2017 - 2018
Annual Program Assessment Report

The Office of Academic Program Assessment
California State University, Sacramento

For more information visit our **website**
or **contact us** for more help.

Please begin by selecting your program name in the drop down.
If the program name is not listed, please enter it below:

BA Communications

OR enter program name:

Section 1: Report All of the Program Learning Outcomes Assessed

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1.
Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs), and emboldened Graduate Learning Goals (GLGs) **did you assess?** [**Check all that apply**]

- ☐ 1. **Critical Thinking**
- ☐ 2. **Information Literacy**
- ☐ 3. **Written Communication**
- ☑ 4. **Oral Communication**
- ☐ 5. Quantitative Literacy
- ☐ 6. **Inquiry and Analysis**
- ☐ 7. Creative Thinking
- ☐ 8. Reading
- ☐ 9. Team Work
- ☐ 10. Problem Solving
- ☐ 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- ☐ 12. **Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives**
- ☐ 13. Ethical Reasoning
- ☐ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- ☐ 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**
- ☐ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- ☐ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- ☐ 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**
- ☐ 19. **Professionalism**
- ☐ 20A. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

- ☐ 20B. **Check here if your program has not collected any data for any PLOs**. Please go directly to Q6 (skip Q1.2 to Q5.3.1.)

Q1.2.
Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information including how your specific PLOs are **explicitly** linked to the Sac State **BLGs**/**GLGs**:

The Oral Communication Skills program learning outcome aligns with the University's Baccalaureate learning goal Intellectual and Practical Skills, including Oral Communication.

Q1.2.1.
Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?
- ◉ 1. Yes, for all PLOs
- ○ 2. Yes, but for some PLOs
- ○ 3. No rubrics for PLOs
- ○ 4. N/A
- ○ 5. Other, specify:

Q1.3.
Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?
- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

Q1.4.
Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?
- ○ 1. Yes
- ◉ 2. No (skip to **Q1.5**)
- ○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q1.5**)

Q1.4.1.
If the answer to Q1.4 is **yes**, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?
- ○ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

Q1.5.
Did your program use the *Degree Qualification Profile* ("DQP", see http://degreeprofile.org) to develop your PLO(s)?
- ○ 1. Yes
- ◉ 2. No, but I know what the DQP is
- ○ 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is
- ○ 4. Don't know

Q1.6.
Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?
- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

(Remember: Save your progress)

Section 2: Report One Learning Outcome in Detail

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO

Q2.1.

Select **OR** type in **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the* **correct box** for this PLO in Q1.1):

Oral Communication

If your PLO is **not listed, please enter it here**:

Q2.1.1.

Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

Demonstrate proficiency in oral communication: determine presentation needs in different situations; select visual aids to elucidate the central message; compose the appropriate language for the occasion; organize the proper structure of the presentation; and deliver compelling presentations.

Q2.2.

Has the program developed or adopted ***explicit program standards of performance/expectations*** for this PLO? (e.g. "We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 or higher in all dimensions of the Written Communication VALUE rubric.")

- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know
- ○ 4. N/A

Q2.3.

Please **1) provide and/or attach the rubric(s) AND 2) the standards of performance/expectations** that you have developed for *the selected PLO* here:

We expect 100% of students to achieve a rating of 3 or higher on all five criteria. Rubric attached.

📎 OralCommunication rubric copy.pdf 85.05 KB	📎 No file attached

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdrd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the **PLO**, the **standard (stdrd)** of performance, and the **rubric** that was used to measure the PLO:
☐	☑	☐	1. In **SOME** course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO

☐	☐	☐	2. In **ALL** course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
☐	☐	☐	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
☐	☑	☐	4. In the university catalogue
☐	☑	☐	5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters
☑	☑	☑	6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities
☐	☑	☐	7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
☐	☐	☐	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
☐	☐	☐	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
☐	☐	☐	10. Other, specify:

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

Q3.1.
Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO?

- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
- ○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
- ○ 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.1.1.
How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO?

`1`

Q3.2.
Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?

- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
- ○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
- ○ 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.2.1.
Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected:

> Instructors from 6 different senior seminar or seminar classes were asked to randomly select 5 student oral presentations to evaluate. Instructors then rated student's projects using the AAC&U rubric.

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

Q3.3.

Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?

