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

   CAHS 5750 Apparel Line Development--Required Capstone course for Product Design & Production Management

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

   There were 11 students in CAHS 5750 for spring 2013; this course is only taught one time per year.

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.)

   Students' presentations of their long term collaborative project were evaluated three times throughout the term using the attached rubric, developed based on the "Oral Communication VALUE Rubric" given out at a university wide meeting on assessing oral communication skills. The first 2 presentations were approximately 10 minutes long and were evaluated by the instructor; the final presentation was 25 minutes long and was also evaluated by an additional departmental faculty member in the apparel design area. Seven criteria : content, organization, visual aids, English, elocution, eye contact, and teamwork were assessed for each presentation by each faculty member, using a 7 point scale. Though the student projects were group projects, each student made individual oral presentations regarding the project.

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

   The addition of another departmental faculty member to assess the final presentation was added in 2013 based on the recommendations from the 2011-12 assessment reports.

   Attachment FileName: 5750 presentation rubric-sp 2013.doc

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?)

   Scores for the 7 criteria ranged from 3 (needs work) to 7 (professional) for the first two presentations, with the lowest scores for eye contact and visual aids on the first presentations. Students scored perfect 7's on English both times and also scored a 7 on visual aids the second presentation (vs. 6.6 the first time). For both of the first 2 presentations, the students scored between 6.2-7.0 on content, organization, visual aids, English & teamwork. For the final presentation, two groups encountered issues unrelated to the presentations, but which seemed to decrease their individual scores. The other group increased its overall score from 6.02 to 6.83.

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)

   Next year the instructor will use the Auburn University approved rubric for oral presentations. A discussion of eye contact, elocution, and inter-personal skills will be discussed at length in the class prior to the presentations.
by the students. One or more additional faculty members will be asked to assess the students' oral communication skills for each of three presentations.

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

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

   CADS 5850 Apparel Merchandising and Retail Management (two sections of the Apparel Merchandising capstone)

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

   33 students enrolled/yr; 23 in fall 2012 and 11 in spring 2013. All 23 students enrolled in fall 2012 CADS 5850 were assessed for their oral communication 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.

   Students were assigned to groups of 2 -3 students for their final oral and written presentation on the Six Month Buying Plan for a particular product category. Each of the students shared in the responsibility of the oral presentation, but the grade for the oral presentation was a group grade.

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

   A group assessment grade was given for the oral communication since that was the way the final project assignment had been made. The rubric used included:
   1. Structuring of ideas--5 pts. possible based on criteria: well organized, logical, complete, accurate, used correct terminology, ideas supported; 2. Effective Communication--10 pts. possible based on criteria: spoke clearly/articulate, good eye contact, enthusiastic, good visuals for compelling presentation; 3. Communication Opportunities/Appropriate Appearance and Demeanor--15 points based on criteria: professional dress & appearance, posture, confidence.

   Attachment FileName: forsythe-cahs 5850oral communication assessment-2012.docx

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 this capstone class scored better on the Effective Communication criteria, with the clear and articulate speech, effective visuals, and good eye contact. They were least effective in the Communication Opportunities/Appropriate Appearance and Demeanor where their presentation of themselves and their confidence in their message were scored at a lower level. That is, it seemed that the mechanics of the oral communication were more effectively achieved than the delivery of the message.

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

   Future assessment of oral communication competency in CADS 5850 will utilize the Auburn University approved rubric for oral presentations for the AMDP program. Individual, rather than group, data will be gathered.
8. Additional Comments: (What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?)

CAHS 4920 AMDP Merchandising Internship--Required professional internship. CAHS 4920 was used as a basis for indirect assessment of oral communication skills in 2011-12 and again in 2012-13. CAHS 4920 AMDP Merchandising Internship requires end-of-term evaluation of intern performance by the on-site supervisor. This comprehensive intern evaluation includes a question about the student's oral communication competency, ranked on a 5 point scale from 5=Excellent to 1=Poor. There were 35 Apparel Merchandising interns Summer 2013. A sample of 27 of these students (for whom the evaluations were available) was used to assess the oral communication competency of the interns. The following oral communication scores were assigned for these interns as follows: Excellent=19; Very Good=6; Good=2.

9. Committee Comments