2018

Teaching Talk: An Exploration of the Content and Implementation of the Common Core State Standards

Anna Wright
Illinois State University, amwrigh@ilstu.edu

Brian Rohman
Illinois State University, brianrohman@gmail.com

Dakota Horn
Illinois State University, dchorn@ilstu.edu

Barbara Meyer
Illinois State University, bbmeyer@ilstu.edu

Cheri J. Simonds
Illinois State University, Cjsimon@ilstu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca

Part of the Higher Education Commons, and the Other Communication Commons

Research Article

Teaching Talk: An Exploration of the Content and Implementation of the Common Core State Standards

Anna Wright, Illinois State University
Brian Rohman, Illinois State University
Dakota Horn, Illinois State University
Barbara Meyer, Illinois State University
Cheri J. Simonds, Illinois State University

Abstract

The implementation of the Common Core State Standards has brought about a renewed inspiration for exploring the role of communication in K-12 schools as they include a speaking and listening strand. Communication education in K-12 schools had been sparsely researched; however, a handful of scholars have made calls to increase the research and advocacy done in this arena. There is a need to understand the K-12 context as a means to inform practices at the college level. This study breaks down the speaking and listening strand of the standards to create a better understanding of the content addressed and applies them to two contexts: a required high school communication course and a college-level basic communication course. Results suggest that the volume of standards addressed is problematic, especially given a lack of teacher training in this area.

Keywords: communication education, K-12 education, basic communication course, speaking and listening, Common Core State Standards

32

Communication has and continues to struggle to find its place within elementary and secondary education curriculums. Regardless, the call for standardizing the curriculum has remained consistent. In fact, Book (1989) made a call to communication scholars to become more actively involved in securing the role of communication in K-12 schools. Problematically, 25 years later, Hunt, Wright, and Simonds (2014) revisited Book's call and addressed many of the same concerns. The need exists for clear communication standards to be implemented, with teacher training geared towards those standards once they are established (Yocum, 1995). Without clear standards of what communication instruction should look like, it becomes difficult to know how to develop a course in communication at the K-12 level. And, without knowing what instruction K-12 students receive, it is difficult to scaffold communication instruction at the college level. Morreale, Cooper, and Perry (2000) outlined guidelines for a communication curriculum at the K-12 level which represented the first true call for standardization in the discipline. The difficulty arises in the history of the discipline, as well as the variety of methods used to approach the instruction of communication (Morreale & Backlund, 2002). These disjointed efforts have caused difficulty in securing the role of communication in schools.

The role of communication in the high school curriculum shifted further with the adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in 2010. While speaking and listening standards represent one-fifth of the K-12 English Language Arts standards, a speedy roll out of the standards resulted in teachers being asked to provide instruction and assessment in speaking and listening with little or no training in the area (Rothman, 2013). While the Common Core has amazing potential to revolutionize communication instruction, there has been little movement in securing its implementation. This paper discusses the importance of communication instruction, Common Core State Standards in high schools, the impact of those standards on the college-level basic communication course, and how basic course directors can help streamline communication instruction in grades 6-16.

Importance of Communication Instruction

The importance of communication instruction has been articulated from a variety of stakeholders. Ultimately, without communication skills, children will not develop academically or socially (Bain, James, & Harrison, 2015). Learning how to communicate with others allows students to transfer information and understand the world around them, and students that lack these skills struggle to learn, make friends,

33

and ask for clarification (DCSF, 2008). Students who have been exposed to communication skills courses are reported to have higher standards for learning, improved behavior, and greater confidence (Sage, 2000; Griffiths, 2002). Clear instruction in communication skills allows for children to evolve into well-developed adults.

Benefits of communication skills are well documented. Multiple analyses have demonstrated communication instruction is important in the development of a 21st-century skill set (Morreale, Osborn, & Pearson, 2000; Morreale & Pearson, 2008; Morreale, Valenzano, & Bauer, 2017). Further, communication is a skill set that should be built upon in the general education curriculum. The development of oral communication skills is a prerequisite for future leadership ability (Mercer, Ahmed, & Warwick, 2014). Without this instruction at the secondary level, it is difficult to understand the role that students can plan as future leaders. Larson, Britt, and Larson (2004) furthered that developing the skills to make and dissect an argument are excellent preparation for postsecondary education. In essence, if we hope to prepare students for life after high school, oral communication training will be instrumental in preparing them for their academic and professional lives.

Students graduating high school and college alike must be prepared to be successful in their careers. Business leaders suggest that oral communication skills are one skill that can lead to student success in their career (Morreale et al., 2000). Specifically, employers expect future employees to use a broad set of skills and 89% list the ability to effectively communicate orally as an important skill (Hart Research Associates, 2010). To address the way that communication courses can meet the needs of businesses desire for these skills, Hooker and Simonds (2015) aligned skills sought by business leaders to the college-level basic communication course. Their analysis found that following skills addressed in business are taught within the basic communication course: thesis statements, extemporaneous speaking, audience analysis, establishing credibility, conflict management, and ethical communication. Regardless of the ranking by individual businesses, communication skills are consistently identified as important to the workforce. Moreover, Stephens (2015) contended that most adults understand there is a need for oral communication skills, but openly admit that they have a large deficiency in this area. Despite the knowledge that oral communication skills are clearly needed on an individual and organizational level, the gap exists in prioritizing communication training.

