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

THEA 1110 (Introduction to Theatre for Majors II) & THEA 4980 (Senior Capstone)

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

30 in THEA 1110 and 11 in THEA 4980. All students in each class have their work evaluated. All Majors must take both courses.

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.**

SLO 7 will be assessed in THEA 1110 (Introduction to Theatre for Majors II) and in THEA 4980 (Senior Capstone). Every Theatre Majors takes both of these courses.

Competency in the SLO measures is assessed in one oral dramaturgical presentation each student must complete in THEA 1110 and at least 3 subsequent oral presentations they must make as a part of THEA 4980. The theatre department assessment committee has developed a rubric (attached) for assessing students' ability to effectively communicate. The rubric provides for an assessment score of overall ability to effectively communicate as well as scores for components based on the individual measures of the SLO. Additional written comments may also be given for each component. The rubric will be used to assess each student presentation in both courses.

The department assessment committee will collect the rubrics for each class. Average overall and component scores will be calculated to discern students' ability to master the objectives and to see whether improvement is being made throughout the semester and throughout their course work. The written comments from the individual components of the rubric will be summarized. Discussion of the assessment results will take place during the department's annual assessment meeting. Recommendations will be decided as a result of the discussion.

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

We are currently trying to figure out a system to allow multiple people to assess these student presentations in addition to simply just the instructor. As these presentations are generally spread out over the course of the semester, there has been some difficulty in figuring out a way to have multiple sets of eyes on each presentation. We are investigating possibly recording these productions or trying to restructure the syllabi to allow for more centralized presentation days.

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

We are currently in our first year of implementing the plan that was approved last spring so we do not yet have data. Our first data set will be collected from the INTRO II course in Spring of 2013 and then the subsequent Senior Capstone course in the Fall of 2013.
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 is our initial year of implementation

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

1.7/4- This is the first year of their assessment. They're working on a way to allow more members of the department to assess this response rather than just the instructor.