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

   ENVD 3100 Civic Engagement and Research Methods

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

   28

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 rubric developed for ENVD 3100 was an amalgam of two rubrics proposed CCGEC (“Oral Communication Value Rubric” by AACU, and “persuasive Value Speech”). Professor Justin Miller came up with this new rubric in order to emphasize two activities particular to design students: responsibility for a clear visual communication for each individual student, and engagement of each student in a live “critique” of their projects.

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

   n/a

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

   The rubric worked well for the evaluation of the team-leaders, but was not adequate for every individual student in the group (ENVD 3100 was based on group project proposals that led to ENVD Capstone group projects). Additionally, review was conducted at the end of the semester, and it would have been helpful if there was another intermediate review/data collection point.

   The new rubric will be developed for the class that will be conducted in the spring semester of 2013; this time, the class will be based on individual proposals only. There will also be a new method developed to better evaluate “live critique” of the student’s project.

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?)**

   This report is prepared by a newly appointed interim chair of the program who is presently in the process of evaluating existing course teaching material for the entire ENVD curriculum. ENVD 3100 is already in the process of being restructured (as mentioned – shift from team projects to individual ones, different level of involvement with the civic issues/institutions, etc.). Therefore, new rubric/evaluation methods will be developed to help us assess more accurately the outcomes from this class that is not taught by the same faculty every year (ENVD program does not have permanent faculty, but rather, relies on availability of existing CADC faculty and/or adjuncts).

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

   n/a
8. Committee Comments

22.22%—There is no real data or sense of what is being assessed here.