Specified education programs have acknowledged the need for courses that explore communication skills. Medical professionals prefer a "quality communication

34

curricula" (Passalacqua, 2009, p. 574) for medical students as a requirement for graduation as it has benefits for assessing patients and establishing relationships with patients (Janicik, Kalet, Schwartz, Zabar, & Lipkin, 2007). Similarly, oral communication skills are important in engineering curriculums. Berjano, Sales-Nebot, and Lozano-Nieto (2013) acknowledged the importance of oral communication for engineering students and conducted a study to explore whether oral communication lessons benefited the students. Their study found that the presentations did benefit students and that oral communication skills are necessary to their professional success. Research conducted over the last three decades supports the importance of teaching oral communication skills.

Common Core State Standards

Because the CCSS were developed based on research regarding what makes students college and career ready, the standards have created the impetus for teaching speaking and listening in K-12 schools (Hunt et al., 2014). The CCSS are a consensus understanding of what should be expected of students in grades K-12 to ensure they have the skills and knowledge to be both college and career ready (Porter, McMaken, Hwang, & Yang, 2011). The CCSS were created through a collaboration of teachers, research, and curriculum experts and then implemented by individual school districts (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017c). States were then asked to adopt consistent standards to ensure consistency for students in college and career readiness. The majority of states have adopted the Common Core State Standards (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017a). While support of the standards has been the topic of national debate, they are still a reality in almost every state across the nation.

The largest issue with preexisting standards was a lack of rigor. The CCSS are built upon the strengths and lessons of current state standards, based on rigorous content and application of knowledge through higher order thinking skills, and ultimately aligned with college and career expectations (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017a). The standards were developed to be progressive and address what students should learn at each grade level to be college and career ready by high school graduation (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017b). While the goal is clearly articulated, the achievement of that goal proves to be a much different feat.

The English Language Arts (ELA) standards are divided into four strands, one of which is Speaking and Listening. This strand is further broken down into two areas:

Comprehension and Collaboration and Presentation of Knowledge and Ideas (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017c). The comprehension and collaboration strand focuses on skills in discussion, bringing multiple media together in presentations, and developing the ability to assess a speaker's point of view. The second strand, presentation of knowledge and ideas, requires the development of presentation skills including organizational clarity, proper use of visual aids, and adaptation to a specific audience.

Each strand of the English Language Arts portion of the Common Core State Standards contains up to 10 standards. A major criticism of the ELA standards is that each individual standard is assessing too many skills at once. Ruchti, Jenkins, and Agamba (2013) discovered that for the best implementation of the standards, teachers should work in teams as to best unpack each skill in the standard. Because the speaking and listening strand is not unique in the complexity of each standard, we asked the following research question:

> RQ1: What individual objectives are present in the Common Core
> State Standards speaking and listening strand?

Concerns With Implementation of Common Core

Establishing clear standards are the first step in justifying communication curriculum; however, implementation is the next step. How, and if, these standards are taught is debated. In fact, one study suggested that only 27% of high school students receive instruction in oral communication skills (Johnson, 2012). It is important that we explore the gaps in the implementation of these standards.

Teacher Training

While the Common Core calls for a greater amount of rigor in the classroom, training teachers in communication skills has not followed suit. Only 21 states have a teaching license or content test related to communication education (Strieff, Morris, Weintraub, Wendt, & Wright, 2012), which means that although 42 states have adopted the standards (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017a), half of the states have untrained teachers executing the standards. The reality is that speaking and listening are expected to be taught across the curriculum; however, there is no training to do so. Moreover, elementary educators are required to have a breadth of knowledge of all disciplines rather than a specific focus in any one area. Teachers,

36

especially in younger grades, are not well versed enough with communication scholarship to effectively teach and assess students' skills (Hess, Taft, Bodary, Beebe, & Valenzano, 2015). The burden on teacher training is already high. However, without preparing teachers for their future classrooms, students and instructors alike are harmed.

At the secondary education level, qualified individuals are no longer the primary instructors of oral communication. Carlgren (2013) argued that instructors of communication skills should be specialized in that field, and that the nature of high-stakes assessment has hindered this. Similarly, following the adoption of the *No Child Left Behind Act*, states across the nation began to limit the number of content area certifications. English and Speech became two areas that were easy to combine to create more teachers that are highly qualified to teach a variety of class (Jennings, 2010). The implication is that teachers may be highly qualified to teach oral communication classes without receiving training or even taking a single communication course (Johnson, 2012). Additionally, many teachers have a fear of public speaking themselves (Palmer, 2014). A generation of teachers are being asked to teach and assess content and skills without knowledge or development of the skills themselves.

Instruction

A lack of qualified teachers results in a gap in communication skills. In fact, a survey of high school graduates currently enrolled in college indicated that 43% identified gaps in their oral communication skills, while 12% identified large gaps (Hart Research Associates, 2005). Furthermore, Kahl (2014) illustrated the gap through a series of interviews with high school students. His study found that when communication skills are taught by a teacher with an English Language Arts background, instruction is not enough to result in an effective, formal presentation. While lip service is given to teaching communication skills, the actual results may vary. Instructional guides and resources (Roberts & Billings, 2011) have been developed to aide teachers in their inclusion of speaking and listening assessments into existing curricula; however, these guides tend to be vague and not include key components and vocabulary of communication assessments. Ultimately, K-12 teachers are not held accountable for appropriate content knowledge in communication (Hunt et al., 2014).

Even with the CCSS in place, discrepancies in when to teach communication skills exist. Most states include oral communication throughout their language arts curriculum (Hall, Morreale, & Gaudino, 1999). Texas provides an interesting example, because while they have not adopted the Common Core (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017d), they do have a single semester oral communication requirement (Hanson, 2008). Problematically, schools vary when oral communication is taught; some teach the course at the junior/senior level while others teach it at the sophomore, freshman, or even eighth-grade level. Advocates of the stand-alone course make the argument that depending on the exact skills covered in an oral communication course, the ability for an eighth-grade student to apply them is vastly different from a senior in high school. The goal of any set of standards is that students will reach college with the same set of skills, but with the wide array in timing of instruction in communication skills, this is simply not the case.

