1. **Name(s) and Number(s) of Course being assessed for Oral Communication:**

   ARCH 2020; Studio 2

2. **Number of Students enrolled per year AND number of those students whose work was assessed for oral communication (SLO 7) competency:**

   62 students; 32 students assessed

3. **Assessment Method(s): Explain how assessment for this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole-was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method.)**

   Assessment of this SLO is conducted via review of student oral presentations, which occur at least three times throughout the semester.

   These presentations are 15-30 minute in length. During that time there is both the presentation by the student as well as discussion of the student’s design proposals. These presentations occur at the beginning, middle and end of the project. Students are expected to support their design proposal with persuasive rhetoric and visual aids (scaled drawings, diagrams, and physical models). The presentation (10 minutes) is made to a group of faculty and visiting architects as well as the student’s peers. The remaining time of the presentation is devoted to discussion, during which students must respond to live critique, and evaluate the effectiveness of their arguments. It is during the second year studio sequence (ARCH 2010 and ARCH 2020) that faculty spend time teaching students how to make an effective verbal and visual presentation.

   Data was collected and submitted last spring for ARCH 2020. Last year a rubric was developed that allowed faculty and students to evaluate the effectiveness of each students’ oral communication skills. The rubric is attached. This fall, out of a class of 62 students (4 sections of 15-16 students), 50% of the students were evaluated during the oral presentations they made for a precedent analysis presentation. Although ARCH 2010 is not a class where SLO 7 is officially assessed, the second year faculty have gone ahead and collected new data.

4. **If the Assessment methods differ from those initially proposed to the CCGEC, identify the differences and explain the rationale for those changes:**

   This assessment method is effectively the same as the one initially proposed. We are however trying to adjust the rubric and method of assessment to reflect some of the unique aspects of a design project presentation that is open-ended, responsive and qualifies the nature of the visual material.

5. **Findings: (what add assessment data tell you about student proficiency in this outcome?)**

   ARCH 2020 submitted data at the end of the Spring Semester 2012 which was evaluated during the last round of assessment reports. No new data has been collected, as ARCH 2020 is only offered in the spring. We have had several opportunities to discuss the rubric and its shortcomings. Following the first presentation it has become clear that the rubric and method of assessment is an impediment to providing live feedback and discussion of the student work. The year level coordinator is working with year level faculty to revise the rubric and method of collecting data to allow for a more effective assessment of the student presentations.
6. How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement? (What questions/issues/concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department/program take as a result of this analysis?)

Following the first presentation it has become clear that the rubric and method of assessment is an impediment to providing live feedback and discussion of the student work. The year level coordinator is working with year level faculty to revise the rubric and method of collecting data to allow for a more effective assessment of the student presentations.

Based upon last year’s outcomes, our response is to:

1. Make students more aware of the evaluation criteria for oral communication earlier in the semester.
2. Work on the form and content of oral presentations with students in a more focused manner.
3. Try to make them increasingly aware of the types of physical distractions they create unintentionally.
4. Adjust the rubric and method of assessment to reflect some of the unique aspects of a design project presentation that is open-ended, responsive and qualifies the nature of the visual material.

50% of students in ARCH 2010 were evaluated during an intermediate, mid-term oral presentation. The rubric included with this report was used to evaluate the student’s performance. The presentation was given in conjunction with drawings and diagrams.

Two areas where students exhibited strength in oral presentation were in the Introduction and in the development of Supporting Materials and Visual Aides. We intend to reintroduce these techniques. One area to move forward for us is in calibrating the rubric for design presentations. Citing sources is included as an important part of a presentation. Design students are looking at the work of other architects, but tend to be more interested in what they have done, not what they say. We need to try and incorporate this use of precedents into the evaluation. Response to counter arguments is included in the rubric as an internal part of the student’s presentation, however in design presentations; the counterargument is often posed in the form of a question from a guest reviewer. How students respond to this dialogue is important not just for this class, but also as an essential professional skill.

