**General Education Oral Communication Outcome:** **FORM A: faculty report**

LSSU graduates will be able to communicate competently in a variety of contexts.

This assessment maps to LSSU’s Institutional Learning Outcomes by addressing ILO 1: Formal Communication.

**Target Outcome:**90% of students will achieve or exceed Level 1 competency.

**Bloom’s Taxonomy Level for Assessment:** *Explain/Analyze/Create*

**EXPECTED**

**OUTCOME:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2 - Meets** | **1 – Partially Meets** | **0** – **Does Not Meet** |
| 1. **Communication Competence**
 | The receiver(s) easily understand the information because the student used perception, research, verbal, and nonverbal strategies effectively. | The receiver(s) understand the information because the student used perception, research, verbal, or nonverbal strategies somewhat effectively. | The receiver(s) did not understand the information because the student did not use perception, research, verbal, or nonverbal strategies effectively. |
| 1. **Contextual Analysis**
 | When presented with five different contexts for communication, the student correctly analyzes at least four correctly. | When presented with five different contexts for communication, the student correctly analyzes two or three correctly. | When presented with five different contexts for communication, the student correctly analyzes no more than one correctly. |

**Assessment Results**

**Course: Semester:**

**Number of Course Sections: Instructor:**

**Total number of students not completing the assessment**:

**Assessment Method** (*i.e., exam questions, presentation, research paper, etc*.): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Indicate the number of students who met or exceeded the expected outcome on each of the criteria:**

(*Note:* Recording data for those who scored below the expected outcome may also be useful for assessment).

**EXPECTED**

**OUTCOME:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| 1. **Communication Competence**
 |  |  |  |
| 1. **Contextual Analysis**
 |  |  |  |

**Summarize the students’ strengths related to the outcome as evidenced in their work.**

**Summarize the students’ weaknesses related to the outcome as evidenced in their work.**

**Summarize the strengths and weaknesses of how your assessment method measured this General Education outcome.**

(*Examples of Oral Communication Outcome assessment reporting follow*)

**Oral Communication Examples**

*ORAL COMM. OUTCOME:* LSSU graduates will be able to communicate competently in a variety of contexts.

**Summarize the students’ strengths related to the outcome as evidenced in their work.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessment Method** | **Example Summary** |
| 3 Video Presentations: informative, persuasive, and descriptive | Students demonstrated communication competency in three different 5-7 minute video presentations that required: a clear overview of the topic; clear delivery of 3-5 informative points on the topic; a clear summary/conclusion. Most students achieved mid-range competency scores or above for all three presentations.  |
| Speeches: proposal, PSA, descriptive, persuasive | Students presented four speeches in different contexts that demonstrated their ability to communicate clearly, effectively, and succinctly. 95% of the students performed at “competent” or “highly competent” levels for the assessment of this learning outcome.  |
| Individual and Group Presentations | Individual presentations measured students’ ability to communicate competently in a variety of contexts. The group presentation measured students’ ability to communicate competently in a teamwork setting. All students achieved “competency” for this outcome.  |

**Summarize the students’ weaknesses related to the outcome as evidenced in their work.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessment Method** | **Example Summary** |
| 3 Video Presentations: informative, persuasive, and descriptive | While most students were able to demonstrate communication competency for all three types of presentations, it was clear that some used editing tools to smooth out the presentations. It is therefore unclear if they would be able to communicate as effectively in a real-time setting.  |
| Speeches: proposal, PSA, descriptive, persuasive | Since this is a higher-level communication course, it was expected that students would communicate at the “competent” or “highly competent” levels. However, only 12% of the students earned a “highly competent” score, and the rubric and expectations should be adjusted to move more students into that range of performance.  |
| Individual and Group Presentations | GenEd assessment in this oral communication course identified a weakness in group presentations and teamwork. Some students did not do their fair share of the work. More focus will be aimed at increasing students’ understanding of how teamwork will benefit them in preparing for working after graduation in the real world. |

**Summarize the strengths and weaknesses of how your assessment method measured this General Education outcome.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessment Method** | **Example Summary** |
| 3 Video Presentations: informative, persuasive, and descriptive | Three types of presentations provided enough range to assess students’ ability to “communicate competently in a variety of contexts.” A more detailed scoring rubric is needed to clearly define what is perceived as “competence” in each of the three contexts. A one-size-fits-all rubric did not work well.  |
| Speeches: proposal, PSA, descriptive, persuasive | All four assignments and their rubrics effectively measured communication competency in a variety of contexts. Although the rubric for the Public Service Announcement was strong, students need more guidance on the actual purposes and goals for a PSA.  |
| Individual and Group Presentations | The rubric for the individual presentations was clear and easy for students to use, which helped them meet all the expectations for “communication competency” in each category. The rubric for the group presentation needs more clarification and a criterion to appropriately score students on the level of individual contribution to the group project. |