1. Name(s) and Number(s) of Course being assessed for Oral Communication: (e.g. ENGL 4444; Capstone in Literature)
   ARCH 2020 Studio II

2. Number of Students enrolled per year AND number of those students whose work was assessed for oral communication (SLO 7) competency:
   60 students / 40 assessed

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.)
   Assessment of this SLO is conducted via review of student oral presentations, which occur at least three times throughout the semester. These presentations are 15-30 minute presentations and discussions of the student’s design proposal and occur at the middle and end of the project. Students are expected to support their design proposal with persuasive rhetoric and visual aids (scaled drawings, diagrams, and physical models). The presentation (5 minutes) is made to a group of faculty and visiting architects and their peers. The remaining time of the presentation is devoted to discussion, during which students must respond to live critique. It is during the second year studio sequence (ARCH 2010 and ARCH 2020) that faculty teaches students how to make an effective verbal and visual presentation. This year the final presentation was assessed, by one of the year level faculty members. Last year the rubric was revised to allow for a more effective evaluation of each student’s oral communication skills. The rubric is attached. 100% of the students were evaluated during the oral presentations of their final studio 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 assessment rubric was modified from the previous years to more accurately assess the nature of oral presentation type used in Architecture Studio presentations.

   Attachment FileName:   ARCH 2020 SLO7 Rubric.pdf

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?)
   The students made effective use of supporting material when presenting. On a whole, the students’ ability to articulate a clear position and end their presentation with a compelling conclusion is weak.

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
   Based upon last year’s outcomes, our response has been to: 1. Make students more aware of the evaluation criteria for oral communication earlier in the semester. 2. Work on the form and content of oral presentations with students in a more focused manner. 3. Try to make them increasingly aware of the types of physical
distractions they create unintentionally. 4. Adjust the rubric and method of assessment to reflect some of the unique aspects of a design project presentation that is open-ended, responsive and qualifies the nature of the visual material. Two areas where students exhibited strength in oral presentation were in the Introduction and in the development of Supporting Materials and Visual Aides. These aides are a central component of the course and we intend to reinforce these techniques.

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

   Please refer to last year’s report for a description of the relevance of this SLO to the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) accreditation criteria for professional Architecture programs.

9. **Committee Comments**