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

2. Number of Students enrolled per year AND number of those students whose work was assessed for oral communication (SLO 7) competency:
   11 of 11

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.)
   Data from the AU EducateAlabama internship assessment form were used to assess SLO 7. Specific items that relate to this SLO include standards 2.10, 3.2, 3.3, and 4.2. Standard 2 is Teaching and Learning. Number 2.2 deals with maintaining records so that better communication is possible. Standard 3 is Literacy. Number 3.2 deals with effective verbal and non-verbal communications during instruction, and 3.3 deals with the strategies students use during instruction, specifically related to critical literacy components. Standard 4 is Diversity. Number 4.2 deals specifically with the way students communicate to show sensitivity to different populations.

4. If the Assessment methods differ from those initially proposed to the CCGEC, identify the differences and explain the rationale for those changes:
   In 2011-2012, we used additional data from multiple courses. Since then, the college of education has developed and adopted for use the AU EducateAlabama assessment form which aids in assessing many different areas including oral communication. Because all students in the program must complete CTMU 4920 to graduate, using this assessment form will allow for better overall assessment from year to year.

   Attachment File Name: MusicEdSLO7.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?)
   Most students were competent (level 3 of 4) in this area, while some were excellent (4 of 4). Overall, our students are effective oral communicators.

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
   Deficiencies are addressed as students progress through their preparatory coursework, and when internship (CTMU 4920) supervisors and cooperating teachers note deficiencies, they are immediately and personally addressed with students. In future we will work more specifically standard 2.10, which had the lowest mean (3.18) and 3.3, which had a mean of 3.36. The remaining two each had a mean of 3.45. We will continue to hone our own teaching strategies and help develop students' abilities in each of these areas.
8. Additional Comments: (What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?)
   We will continue to use AU EducateAlabama results, and if possible, may add the SLO7 components from the AU Comprehensive Rubric to the internship assessment.

9. Committee Comments