7. Additional Comments: (What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?)

Please refer to last year’s report for a description of the relevance of this SLO to the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) accreditation criteria for professional Architecture programs.

8. Committee Comments

What are the exact findings? The students overall have a score. What does this score represent? Are they able to see regional variations but they don’t know terms, for instance? Findings should identify where the improvements should be.
SLO – 7 Students will demonstrate effective oral communication skills.

1. Structure ideas clearly and expressively, using appropriate language free from bias and understand what it means to be an ethical and credible speaker.
2. Recognize appropriate opportunities for communication and identify the most suitable and effective mediums for message dissemination.
3. Communicate candidly (in an open and direct manner) and effectively as an individual, in pairs, or in small groups.
4. Actively listen to oral arguments and recognize when a recipient does not understand a message, adapting it as necessary.

Organization
Language
Delivery
Supporting Material
Central Message
01 INTRODUCTION 10 points
a. Creative and effective attention getter (2)
b. Clear central idea / proposition of value (2)
c. Established relevance to the audience (2)
d. Established credibility as a speaker (2)
e. Clear preview (1)
f. Clear transition between preview and reason (1)
total

02 REASON ONE 20 points
a. Clear reason in support of the proposition (5)
b. Supported reason with criteria and evidence (5)
c. Support used effective appeals (1)
d. Effectively cited at least two sources (5)
e. Provided a summary of the body point (2)
f. Clear transition between reason one and reason two (2)
total

03 REASON TWO 20 points
a. Clear reason in support of the proposition (5)
b. Supported reason with criteria and evidence (5)
c. Support used effective appeals (1)
d. Effectively cited at least two sources (5)
e. Provided a summary of the body point (2)
f. Clear transition between reason one and reason two (2)
total

04 ADDRESSED COUNTER - ARGUMENTS 10 points
may be addressed at any point in the presentation
a. Gave counter arguments fair weight (5)
b. Effectively refuted counter arguments (5)
total

05 CONCLUSION 10 points
a. Clearly signaled conclusion (2)
b. Restated central idea / proposition (2)
c. Summarized three main points (2)
d. Related back to introduction (2)
e. Strong ending statement (2)
total

06 VISUAL COMMUNICATION 30 points
drawings and models are used to describe the design proposal and serve as visual aids in the support of the student’s reasoning.
a. Organized reasons in a clear and effective manner (10)
b. Included a variety of supporting material (5)
c. Effective use of visual material (5)
d. Effective preparation of visual material (5)
e. Clear and legible visual material (5)
total

07 QUALITY OF OUTLINE
deduct 1-10 points based on severity
a. Introduction missing central idea
b. Major evidence is missing
c. Sources or precedents missing
d. Transitions missing
e. Conclusion with summary missing
f. Not written in full sentences

total

08 QUALITY OF LANGUAGE
deduct 1-10 points based on severity
a. Language choices ill suited to the audience
b. Fallacies of reasoning

c. Offensive or inappropriate language

total

09 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS
deduct 1-10 points each based upon severity
a. Speech is not principally persuasive
b. Clear central idea / proposition of value

c. Established relevance to the audience

total

10 DELIVERY
deduct 1-5 points each based on severity
physical delivery
a. Distracting mannerisms
b. Personal eye contact was limited

c. Leaning or slouching

d. Ineffective or no gestures

e. Over / under reliance on notes

vocal delivery
f. Use of filler words such as ‘um,’ ‘you know,’ ‘uh,’
g. Spoke in monotone or hushed manner

h. Vocal delivery was choppy


total

11 STYLE BONUS
add up to 5 points for exemplary artistic presentation skills (word choice, imagery, emotional appeal)
total

12 TIME
a. 3:00 - 3:30 -6 points
b. 3:31 - 3:59 -3 points
c. 4:00 - 6:00 0 points
d. 6:01 - 6:15 -3 points
e. 6:16 - 6:30 -6 points
total

13 TOTAL
score / 100