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1. Name(s) and Number(s) of Course being assessed for Oral Communication: (e.g. ENGL 4444; Capstone in Literature)
   ENGL 4800 Seminar in Literature

2. Number of Students enrolled per year AND number of those students whose work was assessed for oral communication (SLO 7) competency:
   42 enrolled and 33 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.)
   The English Department assesses oral competency using the prescribed University rubric. At the end of the fall and spring semester, students in the Department’s three capstone classes presented formal presentations describing the work they had accomplished during the semester. As described in the Department’s assessment plan, each of the remaining students in the class assessed the presenter on the criteria in the rubric. The number of students assessed in each category is given in parentheses. Students were evaluated on a 4-point scale with 3 = Advanced, 2 = Intermediate, 1 = Basic, and 0 = Limited competency in this SLO.

4. If the Assessment methods differ from those initially proposed to the CCGEC, identify the differences and explain the rationale for those changes:
   N/a
   Attachment FileName: slo7f13sp14 raw data.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?)
   In the ability to structure ideas clearly and expressively, using appropriate language free from bias and understand what it means to be an ethical and credible speaker, students in Literature scored a 2.8, indicating Intermediate competence. In the ability to recognize appropriate opportunities for communication and identify the most suitable and effective mediums for message dissemination, students in Literature scored a 2.8, indicating Intermediate competence. In the ability to communicate candidly (in an open and direct manner) and effectively as an individual, in pairs, or in small groups, students in Literature scored a 2.5, indicating Intermediate competence. In the ability to actively listen to oral arguments and recognize when a recipient does not understand a message, adapting it as necessary, students in Literature scored a 2.8, indicating Intermediate competence.

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
   Areas for greatest improvement are the ability of students to communicate in an open and direct manner, Criterion 3, and active listening, Criterion 4. To address these areas of comparative weakness, faculty teaching
upper division classes, particularly those in the Literature track, are encouraged to provide opportunities for students to give formal presentations with opportunities for constructive feedback, especially with respect to criteria 3 and 4. This can be coupled with helping students prepare for participation in research week.

8. **Additional Comments:** (What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?)
   
   None

9. **Committee Comments**