Assessment

It should be no surprise that when gaps in teaching emerge, gaps in assessment emerge as well. Students place the importance of various skills based upon who is teaching those specific skills. With fewer and fewer communication education licensure programs, most instructors teaching oral communication courses receive their training in English Language Arts (Jennings, 2010). This establishes two dangerous precedents: (1) administrators believe that anyone can teach communication skills regardless of their level of training in communication skills (Dannels & Housley Gaffney, 2009) and (2) organizational and delivery skills needed for effective oral presentations are deprioritized and students feel that they are not important due to inadequate assessments (Kahl, 2014). While some teachers contend that they do meet the demands of speaking and listening strand of the CCSS, teachers often assign speaking without providing adequate instruction; thus, it cannot be adequately assessed (Palmer, 2014). Further, unqualified teachers are unable to write valid and reliable assessments that emphasize important communication skills.

While gaps in assessment occur in specific classrooms, these gaps also exist when examining standardized and norm-referenced examinations. Hall et al. (1999) found that only 12 states have some type of high school exit exam for students in oral communication skills. Students are being taught skills that they are not held accountable for later. Additionally, there is often no mechanism in place to ensure teachers possess communication knowledge themselves prior to teaching and

38

assessing their students (Hunt et al., 2014). Teachers are told that they must teach skills that they are not prepared to teach and assess in their own classrooms, only to not be held accountable for their knowledge or their students' learning.

These concerns with teacher training, instruction, and assessment give us pause for how these standards are being implemented in K-12 classrooms. To further address these concerns, it is important to map and align the communication knowledge and skills being taught in the speaking and listening strand in the Common Core. Thus, we asked the following research question:

> RQ2: Which parts of the Common Core State Standards speaking and listening strand are taught in a required high school communication course?

Finally, the standards are supposed to be taught in a manner that allows students to develop from Kindergarten to Grade 12, building on the skills as they go (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017b). The implementation of these standards should prepare students for their college experience. Because it is not certain what, if any, of these skills are being properly addressed, it is important to examine the potential gaps and overlaps from the high school curriculum to the college communication course. Ideally, the knowledge and skills from a college course should go beyond what is taught in the CCSS. Because we are unsure the extent to which college courses go beyond high school expectations, we asked the following research question:

> RQ3: Which parts of the Common Core State Standards speaking and listening strand are taught in the college level basic communication course?

Methods

The authors began by examining the Speaking and Listening strand of the CCSS, beginning with Grade 6. Because the standards are scaffolded so that students build their knowledge and skills before high school graduation (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017b), the authors chose to begin with Grade 6, as what is taught in middle level grades would have implications for high school curriculum. The standards are written in such a way that many individual objectives are found

within each standard. Stiggins, Arter, Chappuis, and Chappuis (2004) contend that standards often include multiple individual learning objectives and when deconstructing standards "you are looking at what the content standard requires students to know and be able to do" (p. 81). The method used to deconstruct standards follows the deconstruction components outlined by Stiggins et al. (2004). To deconstruct the standards, the authors began by identifying the verbs in the standards. From there, they identified the course of specific action following that verb. They broke the standards into individual statements that had one verb and one specific course of action in them. The deconstruction began with the Grade 6 standards. Next, the authors moved to Grade 7, but only verbs and courses of action that were different than what was identified in Grade 6 were added. The authors continued following this process through the Grade 11-12 standards. Each individual statement identified is referred to as an objective. For sake of clarity, an example is provided below.

CCSS.SL.6.2 states, "Interpret information presented in diverse media and formats (e.g. visually, quantitatively, orally) and explain how it contributes to a topic, text, or issue under study" (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017c, p. 49). The verbs in this standard are "interpret" and "explain." The authors broke this standard down into three individual objectives: (1) Interpret information presented in diverse media, (2) Interpret information presented in diverse formats, and (3) Explain how information contributes to a topic, text, or issue under study.

It is important to note that the "interpret" verb was broken into two individual objectives because it used the word "and." The authors interpreted this to mean students must be able to do both. Conversely, the "explain" verb was only one individual objective because it used the word "or." The authors interpreted this to mean students only need to be able to do one of these, making it one objective. After completing Grade 6, the authors moved to Grade 7 to determine what verbs and action statements were added, adding those to the individual objectives list. This analysis can be used to further explore the volume of the standards addressed in the Speaking and Listening strand of the CCSS. Further, it can be used for educators to determine how they are meeting each of the objectives addressed in the Speaking and Listening strand.

