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

   THEA 11110 (Introduction to Theatre for Majors II) & THEA 4980 (Senior Capstone)

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

   20 in THEA 1110 and 15 in THEA 4980. All students in each class will have their work evaluated. All Majors must take both courses.

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.)**

   SLO 7 will be assessed in THEA 1110 (Introduction to Theatre for Majors II) and in THEA 4980 (Senior Capstone). Every Theatre Major takes both these courses. Competency in the SLO measures in assessed in one oral dramaturgical presentation each student must complete in THEA 1110 and at least 3 subsequent oral presentations they must make as a part of THEA 4980. The Theatre Department assessment committee has developed a rubric (attached) for assessing student's ability to communicate effectively that incorporates the University Core's universal SLO 7 Rubric. The rubric provides for an assessment score of overall ability to effectively communicate as well as scores for components based on the individual measures of the SLO. In addition, written comments may also be given for each component. The rubric is used to assess each student presentation in both courses. The department assessment committee collects the rubrics for each class. Average overall component scores are calculated to discern students’ ability to master the objectives and to see whether improvement is being made throughout the semester and throughout their course work. The written comments from the individual components of rubrics are gathered together for review by the committee. These numeric scores are then translated to the UNIVERSITY mandated rubric and a rank of advanced, intermediate, basic, or little/none for each student. Those rankings are then compiled and averaged to come up with the overall ranking for the assessment report.

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

   We remain dedicated to trying to figure out a system to allow for multiple people to assess these student presentations in addition to the instructor but this has remained a difficulty. These presentations are incredibly and necessarily spread out throughout the semester and thus make it hard to have people attend that regularly so as to see/hear them all. So we are looking into ways to revise our system at the same time as more fully implementing the above plan over the course of the next academic year.

   Attachment FileName: CoreCurriculumRubric.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?)**

   We are currently in our third year of implementing this plan that was approved last year and as a result we are
just beginning to collect enough data to confidently assert whether or not our students are meeting the competency of this SLO7. Our data set was from Spring 2014 Intro II and our other data collected from the fall 2013 Capstone course. We have further revised the rubric to reflect the new University rubric standards. Our students are engaged in oral communication as theatre majors from the moment they begin the major. So they are touching on the 4 aspects of this SLO in all their courses work across their various program tracks. While we remain confident in our students abilities to express themselves orally, particularly in the area of "structuring ideas clearly and expressively, using appropriate language free from bias and understanding what it means to be an ethical and credible speaker," there are some areas where we find our students needing some attention. While they certainly have excelled in "communicating candidly (in an open and direct manner) and effectively" and in active listening, we found our students struggled with the second portion of the SLO) in regards to crafting their oral communication for a specific and appropriate audience. While we found students Advanced in #1 and Intermediate in #3 and #4, we found students only basic in #2.

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

As a faculty we will seek to craft clearer guidelines that compel students to consider a specific audience for each of their oral assignments in these two courses. We will clarify language and expectation around how students need to shape content and delivery to appeal to the desired audience. These shifts will also allow for a more in depth conversation in each course regarding the considerations of audience that will connect the oral presentations to the work many of these students already are accomplishing both onstage and backstage. We also seek to develop a clearer mechanism for student feedback relating to this SLO and are considering the implementation of a peer review/self review system.

8. Additional Comments: (What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?)

N/A

9. Committee Comments