1. Name(s) and Number(s) of Course being assessed for Oral Communication: (e.g. ENGL 4444; Capstone in Literature)
   ENGL 4240 Special Project in Creative Writing

2. Number of Students enrolled per year AND number of those students whose work was assessed for oral communication (SLO 7) competency:
   17; all students were assessed for this outcome

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 course for the BA in Creative Writing and Literacy assessed oral competency as a component of course instruction but was not a component of the course grade. For ENGL 4240, students gave a craft talk based on their portfolio of creative work produced for the class. All students assess each student's oral presentation using a checklist that asks for feedback on the following ten items:1. Is the thesis/argument of the presentation clear?2. Was the type of information audience-appropriate?3. Was the amount of information audience-appropriate?4. Was the closing effective?5. Is the speaker prepared for questions?6. Are topics discussed in a logical order?7. Are topics discussed in an interesting order?8. Are transitions between main points effective?9. Does the speaker speak clearly and at a good pace?10. Is the speaker engaging? Individuals were asked to check a box to indicate the degree to which the speaker demonstrated each of the skills. In the Fall, there were three categories: (Superior = 3, Acceptable = 2, and Needs Work = 1). In the Spring, this scale was replaced by the four-point scale. These four degrees (Advanced, Intermediate, Basic, Limited) were given a numeric score from 4 to 1 corresponding to each level of achievement (Advanced = 4, Intermediate = 3, Basic = 2, and Limited = 1). These questions are grouped into four areas: Focus (Question 1), Development (Questions 2, 3, 4, & 5), Organization (Questions 6, 7, & 8), and Style (Questions 9 & 10). Each of the groups are averaged for a score for that area. The four scores were reported on a spreadsheet.

4. If the Assessment methods differ from those initially proposed to the CCGEC, identify the differences and explain the rationale for those changes:
   Apart from assessing the degree to which students achieved the learning outcome, there have been no changes to the method.

   Attachment File Name:   SLO 7 2012-2013.xlsx

5. Based on the comprehensive rubric for the appropriate SLO7, indicate the extent of competency of the average student who has completed this course:
   intermediate

6. Findings: (what add assessment data tell you about student proficiency in this outcome?)
   Faculty members did not evaluate the presentations. Students in Spring 2013 demonstrated the skills better than those in the Fall. • An average of those scores for Focus in Fall 2012 was 2.7 (Basic) which is lower that the Spring 2013 report of 3.6 (Intermediate). • The Fall class reported for Development a score of 2.7 for Focus (Basic) but the Spring class reported 3.1 (Intermediate). • The Fall class reported for Organization a score of 2.8 (Basic) but the Spring class reported 3.6 (Intermediate). • The Fall class reported for Style a score of 2.6 (Basic)
but the Spring class reported 3.7 (Intermediate). A crucial point of difference between these two classes is that the Fall class had 3 students enrolled and the Spring class had 14 students enrolled for a total of 17 students completing the major in 2012-13. I am not certain whether the directions for evaluating the oral communications exercise in the Fall class were clear. Despite those low numbers, the majority of students who completed the course in 2012-2013 did so with an Intermediate level of achievement.

7. 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)

The number of students in these two classes may have something to do with the wide variety of the scores. This is still a relatively new major (begun 2010). In spite of the disparity of scores between Fall and Spring, the Development score is significantly low. The faculty should work on strengthening students' ability making the kind of and amount of information appropriate to the audience, creating effective closings, and preparing speakers for questions. The faculty will also be encouraged to work on consistency in expectations in teaching oral communication.

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

Despite the different sets of numbers reflecting two different scales of evaluation, the majority of students who completed the course in 2012-2013 did so with an Intermediate level of achievement.

9. Committee Comments