After the authors had a list of stand-alone objective statements, they mapped and aligned these objectives to two different courses. Mapping and aligning courses to the Common Core State Standards allows for the examination of a program of study to determine relationships and structures in the scaffolding of communication

40

knowledge and skills (Archambault & Masunaga, 2015). The first course was a high school communication class at a Midwestern laboratory high school. The course is required of all sophomore students as a one-semester English Language Arts requirement. Next, they aligned the standards to the college-level basic communication course at a Midwestern university. This course is taught to all first-year college students as a general education requirement. Coders for the high school course were a director of a teacher education program, a high school teacher who teaches the course, and a graduate teaching assistant who teaches the basic communication course. The coders for the college course were the same director of a teacher education program listed above who is also an instructor of the course, the director of the basic communication course, and the same graduate teaching assistant who teaches the basic course. To align the standards to the courses, the authors consulted the common content, assignments, and assessments for the courses. As such, they reviewed the standard textbooks, workbooks, and syllabi for the courses. The analysis sought to determine: (1) Is this content taught across all sections in the class? (2) Is this objective assessed in all sections of the class? When answering both questions, they had to be able to directly identify where the content was given to students and/or exactly where and how it was assessed. Three researchers worked on each alignment and had to agree on the classification of each objective before documenting it. The objective had to be taught and assessed in a standard fashion across all sections of the courses. It should be noted that the criteria for placement included a clear identification within the common course materials that the material was either being taught or assessed across sections. For example, some instructors may teach students to integrate multiple sources of information presented in diverse media (11-12.2), but not all instructors may do so. Also, the pedagogy of the course may have students practice their discussion skills (11-12.1), but if they were not taught specifically how to do so, they were not classified as such.

This analysis can be used as one example of how the Speaking and Listening strand of the CCSS is addressed in Grades 6-16. Additionally, this analysis can serve to illustrate where we might see overlap and what objectives are missing from this course, which might shed light on how these standards are implemented at other institutions.

Results

The results of all three analyses, which include the deconstructed standards as well as symbol/color codes for each objective (taught and assessed, assessed, taught,

41

and neither taught or assessed) for each institution, can be found in the appendix. The first research question asked how many individual objectives are present in the CCSS. The analysis revealed 171 individual objectives for grades 6-12 (see Appendix).

Research question two asked which of these objectives were taught in a required high school communication course. The alignment showed that out of the 171 objectives, 82 (48%) were both taught and assessed in the course; 10 (6%) were taught but not assessed, 79 (46%) were neither taught or assessed. None of the objectives were assessed but not taught (see Appendix).

The final research question asked which of these objectives were taught in the college-level basic communication course. The alignment indicated that out of the 171 objectives, 98 (57%) were both taught and assessed in the course; 33 (19%) were taught but not assessed; 16 (9%) were assessed but not taught, and 24 (14%) were neither taught or assessed.

After the alignment was complete, the authors were interested in determining how many of the objectives were neither taught nor assessed across both courses. The comparison revealed that there were 20 (12%) objectives that fit this criteria.

Discussion and Implications

The deconstruction conducted by the authors has implications for the structure of the standards, the high school curriculum, and college level basic communication courses. Initially, K-5 instructors may not be adequately preparing students for grades 6-12, which are the grades covered in this deconstruction. The 6-12 standards are written and implemented under the assumption that students should have specific skills coming out of grade school. For example, in speaking and listening standard four for grades 3-5, students are expected to "speak clearly at an understandable pace" (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017c, p. 25). Building on that, in Grade 6, students are supposed to "use appropriate eye contact, adequate volume, and clear pronunciation" (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017c, p. 49). Since K-5 instructors do not have an adequate knowledge of communication concepts and skills (Hess et al., 2015), 6-12 instructors must teach standards that should have been covered in younger grades once again once students enter middle school.

The CCSS generates concerns for the current structure of a high school standalone course. Through this analysis, the authors determined that in grades 6-12, the CCSS require approximately 171 different objectives within the speaking and

42

listening strand to be taught and assessed. On average, that means that there should be 24 different standards taught and assessed at each grade level, just for the speaking and listening strand. As fewer high school instructors are highly qualified to teach communication skills (Jennings, 2010; Streiff et al., 2012), these are expected to be taught by instructors with little to no training in communication. This is where basic course directors come into play. As individuals that see the benefits of communication skills taught by highly trained instructors, basic course directions are uniquely situated to advocate for communication skills to be included in the high school classroom as individuals that can suggest what is "college ready."

However, advocacy for the inclusion of communication skills is only the beginning. The Common Core State Standards situate the importance of communication skills at all levels (Hunt et al., 2014). The impact goes beyond the English Language Arts classroom, as the standards are expected to be taught across the curriculum. Problematically, while the standards clearly articulate 171 objectives in the speaking and listening strand alone, they do not articulate how the skills should be taught. When unqualified teachers are asked to teach communication skills, they may not have an understanding of how to teach specific objectives outline in the standards. Basic course directors should answer the calls of Book (1989) and Hunt et al. (2014) to further research communication pedagogy in order to put the best practices in teaching communication skills in the hands of high school practitioners.

Once a body of research exists on the best pedagogical practices of communication skills, basic course directors need to work in tandem with high school instructors to write textbooks and other curriculum materials because unfortunately, most oral communication courses do not use a textbook (Book & Pappos, 1981). When highly qualified teachers leave the classroom and are replaced by untrained instructors, there may be little to no materials for them to follow. Certainly, materials are not aligned to the Common Core State Standards. The standards arguably set the stage for a solid K-16 curriculum. Basic course directors have an obligation to ensure high school instructors have an understanding of how a high school course should be situated in the grand scheme of the education of a student.

Basic course directors should also look inward to the design of their own courses to avoid overlap with their high school counterparts. This analysis outlined several standards that are both taught and assessed in high school and college courses while others received attention from neither course. There are also several standards that

are assessed but never taught. Basic course directors should be able to assume that their students are entering college with the skills outlined by the standards. While some may need revisited, the college level basic communication course should be able to build upon the knowledge and skills engaged at the high school level. If basic course directors are able to effectively advocate for the inclusion of communication skills at the high school level, build an effective body of research, aid in the design of high school textbooks and curriculum materials, and consider a redesign of their own course, then communication skills can be adequately taught and assessed across the high school and college communication classroom, making students more prepared to meet the communication skills demanded by their careers.

