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

BUSI 2100 – Oral Communication for Business

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

During the 2013-14 academic year, 731 students were enrolled in BUSI 2100. A random sample of 94 students (or 13% of the class) was selected for assessment purposes.

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.)

Oral communication competency was assessed in two ways and in accordance with plans described in the prior year report. Assessment Method 1Independent raters viewed student presentations in BUSI 2100 and assessed performance on the following factors using a five point scale ranging from Unacceptable (1) to Excellent (5). These factors map best to the first and third standards described in the Committee’s SLO rubric. Specifically, Content and Organization map to the first standard of structuring ideas clearly and expressively, and Delivery maps to third standard of communicating candidly. Presentation Content1. The message contains a clear central idea. 2. The message is relevant to the audience. 3. The speaker is credible/has authority. 4. The message is supported by clear and concise evidence. 5. The message has a clear purpose. Presentation Organization1. The message begins with an effective introduction. 2. The speaker previews the main points in the introduction. 3. The main points of the message are equally balanced. 4. The speaker uses transitions/signposts correctly. 5. The message ends with an effective closing. Presentation Delivery1. The speaker uses correct volume, speaking rate and vocal inflection. 2. The speaker makes consistent eye contact with the audience. 3. The speaker includes appropriate and clear gestures. 4. The speaker uses correct grammar, word choice, and pronunciation. 5. The speaker avoids using filler words. Assessment Method 2Using the same fifteen factors above, the first and last student presentations were graded by an independent rater using a 45-point grading system. The first presentation was made prior to any instruction in the class, and the last presentation was made after all instruction was completed. The scenario given to the students was the same for both presentations. The independent rater grades were then compared for each student to gauge improvement.

4. If the Assessment methods differ from those initially proposed to the CCGEC, identify the differences and explain the rationale for those changes:

NA

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?)

Data From Assessment Method 1 Overall, the average rating across all 94 sample students and all fifteen rubric
categories was 4.17 out of 5.00, indicating a general assessment of “good.” However, the data does indicate greater and lesser proficiencies in specific areas. With respect to Content, Organization, and Delivery, the data shows that students were most proficient at both Content and Delivery (average ratings of 4.31 and 4.26, respectively) and least proficient at Organization (average rating of 3.81). When broken down further into specific rubric categories, the data show that students performed best in the following four areas. Rubric CategoryAverage RatingRatings of “adequate” or betterEstablished a clear central idea4.89100%Contained an effective closing4.81100%Established a clear purpose4.6498%Contained appropriate and clear gestures4.49100%Two of the areas (central idea and clear purpose) were strengths from the prior year. One of the areas – making appropriate and clear gestures – was actually one of the weaker areas of student performance in the prior year, so improvement from year to year is occurring. In contrast to the areas of strength, the data show student performance below a “good” rating in the following three areas. Rubric CategoryAverage RatingRatings of “needs improvement” or “unacceptable”Previewed main points in introduction1.9976%Contained clear and concise evidence3.8113%Made consistent eye contact3.89%Of particular concern is the practice of previewing the main points in the introduction. The average rating was a “needs improvement,” with three-quarters of students performing less than “adequate.” Data From Assessment Method 2The following table contains the average student scores for the first and last presentations as graded by an independent rater. Overall averages (out of 45) as well as averages for Content, Organization, and Delivery (each out of 15) are presented. AreaFirstLastDifferenceContentMean13.0414.341.30Std Dev1.891.04OrganizationMean11.0213.792.77Std Dev1.971.49DeliveryMean12.9013.740.85Std Dev1.210.85OverallMean36.9641.874.91Std Dev3.892.37Overall student performance improved on average by 4.91 points, which roughly equals a 10% improvement. Variance across students improved as well, both overall and in each area. Over half of that improvement was due to gains in Organization, with lesser but still positive improvements in Content and Delivery.

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?)

The analysis showed two main things. First, compared to the prior year, student performance in Delivery improved. This is partially a product of covering the Delivery content earlier in the course to allow students to put the concepts into practice more often. As a result, we will leave the Delivery material where it is in the course. Second, the analysis showed that students are improving during the course but still have some areas of weakness. Because the weakness in performance was somewhat localized (i.e., previewing the main points), we will emphasize that content going forward. We do not plan on making substantive changes to the course unless we see the same issue arise next year.

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