◉ 1. Yes
○ 2. No (skip to **Q3.7**)
○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q3.7**)

Q3.3.1.
Which of the following direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) were used? [**Check all that apply**]

☑ 1. Capstone project (e.g. theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
☑ 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program
☐ 3. Key assignments from elective classes
☐ 4. Classroom based performance assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques
☐ 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects
☐ 6. E-Portfolios
☐ 7. Other Portfolios
☐ 8. Other, specify:

Q3.3.2.
Please **1) provide and/or attach the direct measure** (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) you used to collect data, **THEN 2) explain here** how it assesses the PLO:

Instructors were asked to use a capstone project but in cases where those projects were not yet submitted, other key assignments were used for evaluation.

The direct measure assesses the Oral Communication Skills PLO by instructing students to determine presentation needs in different situations; select visual aids to elucidate the central message; compose the appropriate language for the occasion; organize the proper structure of the presentation; and deliver compelling presentations.

A sample direct measure of a seminar class is attached.

📎 **Example Oral Project Instructions.doc**
26.5 KB   📎 **No file attached**

Q3.4.
What tool was used to evaluate the data?
○ 1. **No** rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
○ 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
○ 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
○ 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
◉ 5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
○ 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
○ 7. Used other means (Answer **Q3.4.1.**)

Q3.4.1.
If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]
☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
☐ 4. Other, specify:

(skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

Q3.4.2.
Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?
- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know
- ○ 4. N/A

Q3.4.3.
Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the rubric**?
- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know
- ○ 4. N/A

Q3.4.4.
Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?
- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know
- ○ 4. N/A

Q3.5.
Please enter the number (#) of faculty members who participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

| 1 |

Q3.5.1.
Please enter the number (#) of faculty members who participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

| 1 |

Q3.5.2.
If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?
- ○ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know
- ◉ 4. N/A

Q3.6.
How did you **select** the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?

Random selection.

Q3.6.1.
How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

Precedent. Each year we ask the instructors of senior seminars to rate 5 students' work for Assessment.

Q3.6.2.
Please enter the number (#) of students that were in the class or program?
325

Q3.6.3.
Please enter the number (#) of samples of student work that you evaluated?
30

Q3.6.4.
Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?
- ● 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

Q3.7.
Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?
- ○ 1. Yes
- ◉ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8**)
- ○ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8**)

Q3.7.1.
Which of the following indirect measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]
- ☐ 1. National student surveys (e.g. NSSE)
- ☐ 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)
- ☐ 3. College/department/program student surveys or focus groups
- ☐ 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- ☐ 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- ☐ 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- ☐ 7. Other, specify:

Q3.7.1.1.
Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:

📎 **No file attached**   📎 **No file attached**

Q3.7.2.
If surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?

Q3.7.3.
If surveys were used, how did you **select** your sample:

Q3.7.4.
If surveys were used, please enter the response rate:

Question 3C: Other Measures
(external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)

Q3.8.
Were external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?
- ○ 1. Yes
- ◉ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8.2**)
- ○ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

Q3.8.1.
Which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]
- ☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
- ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.)
- ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.)
- ☐ 4. Other, specify:

Q3.8.2.
Were other measures used to assess the PLO?
- ○ 1. Yes
- ◉ 2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)
- ○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

Q3.8.3.
If other measures were used, please specify:

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

Q4.1.
Please provide tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO in **Q2.1** (see Appendix 12 in our Feedback Packet Example):

Five Criteria (Areas)	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)
Organization	36.7%	43.3%	20.0%	0%
Language	50.0%	40.0%	10.0%	0%
Delivery	46.7%	40.0%	13.3%	0%
Supporting Material	46.7%	33.3%	16.7%	3.3%
Central Message	50.0%	30.0%	20.0%	0%

📎 2017-2018 Assessment Summary.docx
15.89 KB   📎 No file attached

Q4.2.
Are students doing well and meeting the program standard? **If not**, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

Standards of performance and expectations: We expect 100% students to have scores of at least 3.0 in all areas of the AAC&U's VALUES Oral Communication Skills at the time of graduation. Based on the data in the table above our goal was partially met our goal in having all students score at least 3.0 all areas, i.e., most of the students met the goal. Most problematic are students' rating for the **Organization, Supporting Material,** and **Central Message** criteria where one-fifth of our sample did not meet the 3.0 expectation.

