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

BUSI 2100 – Oral Communication for Business

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

During the 2012-13 academic year, 499 students were enrolled in BUSI 2100. A random sample of 40 students (or 8% of the class) was selected for assessment purposes.

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.)

Oral communication competency was assessed in two ways and in accordance with plans described in the prior year report. Assessment Method 1Independent raters viewed the fourth/final recorded student presentation in BUSI 2100 and assessed performance on the following factors using a five point scale ranging from Unacceptable (1) to Excellent (5). These factors map best to the first and third standards described in the Committee’s SLO rubric. Specifically, Content and Organization map to the first standard of structuring ideas clearly and expressively, and Delivery maps to third standard of communicating candidly. Presentation Content1. The message contains a clear central idea. 2. The message is relevant to the audience. 3. The speaker is credible/has authority. 4. The message is supported by clear and concise evidence. 5. The message has a clear purpose. Presentation Organization1. The message begins with an effective introduction. 2. The speaker previews the main points in the introduction. 3. The main points of the message are equally balanced. 4. The speaker uses transitions/sign posts correctly. 5. The message ends with an effective closing. Presentation Delivery1. The speaker uses correct volume, speaking rate and vocal inflection. 2. The speaker makes consistent eye contact with the audience. 3. The speaker includes appropriate and clear gestures. 4. The speaker uses correct grammar, word choice, and pronunciation. 5. The speaker avoids using filler words. Assessment Method 2 Using the same fifteen factors above, the first and fourth student presentations were graded by an independent rater using a 60-point grading system employed in the class. The first presentation was made prior to any instruction in the class, and the fourth presentation was made after all instruction was completed. The scenario given to the students was the same for both presentations. The independent rater grades were then compared for each student to gauge improvement.

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

Not Applicable
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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 From Assessment Method 1 Overall, the average rating across all forty sample students and all fifteen
rubric categories was 3.82 out of 5.00, indicating a general assessment approaching “good.” As in the prior year, however, the data indicates greater and lesser proficiencies in specific areas. With respect to Content, Organization, and Delivery, the data indicate that students were best at Content (average rating of 4.02) and worst at Delivery (average rating of 3.63). When broken down further into specific rubric categories, the data show that students performed best in the following three areas. Each area relates to the Content of a presentation.

- Rubric Category: Average Rating
  - “adequate” or “good” in the area
  - “acceptable” in the area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
<th>% Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better relevance to the audience</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions/sign posts correctly</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflfection</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the data demonstrate current opportunities for improvement in Delivery, the data also show improvement in a deficiency from prior assessments. In the prior year, only 36% of students adhered to the time limit required. In the current assessment period, 100% of students were rated as “adequate” or better in staying within the prescribed time limit.

Data From Assessment Method 2: The following table contains the average student scores for the first and fourth presentations as graded by an independent rater. Overall averages (out of 60) as well as averages for Content, Organization, and Delivery (each out of 20) are presented. First Fourth Difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean 17.019</th>
<th>Mean 17.019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dev2.50.7</td>
<td>15.419.44</td>
<td>15.917.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev2.02.2</td>
<td>15.356.27</td>
<td>15.92.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student performance improved significantly overall (p<.001) as well as in each of the three areas (p<.001 for Content and Organization and p<.05 for Delivery). In addition, variances improved as well. Levene’s test of variance showed a significant (p<.001) drop in overall score variation between the first and fourth presentations. While these second assessment results are consistent with students improving during the course, Delivery scores were lowest, showed the least improvement, and had an increase in variation from the first to the fourth presentation. As a result, in this second assessment as in the first assessment, Delivery appears to be the weakest of the three areas.

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?

The analysis demonstrates that students were weakest in the Delivery aspects of oral communication. Although the average rating for all delivery components was in excess of “adequate,” three of the four worst areas were delivery-related. Further, student improvement was lowest in delivery-related areas. One potential reason for this concentration in delivery is that delivery-related instruction comes last in the course after the third presentation has been given. Therefore, students only have one presentation to implement the concepts supporting good delivery. The faculty have discussed the possibility of moving the instructional content forward in the course to give students more time to assimilate the concepts into their presentations. However, it was decided to informally emphasize delivery earlier in the course by noting instances of poor delivery when covering content and organization. If the student weakness persists, then moving the content may be explored further.
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