1. Name(s) and Number(s) of Course being assessed for Oral Communication: (e.g. ENGL 4444; Capstone in Literature)
   CTSE 4920

2. Number of Students enrolled per year AND number of those students whose work was assessed for oral communication (SLO 7) competency:
   26 of 26

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.)

   We used measures of Oral and Written Communications on the EDUCATEAlabama assessment instrument. EDUCATEAlabama is used by the College of Education to evaluate teaching proficiency during the full semester school internship (CTSE 4920). The measure is used by the state of Alabama to assess practicing teachers. In Fall 2012, Oral and Written Communication received a single cumulative score. In Spring 2013, the scale was broken out into sub-elements and we used 3 of the EDUCATEAlabama subscales to assess oral communication: Standard 3.2, 3.3, and 4.2 (scale descriptions on attached data report).

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

   In 2011-12, we used 4 of the 8 Initial Teacher Certification Scales of the Professional Educator Performance Evaluation (PEPE) Observation Instrument to measure oral communication. The Professional Educator Performance Evaluation (PEPE) Observation Instrument was used by the college and the state to evaluate teaching proficiency. The EDUCATEAlabama assessment instrument replaced PEPE in 2012-13.

   Attachment File Name: AU EDUCATEAlabama Oral Comm report 12-13.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?)

   Student mean ratings on the EDUCATEAlabama scales scored above the “Competency” standard (3 on a scale of 4). Means for both Fall and Spring semesters were 3.27 with no students scoring below a "3".

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

   Faculty will focus on improvements in the lowest scoring scale: Standard 3.2 Fosters and responds to effective verbal and nonverbal communications during instruction. In instructional methods courses leading to internship as well as in internship teaching observations done prior to the EDUCATEAlabama assessment, we will increase modeling of these skills and devote special emphasis to them in student feedback on lessons presented to peers and to secondary school students.
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8. Additional Comments: (What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?)
   
   In 2013-14, we will use the AU Comprehensive Rubric for SOL7 to report assessment results.

9. Committee Comments