Looking elsewhere in the data, based on the standards and criteria from the Oral Communication Skills rubric, most students met or exceeded the milestone rating.

For the **Language** criterion, 90% of students met the capstone rating as demonstrated in their comments being rated as imaginative, compelling, and generally supportive of their presentation. This was the strongest area among the five criteria.

The **Delivery** criterion, the second highest rated, 86.7% of students were rated at or above the benchmark, indicating a presentation in which the speakers were confident and polished, and the presentation itself was interesting.

 The **Organization, Supporting Material, and Central Message** criteria accounted for 80% of students meeting or exceeding the benchmark. These ratings demonstrate that students made coherent and consistent presentations, they used a variety of supporting materials to support their central thesis, and their central message was compelling.

Overall, in this sample, a minimum of 80% of students was rated as at least having met milestone 3 on any of the five criteria.

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

Q4.3.
For the selected PLO, the student performance:
- ○ 1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard
- ○ 2. **Met** expectation/standard
- ◉ 3. **Partially** met expectation/standard
- ○ 4. Did not meet expectation/standard
- ○ 5. No expectation/standard has been specified
- ○ 6. Don't know

Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

Q4.4.
Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?
- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

Q4.5.
Were **all** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?
- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

Q5.1.
As a result of the assessment effort and based on prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate ***making any changes*** for your program (e.g. course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?
- ○ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No (skip to **Q5.2**)
- ◉ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q5.2**)

Q5.1.1.

Please describe *what changes* you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO.

```



```

Q5.1.2.

Do you have a plan to assess the *impact of the changes* that you anticipate making?

⭘ 1. Yes, describe your plan:

```



```

⭘ 2. No

◉ 3. Don't know

Q5.2.

To what extent did you apply **previous assessment results** collected through your program in the following areas?	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Improving specific courses	⭘	⭘	◉	⭘	⭘
2. Modifying curriculum	⭘	⭘	◉	⭘	⭘
3. Improving advising and mentoring	⭘	⭘	◉	⭘	⭘
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	⭘	⭘	⭘	◉	⭘
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	⭘	⭘	⭘	◉	⭘
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	⭘	⭘	⭘	◉	⭘
7. Annual assessment reports	⭘	⭘	⭘	◉	⭘
8. Program review	⭘	⭘	⭘	⭘	◉
9. Prospective student and family information	⭘	◉	⭘	⭘	⭘
10. Alumni communication	⭘	◉	⭘	⭘	⭘
11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation)	⭘	⭘	⭘	⭘	◉
12. Program accreditation	⭘	⭘	⭘	⭘	◉
13. External accountability reporting requirement	⭘	⭘	⭘	⭘	◉
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations	⭘	⭘	⭘	⭘	◉
15. Strategic planning	⭘	⭘	◉	⭘	⭘
16. Institutional benchmarking	⭘	⭘	◉	⭘	⭘

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
17. Academic policy development or modifications	○	○	◉	○	○
18. Institutional improvement	○	○	◉	○	○
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	○	○	◉	○	○
20. New faculty hiring	○	◉	○	○	○
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	○	◉	○	○	○
22. Recruitment of new students	○	◉	○	○	○
23. Other, specify:	○	○	○	○	○

Q5.2.1.
Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above:

1) Assessment data are collected in fall semester based on previous recommendations from OAPA staff. Results of a preliminary evaluation show a consistent pattern of students not meeting the program standard, i.e., 100% rated 3 or better. These data were shared with the full faculty for discussion. This is a persistent issue. Previous faculty meeting discussions result in heavily divided arguments for and against making revisions to the program standard. We have not had a faculty retreat in which we could dedicate an extended period of time to discuss the issue further as indicated in the last assessment report. The issue remains unchanged.

2) The curriculum maps that are part of SmartPlanner are being used when advising some students for an academic plan which can ultimately help students achieve the benchmarks. Roughly 22% of ComS students have a complete SmartPlanner. The department continues to evaluate how the curriculum can be modified and used to prepare students to achieve benchmarks.

