 2017,p.1). This made me interested in this year’s assessment and doing something different with our "Communication Abilities" rubric.

The EMCC Communication Abilities Rubric was originally designed to assess 12 areas of physical and vocal delivery for various types of speaking presentations, with the student being assessed by the instructor. However, over the years both instructors and students have not fully understood the intent and categories in the rubric. Therefore, we needed a different approach to ensure learning.

**Part A:** This year I decided to remedy the situation by assigning my Com230H section a media project. They were to break down each element of the rubric giving an example of 0-emerging and 4-excelling for each category on the rubric. The parameters of the project were strict yet, I allowed for flexibility and creativity with representation of all disciplines and all presentation types.  As well as research about Communication and representation for the college.

**Part B:** As the instructor, I had students assess themselves 3x for their 3 group presentations in Com 230. First, using the EMCC Instructor evaluation based on the rubric with no instruction. Next, using the above same form after they had taken home the actual rubric that explained the form and were instructed to read it and I had briefly reviewed the rubric in class. Lastly, upon the video completion, the students who created the video would explain both their honor's project and show the class the video, then all students assessed themselves on their third project group presentation they gave the day before.

**Part C:** Upon video completion students who assisted with production also received a byline and link to the video (for needed experience) to assist them with part-time employment opportunities they may need and I compared the student participants in the projects and those that did not participate on the project in another overall assessment result.

**RESULTS**

Overall average scores: All student’s average score was **37.56.   S**tudent’s participating in the project average score was **38.33** students who worked hands on all aspects of the video actually decreased their score by **.98** percent which was a bit less than those who didn't participate.

**Analysis of Results:**

Clearly, derived from student data, students rated themselves much higher not knowing what the rubric meant in comparison with when they read it, received an explanation from the instructor, and viewed the rubric of peers teaching them. Meaning the more they know about what the rubric means the more they actually analyzed their communication abilities instead of just marking a high number.  This may show critical thinking about the rubric category was taking place.

**Total score possible on rubric (see attached) 48 points**

**#1 (P#1)** no instruction average score= **41.89**

**#2 (P#2)** student were supposed to read the categories and the instructor briefly explained the rubric, average score= **39.67**

**#3 (P#3)** Peers explained project and were shown the video average score=**37.56**.

**The analysis** shows students rated themselves .**9%** lower from presentation 1(no instruction) and 2 (some instruction). And from 2(some instruction) to 3 (video peer instruction) with a **.90%** decrease in score presentation. Score averages presentation went from 1 to 3 **41.89** to a **37.56**. The student cohort that actually did the project was a little less hard on themselves by **.98%** concluding that although other variables are not accounted for, that peer learning as well as participative learning with others peers, lowered their scores on how students rated themselves on the “communication abilities” rubric.

 **In conclusion**, by seeing project 3 results for both sets of students, it is clear the more students know about rubric categories the harder they tended to rate themselves, meaning perhaps they are critically thinking more about the 12 rubric categories and learning occurred.

*Thank you Com 230 cohort! Daniel for filming and help, Denise for numbers in excel, and Ro for creating half the rubric years ago with me. A shout out for “collaboration”!*