SLO7 Oral Communications Report 2013_14

College: College of Education
Department: General Social Science Education
Representative: John Saye

1. Name(s) and Number(s) of Course being assessed for Oral Communication: (e.g. ENGL 4444; Capstone in Literature)
   CTSE 4920/3

2. Number of Students enrolled per year AND number of those students whose work was assessed for oral communication (SLO 7) competency:
   21 of 21

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.)
   We used measures of Oral and Written Communications on the EDUCATEAlabama assessment instrument. EDUCATEAlabama is used by the College of Education to evaluate teaching proficiency during the full semester school internship (CTSE 4920). The measure is used by the state of Alabama to assess practicing teachers. The scale is broken out into sub-elements and we used 3 of the EDUCATEAlabama subscales to assess oral communication: Standard 3.2, 3.3, and 4.2 (scale descriptions on attached data report).

4. If the Assessment methods differ from those initially proposed to the CCGEC, identify the differences and explain the rationale for those changes:
   Same methods used in 2012-13

   Attachment FileName:  AU EDUCATEAlabama Oral Comm report 13-14.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:
   Intermediate

6. Findings: (what add assessment data tell you about student proficiency in this outcome?)
   Student mean ratings on the EDUCATE ALABAMA scales scored above the “Competency” standard (3 on a scale of 4). The aggregate mean score for Fall 2013 -Spring 2014 was 3.4. This was an improvement from the previous Spring 2013 mean score (the only semester when a comparable scale was used) of 3.27.

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
   Faculty will focus on improvements in the lowest scoring scale: Standard 3.3  Uses age-appropriate instructional strategies to improve learners’ skills in critical literacy components. In instructional methods courses leading to internship as well as in internship teaching observations done prior to the EDUCATEAlabama assessment, we will increase modeling of these skills by engaging students in analysis of videocases of expert teachers demonstrating these skills and devote special emphasis to them in student feedback on lessons presented to peers and to secondary school students

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