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

   BUSI 2100 – Oral Communication for Business

   Note: This report is submitted under the International Business major. See #7 for information on the additional Business majors covered by this class.

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

   The College of Business began teaching BUSI 2100 in Spring Semester, 2012. A total of 42 students were enrolled in two sections of the class. The assessment data presented below is based on all 39 students who completed the course.

   Because BUSI 2100 is now part of the Business Core, enrollments will increase dramatically in the next assessment cycle. For example, current Fall Semester enrollment is 250 students, and we expect at least that many to be enrolled in Spring Semester. Therefore, the opportunity for assessment in BUSI 2100 will grow significantly in the next assessment cycle.

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.)**

   Oral communication competency in BUSI 2100 was assessed in two ways: 1) an evaluation of student case presentations and 2) an evaluation of student critiques of an oral presentation.

   **Evaluation of student presentations:**

   One assignment in the class required students to deliver a message that contained bad news. The presentations were assessed on the following factors using a five point scale ranging from Unacceptable (1) to Excellent (5):

   1. Used correct approach based on type of message.
   2. Organized content in an effective manner.
   3. Effectively introduced the presentation content.
   4. Included easily understandable main points in the presentation body.
   5. Effectively concluded the presentation.
   6. Conveyed a clear message or purpose.
   7. Expressed clear transition statements.
   8. Maintained rapport and tact with the audience.
   9. Used effective verbal and non-verbal delivery.
   10. Adhered to the specified time limit.

   **Evaluation of student critiques:**

   Another assignment required the students to watch a recorded presentation and to identify and evaluate certain presentation elements. The presentation was a message containing good news. The students identified and assessed the effectiveness of the following elements:
1. Approach taken.
2. Expression of central idea and main points.
3. Expression of purpose.
4. Transitions.
5. Language used.
6. Adaptation to the audience.
7. Verbal and non-verbal delivery.

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

Not Applicable

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

Evaluation of student presentations:

The data on student presentations indicates proficiencies in some areas and weaknesses in others. In general, students performed best in the following areas (as evidenced by at least 80% of students scoring a four or five on the five-point scale):

- Approached the audience correctly
- Organized content in an effective manner
- Effectively introduced and concluded the presentation

They performed worst in the following areas (as evidenced by less than 50% of students scoring a four or five on the five-point scale):

- Adhered to specific time limit
- Maintained rapport and tact with the audience

Of particular concern was adherence to the stated time limit for the presentation. Only 36% of students adhered to the time limit required. This is in contrast to the prior year’s assessment in which adherence to time limits was not a problem.

Evaluation of student critiques:

The assignment totaled 100 points. For the 39 students, the average score was 87%, which indicates overall proficiency in identifying and evaluating the specified presentation elements. However, there were a few areas in which student assessments did not match the presentation. Specifically, 39% of students identified and/or assessed the presentation’s central idea/main points in a manner that was not fully consistent with the quality of the presentation. Moreover, 32% did not appropriately evaluate the language used in the presentation. Finally, 42% of the students did not fully identify the transitions within the presentation.
Overall, the data shows some specific areas for improvement among our students. Most areas (e.g., time limits, central ideas/main points, and transitions) were identified in only one method of assessment. However, both assessments demonstrated potential weaknesses in the general area of using language to establish rapport and tact with the audience.

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?)**

As mentioned earlier, the College of Business taught BUSI 2100 for the first time in Spring Semester, 2012. Based partly on our experiences with class and partly on our original plan for full implementation of the course, the BUSI 2100 course was modified for Fall Semester. The content of the course now focuses on three major areas: Content, Organization, and Delivery. Within the course, students give four individual presentations that build across these three areas. These presentations are as follows:

- Presentation 1 – Given the first week of class to establish a baseline.
- Presentation 2 – Focuses on presentation content.
- Presentation 3 – Focuses on presentation content and organization.
- Presentation 4 – Focuses on presentation content, organization, and delivery.

Our current plan is to use the fourth presentation as our primary means of assessment. This will have several advantages over our current assessments. First, it will allow students to practice multiple presentations before assessment. Second, it will yield a pre-class and post-class form of assessment. (Specifically, the scenario of the fourth presentation will be the same as the first so that student improvement can be measured.) Finally, because the presentations build on one another, it will give students multiple opportunities to interact with the rubrics provided to them.

As this new course is established and repeated semester after semester, the College’s sophistication in measuring oral proficiency will increase significantly. And as a result, our ability to address deficiencies in a systematic manner will also increase.

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**

4/4- The assessment methods fully address the measures that they intend to evaluate. The level of detail in the assessment is conducive to making improvements.