Limitations and Future Research

This study is not without limitations. The main limitation is that the standard alignment occurred at one university and one high school. Depending upon its role as either an introductory or general curriculum course, the content of the college-level basic communication may be vastly different from one campus to the next. Similarly, the design of high school courses is largely dependent upon the instructor of the class. Future research should explore how these standards play out in K-16 at a variety of institutions. Additionally, the standards need to be deconstructed starting at the Kindergarten level. This would allow more application to see how many and exactly what communication skills are represented in the standards. Another limitation is the lack of acknowledgement of speaking and listening skills addressed in other strands of the standards. For example, we are aware that figurative language and listening in oral communication are addressed in the language strand; however, we did not explore that strand. Future research should take a more comprehensive look at all the ELA standards to determine every place that communication skills are addressed.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we know that communication skills are important in many facets of life. The CCSS provide a strong foundation for the importance of speaking and listening and offer a comprehensive suggestion for how these skills can be taught K-12. Problematically, there are a lot of skills to teach and assess, especially when the burden falls on teachers who are already tasked with teaching and assessing a variety of other standards. Ideally, stand-alone communication courses would be taught by qualified communication teachers. Understandably, the skills should be applied in

44

other disciplines, but without a qualified teacher held accountable for implementing these standards, we cannot guarantee students are going to college and career equipped with competent communication skills needed for success.

Author Information

Anna M. Wright (M.S. Illinois State University, 2013) is a lecturer and doctoral student in the School of Communication at Illinois State University.

Brian Rohman (B.S. Illinois State University, 2014) is a high school communication and English teacher at University High School and a master's student at Illinois State University.

Dakota C. Horn (M.A. Western Illinois University, 2016) is a doctoral student in the School of Communication at Illinois State University.

Barbara Meyer (Ed.D. University of Memphis, 1999) is an associate dean in the College of Education at Illinois State University.

Cheri J. Simonds (Ph.D. University of Oklahoma, 1995) is a professor and director of communication as critical inquiry in the School of Communication at Illinois State University.

References

Archambault, S. G., & Masunaga, J. (2015). Curriculum mapping as a strategic planning tool. *Journal of Library Administration, 55*, 503-519. doi:10.1080/01930826.2015.1054770

Bain, J., James, D., & Harrison, M. (2015). Supporting communication development in the early years: A practitioner's perspective. *Child Language Teaching & Therapy, 31*, 325-336. doi:10.1177/0265659015596795

Berjano, E., Sales-Nebot, L., & Lozano-Nieto, A. (2013). Improving professionalism in the engineering curriculum through a novel use of oral presentations. *European Journal of Engineering Education, 38*, 121-130. doi:10.1080/03043797.2012.745829

Book, C. L. (1989). Communication education: Pedagogical content knowledge needed. *Communication Education, 38*, 315-321. doi:10.1080/03634528909378770

45

Book, C. L., & Pappas, E. J. (1981). The status of speech communication in secondary schools in the United States: An update. *Communication Education, 30*, 199-208. doi:10.1080/03634528109378471

Carlgren, T. (2013). Communication, critical thinking, problem solving: A suggested course for all high school students in the 21st century. *Interchange, 44*, 63-81. doi:10.1007/s10780-013-9197-8

Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2017a). About the standards. Retrieved from http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/

Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2017b). English language arts: Introduction: Key design considerations. Retrieved from http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/introduction/key-design-consideration/

Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2017c). English language arts standards. Retrieved from http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/ELA_Standards1.pdf

Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2017d) Standards in your state. Retrieved from http://www.corestandards.org/standards-in-your-state/

Dannels, D. P., & Housley Gaffney, A. L. (2009). Communication across the curriculum and in the disciplines: A call for scholarly cross-curricular advocacy. *Communication Education, 58*, 124-153. doi:10.1080/03634520802527288

Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF). (2008). The Bercow Report: A review of services for children and young people (0–19) with speech, language and communication needs. London, England: Department for Children, Schools and Families. Retrieved from http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/8405/7/7771-dcsf-bercow_Redacted.pdf

Griffiths, F. (2002). *Communication counts: Speech and language difficulties in the early years.* Abingdon, England: Routledge.

46

Hall, B. I., Morreale, S. P., & Gaudino, J. L. (1999). A survey of the status of oral communication in the K-12 public educational system in the United States. *Communication Education, 48*, 139-148. doi:10.1080/03634529909379161

Hanson, T. L. (2008). Teaching speech in Texas: The challenges and rewards of teaching speech communication in Texas public schools. *Texas Speech Communication Journal, 33*(1), 74-77. Retrieved from: http://www.etsca.com

Hart Research Associates. (2005). Rising to the challenge: Are high school graduates prepared for college and work? Retrieved from http://www.achieve.org/files/pollreport_0.pdf

Hart Research Associates. (2010). Raising the bar: Employers' views on college learning in the wake of the economic downturn. Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/2009_EmployerSurvey.pdf

Hess, J. A., Taft, B., Bodary, S. R., Beebe, S. A., & Valenzano, J. M. (2015). Forum: The common core. *Communication Education, 64*, 241-260. doi:10.1080/03634523.2015.1014387

Hooker, J. F., & Simonds, C. J. (2015). From the outside looking in: Employers' views of the basic course. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 27*, 102-116. Retrieved from http://ecommons.udayton.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1484&context=bcca

Hunt, S. K., Wright, A. M. & Simonds, C. J. (2014). Securing the future of communication education: Advancing an advocacy and research agenda for the 21st century. *Communication Education, 63*, 449-461. doi:10.1080/03634523.2014.926016

Janicik, R., Kalet, A. L., Schwartz, M. D., Zabar, S., & Lipkin, M. (2007). Using bedside rounds to teacher communication skills in the internal medicine clerkship. *Medical Education Online, 12*, 1-8. doi:10.3402/meo.v12i.4458

Jennings, D. K. (2010). Assessing communication in the P-12 classrooms. In P. Backlund & G. Wakefield (Eds.), *A communication assessment primer* (pp. 145-164). Washington, DC: National Communication Association.

