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

   CAHS 4400 Institutional Design

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

   21 enrolled. 21 students' work evaluated for SLO7 competency

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.)**

   Two course assignments completed by 21 students incorporated oral communication components. The first focuses on a presentation that communicates a project’s parameters and support of design decisions by a literature review. The second calls for a “pitch” for the design proposal’s quality, details, and meeting of project parameters.

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

   Initial plan (re: report submitted June 25, 2012) was to assess oral communication of CAHS 3400 and CAHS 2500 students. This was modified because the INDS faculty believed the assessment on the CAHS 4400 – the capstone course, was the more appropriate course to evaluate.

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

   Using a grading rubric (20 possible points), the mean score for the first presentation was 17.95 (range: 13–20). High scoring students generally demonstrated good integration of key points with visual aids, and low scoring students generally missed one or more key points. Using a grading rubric (30 possible points), the mean score for the second presentation was 26.43 (range: 24–28). High scoring students generally demonstrated good opening and closing, while low scoring students failed to open or close successfully. Between the assignments, a lecture and exercise was given to assist students in identifying and communicating key points for presentation. All students successfully integrated key points with visual aids on this assignment, showing improvement from the first presentation.

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?)**

   In the next offering of this course the same format (attempt – lecture/exercise – attempt) will be used. Further, the assessment of oral communication will be subdivided into two distinct objectives: 1) terminology and language skills and 2) key points and narrative flow. This change is intended to enable the instructor to better assess different aspects of students’ oral communication skills.

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**
3.77/4- A downloadable rubric would have been helpful in understanding the assessment and findings. The methods seem to be appropriate for the measures they intend to evaluate. Plans for improvement seem logical based on the findings.