2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will..
   SLO 7: Students will demonstrate oral communication skills.

3. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:**
   Area II: Humanities

4. **Assessment Method(s):**
   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with 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. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].
   
   The following assessment data was collected for COMM 1000, Introduction to Public Speaking, and COMM 1003, the online equivalent of the course, for Fall 2012 and Spring 2013. To collect this data, speeches from sections of the course offered during Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 were analyzed based on the SLO 7 guidelines.

5. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**
   see attached

   **Attachment name:** COMM 1000 Assessment for 2012-13 (2).docx

6. **Based on the comprehensive rubric for the appropriate SLO(s), indicate the extent of competency of the average student who has completed this core course in each learning outcome assigned to it:**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Level of Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 7</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 analysis?]
   
   Because this rubric for assessment was not provided until after the majority of our assessment had been done based on how it had been reported for the last two years, we are unclear at this point how we are going to use these new categories to analyze our course. Our assessment committee will meet in the Fall of 2013 to discuss these findings and how or what we may or may not need to do in regard to the categories. At this point I would like to see our data reveal more students in the advanced category; however, I believe it is normal and should be expected to have speeches that fall into all four of the categories.

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:**
The following assessment data was collected for COMM 1000, Introduction to Public Speaking, and COMM 1003, the online equivalent of the course, for Fall 2012 and Spring 2013. To collect this data, speeches from sections of the course offered during Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 were analyzed based on the SLO 7 guidelines.

Fall 2012

34 sections of COMM 1000 and 2 sections of COMM 1003 were offered in Fall 2012. Speeches were analyzed for almost all of those sections. One student per section was randomly selected and a video of their persuasive value speech was assessed:
- The overwhelming majority of speeches fell into the intermediate and basic levels for the category of **structuring ideas clearly and expressively**. One speech was ranked as advanced and none were ranked in the little/none category.
- In most of the speeches, the speakers ranked as basic in terms of **recognizing appropriate opportunities for communication**. Three to four ranked as intermediate. One speech ranked in the advanced category and none were ranked with the little/none designation.
- For the **communicating candidly and effectively**, the majority of speeches ranked in the intermediate category. Two ranked as basic, one speech ranked as advanced and one as little/none.
- While we do not have a chance in our courses to have the recipients respond to the speeches for the last category, students are required to address what they think and audience might have questions/concerns about in relation their topic in the form of what we call counterarguments. For this category all the speeches were ranked as either basic or intermediate. None were ranked as advanced or in the little/none category.

Spring 2013

28 sections of COMM 1000 and 2 sections of COMM 1003 were offered in Spring 2013. Speeches were analyzed for the majority of those sections. One student per section was randomly selected and a video of their persuasive value speech was assessed:
- The overwhelming majority of speeches fell into the advanced, intermediate and basic levels for the category of **structuring ideas clearly and expressively**. Only one speech was ranked in the little/none category.
- In most of the speeches, the speakers ranked basic and intermediate for **recognizing appropriate opportunities for communication**. One speech ranked in the advanced category and none were ranked with the little/none designation.
- For the **communicating candidly and effectively**, again most speeches ranked in the basic and intermediate category. One speech ranked as advanced and one as little/none.
- For the final category, **recognizing when a recipient does not understand a message**, the vast majority of students ranked in the basic and intermediate category. Only one speech was ranked as advanced for this category and none were ranked as little/none.
Overall Comments on Analysis:
Because this rubric for assessment was not provided until after the majority of our assessment had been
done based on how it had been reported for the last two years, we are unclear at this point how we are
going to use these new categories to analyze our course. Our assessment committee will meet in the Fall
of 2013 to discuss these findings and how or what we may or may not need to do in regard to the
categories. At this point I would like to see our data reveal more students in the advanced category;
however, I believe it is normal and should be expected to have speeches that fall into all four of the
categories.