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

   ECON 4600; Econometrics

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

   We assessed 60 students. There were 70 enrolled in the class for Fall 2012, and Spring 2013

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.)**

   ECON 4600 is our capstone class, required of all majors. This class is extremely demanding, and it is not unusual for multiple students to fail despite their senior status. The course requires all students to conduct an individual, extended econometric analysis. This semester-long project results in a research article, and the oral presentation of this article forms the basis for our assessment of student oral communications skills as envisioned by SLO7. Each student makes a 15 minute presentation to a panel of faculty and other interested observers. (The presentations are open to all.) The faculty panel grades the students' performances using a 12 component rubric developed and refined for this purpose by a faculty committee in economics. The rubric is presented below:

   **Economics Oral Communication Skills Evaluation Form**
   **Course Number:** Econ 4600
   **Date:** Spring 2013
   **Evaluator:** Student Name:
   **Directions:** Rate the student's oral presentation on each of the following criteria using the following rating scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   1. _____ The introduction provided a preview of the presentation.
   2. _____ Main points were clearly stated.
   3. _____ Main points were supported by adequate evidence and reasoning.
   4. _____ Main points were organized in a logical manner.
   5. _____ Varied rate pitch and volume of speech appropriately.
   6. _____ Articulated all words clearly.
   7. _____ Dressed appropriately for presentation.
   8. _____ Maintained eye contact with audience.
   9. _____ Visual aids were well prepared to communicate relevant information.
   10. _____ Presentation concluded definitively.
   11. _____ Presentation adhered to specified time limits.
   12. _____ Demonstrated effective economics presentation software skills.

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

   N/A

   **Attachment File Name:** SLO7_Fall12.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?)**

   Data Analysis: In accordance with the description of the new rubric, we analyzed the performances of our students by grouping certain sets of questions around the specific descriptions of skills associated with SLO 7.
There are four such groupings: (1) Structure of ideas is clear; (2) Suitable and effective means of communication; (3) candid and open communication; and (4) active listening and audience engagement. (These are paraphrased.) Our rubric is designed to evaluate these skills. Specifically, we look to results for questions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 10 for group 1, questions 9, 11, and 12 for group 2; questions 5, 6, 7, and 8 for group 3; group 4 is assessed using all the questions and the students’ ability to answer questions posed by the evaluation committee. In our evaluation we paid special attention to the numbers of students scoring below 3, which is our standard for intermediate performance. These numbers are: Q1 6; Q2 5; Q3 16; Q4 6; Q5 7; Q6 3; Q7 0; Q8 2; Q9 4; Q10 9; Q11 1; Q12 8. Recalling that we had evaluations of 60 undergraduate majors, we observe at least intermediate level performances from the majority for all questions. Our worst performances were on Q3 and Q10. Both refer to the rubric requirement that students, “structure ideas clearly and expressively, using appropriate language free from bias and understand what it means to be an ethical and credible speaker.” No students used biased language, nor did any student act manipulatively nor unethically. However, a number were weak in their ability to structure their ideas in their presentations. This concerns us and will be a focus of attention. However, as stated the majority of students performed at the intermediate level or above. In an unrelated note, last year we were slightly dismayed at the very poor attire many students wore during their presentations. Since we viewed the presentations as of an academic and professional nature, this failing was noted and we resolved to give clearer instructions this time around. Evidently this was successful: all students who made presentations were appropriately dressed for an event of this sort.

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)

We remain concerned about the poor organization of ideas evident in some students' presentations. We intend to address this by requiring outlines in advance, so that students will be forced to select an order prior to their talks.

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