Johnson, K. H. (2012). *The effect of a high school speech course on public speaking anxiety for students in a college-level public speaking class* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Proquest Dissertation and Theses database. (Accession Number ED546986).

Kahl, D. H. (2014). High school public speaking curriculum: Assessment through student voice. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication, 15*, 15-58. doi:10.1080/17459435.2014.955592

Larson, M., Britt, M. A., & Larson, A. A. (2004). Disfluencies in comprehending argumentative texts. *Reading Psychology, 25*, 205-224. doi:10.1080/02702710490489909

Mercer, N., Ahmed, A., & Warwick, P. (2014, October 4). We should be teaching kids public speaking in school. *The Washington Post.* Retreived from https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2014/10/04/we-should-be-teaching-kids-public-speaking-in-school/?utm_term=.20e85c1f250c

Morreale, S. P & Backlund, P. M. (2002). Communication curricula: History, recommendations, resources. *Communication Education, 51*, 2-18. doi:10.1080/03634520216498

Morreale, S. P., & Pearson, J. C. (2008). Why communication education is important: The centrality of the discipline in the 21st century. *Communication Education, 57*, 224-240. doi:10.1080/03634520701861713

Morreale, S. P., Cooper, P., & Perry, C. (2000). *Guidelines for developing oral communication curricula in kindergarten through twelfth grade* (2nd ed.). Annandale, VA: National Communication Association.

48

Morreale, S. P., Osborn, M. M., & Pearson, J. C. (2000). Why communication is important: A rationale for the centrality of the study of communication. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration, 29*, 1-25. Retrieved from: http://www.unco.edu/

Morreale, S. P., Valenzano, J. M., & Bauer, J. A. (2017). Why communication education is important: A third study on the centrality of the discipline's content and pedagogy. *Communication Education, 66*, 402-422. doi:10.1080/03634523.2016.1265136

Palmer, E. (2014). Now presenting… *Educational Leadership,72*(3), 24-29. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/nov14/vol72/num03/Now-Presenting-%E2%80%A6.aspx

Passalacqua, S. A. (2009). Teaching and learning communication skills in medicine. *Health Communication, 24*, 572-574. doi:10.1080/10410230903104954

Porter, A., McMaken, J., Hwang, J., & Yang, R. (2011). Common Core standards: The new U.S. intended curriculum. *Educational Researcher*, *40*, 103-116. doi:10.3102/0013189X11405038

Roberts, T., & Billings, L. (2011). Using seminars to teach the Common Core's speaking and listening standards. *Eye on Education*. Retrieved from http://www.eyeoneducation.com/Free/White-Papers

Rothman, R. (2013). Communication and the common core. *Spectra*, *49*(3), 18-21.

Ruchti, W. P., Jenkins, S. J., & Agamba, J. (2013). Critical supports for secondary educators in Common Core State Standards implementation. *The Clearing House, 86*, 246-254. doi:10.1080/00098655.2013.826494

Sage, R. (2000). *Class talk: Successful learning through effective communication*. Stafford, Australia: Network Educational Press.

Stephens, H. (2015, February 24). Kids need communication skills above all, survey says. *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved from http://www.chicagotribune.com/ct-skills-adults-think-kids-need-balancing-20150224-column.html

49

Streiff, J. A., Morris, M. Weintraub, S. C., Wendt, D., & Wright, A. (2012). *Supporting materials for National Communication Association resolution on NCA's support for high school communication education (speaking, listening, and media literacy) as a graduation requirement.* Retrieved from http://www.natcom.org

Stiggins, R. J., Arter, J. A., Chappuis, J., & Chappuis, S. (2004). *Classroom assessment for student learning: Doing it right - using it well.* Portland, OR: Assessment Training Institute.

Yocum, K. L. (1995, November). A vision for the future: The creation of K-12 standards in oral communication curriculum. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Antonio, TX.

50

Appendix

Taught and Assessed	Assessed	Taught	Neither taught nor assessed
@	#	%	+
BC = Basic Course		HS = High School	

Standard	Objective	BC	HS
6.1	Engage in collaborative discussions with different people one on one	%	+
6.1	Engage in collaborative discussions with different people in groups	@	%
6.1	Engage in collaborative discussions with different people in teacher led	@	%
6.1	Build on others ideas in collaborative discussions	+	+
6.1	Express ideas clearly in collaborative discussions	+	+
6.1a	Come to discussion having read or studied required material	#	+
6.1a	Refer to evidence in discussion	@	+
6.1a	Probe on ideas in discussion	@	+
6.1a	Reflect on ideas in discussion	#	+
6.1.b	Follow rules for collegial discussions	@	+
6.1.b	Set goals for collegial discussions	#	+
6.1.b	Set deadlines for collegial discussions	@	+
6.1.b	Define roles for collegial discussions	%	+
6.1.c	Pose specific questions in discussion	+	+
6.1.c	Respond to specific questions in discussion	#	+

