1. **Name(s) and Number(s) of Course being assessed for Oral Communication:** (e.g. ENGL 4444; Capstone in Literature)
   
   CADS 5750 Apparel Line Development

2. **Number of Students enrolled per year AND number of those students whose work was assessed for oral communication (SLO 7) competency:**
   
   CADS 5750--20; 16 students' work assessed

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.)
   
   Evaluation of scores earned by senior students for three group presentations for CAHS 5750, Apparel Line Development

4. **If the Assessment methods differ from those initially proposed to the CCGEC, identify the differences and explain the rationale for those changes:**
   
   Four groups with four students in each presented three successive stages of their term long collaborative project. Each student in each group was required to present at least one part of the overall presentation. The first two presentations ran approximately 10 minutes each with the final presentation taking an average of 25 minutes. A rubric was used to score each team’s presentation using seven criteria: content, organization, visual aids, English (correct use of words), elocution (speaking clearly and smoothly, avoiding ums and ahs), eye contact, and teamwork (displaying planned teaming rather than simply taking turns without planning a transition). This rubric was an adaptation of the “Oral Communication VALUE Rubric” given out at a university wide meeting on oral communication skills. For 2011-12 assessment, a note for improvement was to have departmental faculty other than the instructor assess the first presentation in order to broaden awareness of the extent to which seniors nearing graduation can perform in oral presentations. A 7-point scale was used, and scores were averaged for the assessment for three faculty members, one being the instructor. A 12.5 point scale was used for the final presentation. The same rubric was used all three times with only the values changed (50 pts to 100 pts). For the final presentation, the results of which are presented here, the adapted version used was converted to fit most closely to the SLO7 Rubric for the university which was scored 1-4 (little/none to advanced skills) with Content and Organization (A: Structuring of Ideas and Use of appropriate language), Visual Aids (B: Mediums), English, Elocution, and Eye Contact (C: Oral), and TeamWork (D: Listen and recognize misunderstanding and adapt to increase understanding). Each student in each team was evaluated separately by two faculty.

   Attachment File Name:

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?)**
   
   Scores for the four criteria for the final presentation ranged from 1-4. For Skill A, the scores ranged from 2-4 with an average of 3.525. For Skill B, all scored a 4. Skill C had a low score of 1.5 and high score of 4 with an average of 2.875. Skill C had a low score of 1 with the majority having scores of 4. The average was 3.2. Thus, overall
students did best at use of Visual Aids (Skill B) and nearly as well at Content and Organization (Skill A). Their ability to react to others and adapt was least well developed (Skill D). The basics of good oral delivery (Skill C) were relatively good with an average just above 3 out of 4. For the final presentation, two of the groups encountered issues that were unrelated to the presentations but seemed to have an effect on their individual scores.

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?

Because the program has come to the conclusion that the University’s SLO7 rubric does not conform well to the objectives and types of technical oral presentations needed in our courses, a curriculum proposal is being submitted to add a requirement for COMM 1000, now that the Communications program can handle more students. Until that is implemented, the instructor will use the Auburn University approved rubric for all oral presentations. Each of the skills will be discussed at length in class prior to each presentation. Also, for each of the three presentations, additional faculty members will be asked to assess. For consistency, the same faculty members will be used for all three time points.

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