1. Name(s) and Number(s) of Course being assessed for Oral Communication: (e.g. ENGL 4444; Capstone in Literature)
   Econ 4600 (Econometrics)

2. Number of Students enrolled per year AND number of those students whose work was assessed for oral communication (SLO 7) competency:
   49 enrollment and 37 presentations evaluated

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.)
   ECON 4600 is our capstone class, required of all economics majors. This class is extremely demanding, and it is not unusual for some students to repeat the class. The course requires all students to conduct an individual, extended econometric analysis. This semester-long project results in a research paper and a 15 to 20 minute oral presentation of the project. Two faculty members (in addition to other students and the course instructor) attend the presentation and grade the student’s performance using a 13 question evaluation form. Each question is evaluated on a five point scale. (The evaluation form is in an attached file.) Various sub-groups of questions relate to the four sub-categories of SLO7 and our overall evaluation is determined by the average across all questions using the following scale: 4 to 5 = Advanced 3 to 4 = Intermediate 2 to 3 = Basic 1 to 2 = Little/None

4. If the Assessment methods differ from those initially proposed to the CCGEC, identify the differences and explain the rationale for those changes:
   .
   Attachment File Name: OralComForm_Econ.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:
   advanced ability

6. Findings: (what add assessment data tell you about student proficiency in this outcome?)
   The assessment data from presentations is attached in an excel file. We calculated the averages for each evaluation question as well as an overall average for the comprehensive assessment. Since the overall average was just a hair over 4, we mapped that into the Advanced Category (although just barely). The weakest performance area related to the students using adequate evidence and reasoning in support of their main points. This gets to the clear structuring of ideas and being a credible speaker (in terms of the SLO7 rubric).

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
   Last year we felt that we weren’t making a very direct assessment of the issue of “active listening” so we added an additional question to the evaluation form (Q #13). Moreover, the two faculty reviewers asked multiple questions to each student presenter to see how carefully they listened and responded to the questions. We were
generally pleased with the performance outcome in this regard. This upcoming year we are going to try and get the students to explicitly outline their main points and supporting evidence during the revision stage of their project (prior to the presentation) in an attempt to increase the average performance level on Q#3.

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