51

Standard	Objective	BC	HS
6.1.c	Make comments that contribute to the topic, text, or issue in discussion	+	+
6.1.d	Review key ideas expressed in discussion	@	+
6.1.d	Demonstrate understanding of multiple perspectives through reflection in discussion	#	+
6.1.d	Demonstrate understanding of multiple perspectives through paraphrasing in discussion	@	+
6.2	Interpret information presented in diverse media	@	@
6.2	Interpret information presented in diverse formats	@	@
6.2	Explain how information contributes to a topic, text, or issue under study	@	@
6.3	Delineate a speaker's argument	@	@
6.3	Delineate a speaker's specific claim	@	@
6.3	Distinguish claims supported by evidence from those that are not	@	@
6.3	Distinguish claims supported by reason from those that are not	@	@
6.4	Present claims	@	@
6.4	Present findings	@	@
6.4	Sequence ideas logically	@	@
6.4	Use pertinent descriptions to accentuate main ideas or themes	@	@
6.4	Use pertinent facts to accentuate main ideas or themes	@	@
6.4	Use pertinent descriptions details to accentuate main ideas or themes	@	@
6.4	Use appropriate eye contact	@	@
6.4	Use adequate volume	@	@
6.4	Use clear pronunciation	@	@

52

Standard	Objective	BC	HS
6.5	Include multimedia components in presentations to clarify information	@	+
6.5	Include visual displays in presentations to clarify information	@	@
6.6	Adapt speech to a variety of contexts	%	@
6.6	Adapt speech to a variety of tasks	@	@
6.6	Demonstrate command of formal English when indicated or appropriate	#	@
7.1a	Come to discussion having read or researched required material	#	+
7.1b	Track progress toward specific goals and deadlines for discussion	#	+
7.1c	Pose questions that elicit elaboration in discussion	+	+
7.1c	Respond to questions with relevant observations and ideas in discussion	#	+
7.1c	Respond to questions that bring the discussion back on topic	+	+
7.1d	Acknowledge new information expressed by others in discussion	#	+
7.1d	Modify views based on new information in discussion	%	+
7.2	Analyze main ideas in diverse media	%	@
7.2	Analyze supporting details in diverse media	%	@
7.2	Explain how ideas clarify a topic, text or issue under study	+	+
7.3	Evaluate the soundness of the reasoning in speaker's argument	@	@
7.3	Evaluate the relevance of evidence in speaker's argument	@	@
7.3	Evaluate the sufficiency of the evidence in speaker's argument	@	@
7.4	Emphasize salient points in a focused coherent manner with pertinent descriptions	@	@
7.4	Emphasize salient points in a focused coherent manner with pertinent facts	@	@

53

Standard	Objective	BC	HS
7.4	Emphasize salient points in a focused coherent manner with pertinent details	@	@
7.4	Emphasize salient points in a focused coherent manner with pertinent examples	@	@
7.5	Include multimedia components in presentations to clarify claims	%	+
7.5	Include multimedia components in presentations to clarify findings	%	+
7.5	Include multimedia components in presentations to emphasize salient points	%	+
7.5	Include visual displays in presentations to clarify claims	%	@
7.5	Include visual displays in presentations to clarify findings	%	@
7.5	Include visual displays in presentations to emphasize salient points	%	@
8.1b	Follow rules for decision making in discussion	%	+
8.1c	Pose questions that connect the ideas of several speakers in discussion	+	+
8.1c	Respond to others' questions with relevant evidence in discussion	@	+
8.1c	Respond to others' comments with relevant evidence in discussion	@	+
8.1c	Respond to others' questions with relevant ideas in discussion	@	+
8.1c	Respond to others' comments with relevant ideas in discussion	@	+
8.1d	Qualify or justify their own views in light of the evidence presented in discussion	@	+
8.2	Analyze the purpose of information presented in diverse media	%	@
8.2	Evaluate the motives behind diverse media's presentation	%	%
8.3	Identify irrelevant evidence in speaker's argument	%	@
8.4	Emphasize salient points in a focused coherent manner with relevant evidence	@	@

54

Standard	Objective	BC	HS
8.4	Emphasize salient points In a focused coherent manner with sound valid reasoning	@	@
8.4	Emphasize salient points in a focused coherent manner with well-chosen detail	@	@
8.5	Integrate multimedia into presentations to clarify information	%	+
8.5	Integrate multimedia into presentations to strengthen claims and evidence	%	+
8.5	Integrate multimedia into presentations to add interest	%	+
8.5	Integrate visual displays into presentations to clarify information	%	@
8.5	Integrate visual displays into presentations to strengthen claims and evidence	%	@
8.5	Integrate visual displays into presentations to add interest	%	@
9/10.1	Initiate effectively in a range of collaborative discussions with diverse partners	@	%
9/10.1	Participate effectively in a range of collaborative discussions with diverse partners	@	%
9/10.1	Express their own ideas persuasively in discussion	@	+
9/10.1a	Come to discussion having read required material	#	+
9/10.1a	Come to discussion having researched required material	@	+
9/10.1a	Refer to evidence from text on the topic or issue in discussion	#	+
9/10.1a	Refer to evidence from other research on the topic or issue in discussion	@	+
9/10.1a	Stimulate a thoughtful well-reasoned exchange of ideas in discussion	+	+
9/10.1b	Work with peers to set rules for collegial discussions	%	+
9/10.1b	Work with peers to set rules for decision making in discussion	%	+
9/10.1b	Work with peers to set clear goals and deadlines in discussion	%	+

