1. Name(s) and Number(s) of Course being assessed for Oral Communication: (e.g. ENGL 4444; Capstone in Literature)
ENGL 4800 Seminar in Literature

2. Number of Students enrolled per year AND number of those students whose work was assessed for oral communication (SLO 7) competency:
36; 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 courses for the three BA programs assessed oral competency as a component of course instruction but these oral competencies were not a component of the course grade. For ENGL 4800, students gave a short presentation on the state of their research for their final term paper project. The students in Literature were assessed singly. All students and the faculty member assessed each student's oral presentation using a checklist that asked 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. The 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 the change in the degree to which the student achieved the outcome, there have been no changes.

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?)
Students in the spring demonstrated slightly the skills better than those in the fall. In the fall, there was inconsistent reporting of a score for Focus. An average of those REPORTED scores for Focus in Fall 2012 was 2.9 (borderline Intermediate) which very close to those scores reported for the two sections of the course in Spring 2013. Section one reported 3.4 (Intermediate) and section two reported 2.8 (Basic). The Fall class reported for Development a score of 2.8 (Basic) which very close to those scores reported for the two sections of the course in Spring 2013. Section one reported 3.3 (Intermediate) and section two reported 3.0
(Intermediate).•The Fall class reported for Organization a score of 2.9 (borderline Intermediate) which very close to those scores reported for the two sections of the course in Spring 2013. Section one reported 3.3 (Intermediate) and section two reported 3.4 (Intermediate).•The Fall class reported for Style a score of 2.8 (Basic) which very close to those scores reported for the two sections of the course in Spring 2013. Section one reported 3.4 (Intermediate) and section two reported 3.6 (Intermediate). This data reflects a larger number of students than do the other two capstones. However, the second section of the course for Spring 2013 reported only the faculty member’s rankings and not how the students’ evaluated their peers. Therefore, the data from that particular class is problematic for assessment because the methodology was not consistent with the other two capstone courses in Literature in 2012-13. Twelve students completed the capstone course in the Fall and 24 students completed the capstone courses in the Spring for a total of 36 students completing the capstone course in Literature during 2012-13. A majority of these students completed the course at 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

Despite the fact that one of the capstone courses reported only the findings of the faculty member teaching the course and not the students, the data do show that there is closer agreement in the scores among the classes. The faculty members will be encouraged to follow a consistent methodology.

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