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

   ENGL 4240, ENGL 4800, ENGL4810

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

   56/56

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.)**

   The capstone courses for each of the three major English tracks (Creative Writing, Literature, and Technical Communication and Literacy) assessed oral competency as a component of course instruction but was not a component of the course grade. Although the assessment instruments differed some what, all three contained questions assessing the following four points:

   1. Was speech engaging?
   2. Was information chosen with audience in mind?
   3. Is speaker well prepared for questions?
   4. Was allotted time sufficient for presentation?

   Students and the instructor for each capstone instructor filled out the checklists. For ENGL 4240, students give a 20 minute craft talk and a reading of their creative work. For ENGL 4800, students give a presentation on the state of their research for their final 20 page term research essay on a literary text. For ENGL 4810, students give group presentations of their research projects which comprised their final portfolios. Students in ENGL 4240 and ENGL 4800 were assessed as individuals; student groups were assessed in ENGL 4810.

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

   The assessment does not differ/

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

   98.1% of Literature and Creative Writing students performed satisfactorily (17.4%) or well (80.7%)

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?)**

   Students are doing well. Faculty are encouraged to continue developing student skills in effective ways. Continued work is needed on the assessment tool and on administration of the instrument. A unified rubric is being devised and a draft has been approved as meeting the standards established in for COMM 1000.

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

2.7/4 - What are the findings? Information was provided, but what is inferred from this information about the level of student understanding? How are the findings going to be used to improve the course in the future?
ASSESSMENT OF TECHNICAL COMMUNICATION AND LITERACY TRACK
Spring 2012
Prepared by R. Sabino, October 1, 2012

Department Learning Outcome: Students in the ENGL 4810, the Technical Communication and Literacy capstone, will demonstrate effective written communication skills in the form of a substantial portfolio of work, in which they
1. write effective prose;
2. demonstrate mastery of effective editing principles using traditional and computer-based techniques;
3. discuss theories relevant to professional and public writing;
4. discuss the application of those theories in portfolio documents;
5. analyze and address a particular audience.

Assessment Methodology: A check sheet assessing the learning outcomes was developed by the Technical Communication and Literacy faculty. During the capstone course, 14 students developed portfolios of creative work. The portfolios were assessed by five faculty members of the Undergraduate Studies Committee. Two committee members evaluated each paper with yes/no responses to the five questions above. If the raters disagreed on a question, a third rater judged the portfolio.

Assessment Results: Initial inter-rater reliability was 80 percent. Students performed at the following levels by item:

1. Of the 14 (11/14) students whose work has been evaluated 78.6 percent demonstrated they are able to write effective prose.
2. Of the 14 (12/14) students whose work has been evaluated 85.7 percent demonstrated mastery of effective editing principles using traditional and computer-based techniques.
3. Of the 14 (11/14) students whose work has been evaluated 78.6 percent discusses theories relevant to professional and public writing.
4. Of the 14 (11/14) students whose work has been evaluated 78.6 percent discusses how s/he has applied theories identified in item 3 to portfolio documents.
5. All (14/14) of the students analyzed and addressed a particular audience.

Conclusion and Recommendations:

Students are doing well with respect to their demonstrating their ability to apply relevant theory. Additional emphasis should be placed on helping students to articulate how their work reflects theories relevant to professional and public writing.

With respect to the evaluation, not all evaluators could open all electronic documents. Material submitted for assessment should be submitted in Word format. Additionally, it may be useful for students, as they discuss how their work reflects relevant theory, to select one or two relevant documents for assessment from the portfolio submitted for grading in the course.

A rater training session is scheduled for January with an eye to enhancing inter-rater reliability.