55

Standard	Objective	BC	HS
9/10.1b	Work with peers to determine individual roles as needed in discussion	%	+
9/10.1c	Propel conversations by posing questions that relate the current discussion to broader themes or larger ideas	+	+
9/10.1c	Propel conversations by responding to questions that relate the current discussion to broader themes or larger ideas	+	+
9/10.1c	Actively incorporate others into the discussion	@	+
9/10.1c	Clarify, verify or challenge ideas in discussion	%	+
9/10.1c	Clarify, verify or challenge conclusions in discussion	%	+
9-10.1d	Respond thoughtfully to diverse perspectives in discussion	@	+
9-10.1d	Summarize points of agreement in discussion	+	+
9-10.1d	Summarize points of disagreement in discussion	+	+
9-10.1d	Qualify or justify their own understanding in discussion	@	+
9-10.1d	Make new connections in light of the evidence in discussion	@	+
9-10.1d	Make new connections in light of reasoning in discussion	@	+
9-10.2	Integrate multiple sources of information presented in diverse media or formats	@	@
9-10.2	Evaluate credibility of each source	@	@
9-10.2	Evaluate accuracy of each source	@	@
9-10.3	Evaluate a speaker's point of view	+	+
9-10.3	Evaluate a speaker's reasoning	@	@
9-10.3	Evaluate a speaker's use of evidence	@	@
9-10.3	Evaluate a speaker's rhetoric	@	+
9-10.3	Identify any fallacious reasoning or exaggerated or distorted evidence	%	@

56

Standard	Objective	BC	HS
9-10.4	Present information clearly such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning	@	@
9-10.4	Present information concisely such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning	@	@
9-10.4	Present information logically such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning	@	@
9-10.4	Present supporting evidence clearly such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning	@	@
9-10.4	Present supporting evidence concisely such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning	@	@
9-10.4	Present supporting evidence logically such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning	@	@
9-10.4	Organization of the presentation is appropriate to the purpose	@	@
9-10.4	Organization of the presentation is appropriate to the audience	@	@
9-10.4	Organization of the presentation is appropriate to the task	@	@
9-10.4	Development of the presentation is appropriate to the purpose	@	@
9-10.4	Development of the presentation is appropriate to the audience	@	@
9-10.4	Development of the presentation is appropriate to the task	@	@
9-10.4	Substance of the presentation is appropriate to the purpose	@	@
9-10.4	Substance of the presentation is appropriate to the audience	@	@
9-10.4	Substance of the presentation is appropriate to the task	@	@
9-10.4	Style of the presentation is appropriate to the purpose	@	@
9-10.4	Style of the presentation is appropriate to the audience	@	@
9-10.4	Style of the presentation is appropriate to the task	@	@
9-10.5	Make strategic use of digital media in presentations to enhance understanding of findings	@	+

Standard	Objective	BC	HS
9-10.5	Make strategic use of digital media in presentations to enhance understanding of reasoning	+	+
9-10.5	Make strategic use of digital media in presentations to enhance understanding of evidence	+	+
9-10.5	Make strategic use of digital media in presentations to add interest	%	@
11-12.1b	Work with peers to promote civil, democratic discussions	%	+
11-12.1b	Work with peers to promote decision making in discussion	%	+
11-12.1c	Propel conversations by posing questions that probe reasoning	+	+
11-12.1c	Propel conversations by responding to questions that probe reasoning	+	+
11-12.1c	Propel conversations by posing questions that probe evidence	+	+
11-12.1c	Propel conversations by responding to questions that probe evidence	+	+
11-12.1c	Ensure a hearing for a full range of positions on a topic or issue in discussion	@	+
11-12.1c	Promote divergent perspectives in discussion	@	+
11-12.1c	Promote creative perspectives in discussion	@	+
11-12.1d	Synthesize comments made on all sides of an issue in discussion	#	+
11-12.1d	Synthesize claims made on all sides of an issue in discussion	#	+
11-12.1d	Synthesize evidence made on all sides of an issue in discussion	#	+
11-12.1d	Resolve contradictions when possible in discussion	%	+
11-12.1d	Determine what additional information or research is required to deepen the investigation or complete the task in discussion	@	+
11-12.2	Integrate multiple sources of information presented in diverse media in order to make informed decisions	@	@
11-12.2	Integrate multiple sources of information presented in diverse formats in order to make informed decisions	@	@

58

Standard	Objective	BC	HS
11-12.2	Integrate multiple sources of information presented in diverse media in order to solve problems	+	@
11-12.2	Integrate multiple sources of information presented in diverse formats in order to solve problems	+	@
11-12.2	Integrate multiple sources of information presented noting any discrepancies among the data	+	%
11-12.3	Assess the speaker's stance used in argument	@	@
11-12.3	Assess the speaker's premises used in argument	@	@
11-12.3	Asses the speaker's links among ideas used in argument	@	@
11-12.3	Assess the speaker's word choice used in argument	@	%
11-12.3	Assess the speaker's points of emphasis used in argument	+	%
11-12.3	Asses the speaker's tone used in argument	@	%
11-12.4	Present information that conveys a clear perspective	@	@
11-12.4	Present information that conveys a distinct perspective	@	@
11-12.4	Alternative or opposing perspectives are addressed in the presentation	#	@
11-12.4	Organization of the presentation is appropriate to a range of formal tasks	@	@
11-12.4	Organization of the presentation is appropriate to a range of informal tasks	@	@
11-12.4	Development of the presentation is appropriate to a range of formal tasks	@	@
11-12.4	Development of the presentation is appropriate to a range of informal tasks	@	@
11-12.4	Substance of the presentation is appropriate to a range of formal tasks	@	@
11-12.4	Substance of the presentation is appropriate to a range of informal tasks	@	@

Standard	Objective	BC	HS
11-12.4	Style of the presentation is appropriate to a range of formal tasks	@	@
11-12.4	Style of the presentation is appropriate to a range of informal tasks	@	%

60