Q5.3. To what extent did you apply **previous assessment feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in the following areas?	1. Very Much	2. Quite a bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Program Learning Outcomes	○	◉	○	○	○
2. Standards of Performance	○	◉	○	○	○
3. Measures	○	○	○	◉	○
4. Rubrics	○	○	○	◉	○
5. Alignment	○	○	◉	○	○
6. Data Collection	○	◉	○	○	○
7. Data Analysis and Presentation	○	◉	○	○	○
8. Use of Assessment Data	◉	○	○	○	○
9. Other, please specify:	○	○	○	○	○

Q5.3.1.
Please share with us an example of how you applied **previous feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in any of the areas above:

We continue to consider ways to use the curriculum maps via SmartPlanner. SmartPlanner is a new tool for many faculty members. Faculty members express their attempts to balance the time to advise students with course roadmaps with the need to address course-specific matters and explore career and post-graduation opportunities.

(Remember: Save your progress)

Section 3: Report Other Assessment Activities

Other Assessment Activities

Q6.

If your program/academic unit conducted assessment activities that are **not directly related to the PLOs** for this year (i.e. impacts of an advising center, etc.), please provide those activities and results here:

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

Q6.1.

Please explain how the assessment activities reported in **Q6** will be linked to any of your PLOs and/or PLO assessment in the future and to the mission, vision, and the strategic planning for the program and the university:

Q7.

What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? [**Check all that apply**]

- ☐ 1. **Critical Thinking**
- ☐ 2. **Information Literacy**
- ☑ 3. **Written Communication**
- ☐ 4. **Oral Communication**
- ☐ 5. Quantitative Literacy
- ☐ 6. **Inquiry and Analysis**
- ☐ 7. Creative Thinking
- ☐ 8. Reading
- ☐ 9. Team Work
- ☐ 10. Problem Solving
- ☐ 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- ☐ 12. **Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives**
- ☐ 13. Ethical Reasoning

☐ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
☐ 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**
☐ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
☐ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
☐ 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**
☐ 19. **Professionalism**
☐ 20. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:

a. [   ]

b. [   ]

c. [   ]

Q8.
Please explain how this year's assessment activities help you address recommendations from your department's last program review?

We are still awaiting a report from the most recent program review.

Q9. Please attach any additional files here:

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

Q9.1.
If you have attached **any** files to this form, please list **every** attached file here:

Section 4: Background Information about the Program

Program Information (**Required**)

Program:
[   ]
(If you typed in your program name at the beginning, please skip to **Q11**)

Q10.
Program/Concentration Name: [skip if program name is already selected or appears above]
BA Communications

Q11.
Report Author(s):
Carmen Stitt

Q11.1.
Department Chair/Program Director:

Gerri Smith

Q11.2.
Assessment Coordinator:

Carmen Stitt

Q12.
Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit (select):

Comm. Studies

Q13.
College:

College of Arts & Letters

Q14.
What is the total enrollment (#) for Academic Unit during assessment (see Departmental Fact Book):

1,716

Q15.
Program Type:
- ◉ 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
- ○ 2. Credential
- ○ 3. Master's Degree
- ○ 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)
- ○ 5. Other, specify:

Q16. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

4

Q16.1. List all the names:

B.A. in Communication Studies, Concentration in General Communication

B.A. in Communication Studies, Concentration in Public Relations

B.A. in Journalism

B.A. in Film

Q16.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

2

Q17. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

1

Q17.1. List all the names:

M.A. in Communication Studies

Q17.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

0

Q18. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

0

Q18.1. List all the names:

Q19. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

Q19.1. List all the names:

When was your **Assessment Plan**...	1. Before 2012-13	2. 2013-14	3. 2014-15	4. 2015-16	5. 2016-17	6. 2017-18	7. No Plan	8. Don't know
Q20. Developed?	⦿	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Q20.1. Last updated?	⦿	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q20.2. (Required)
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **assessment plan**:

📎 **Assessment Plan.docx**
14.6 KB

Q21.
Has your program developed a **curriculum map?**
⦿ 1. Yes
○ 2. No
○ 3. Don't know

Q21.1.
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **curriculum map**:

📎 2018_COMS_General Communication Studies BA ROADMAP.docx
144.76 KB

Q22.
Has your program indicated explicitly in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?
○ 1. Yes
⦿ 2. No
○ 3. Don't know

Q23.
Does your program have a capstone class?
⦿ 1. Yes, specify:
We use Senior Seniors as "capstone" classes and, currently, there are 8 different areas for senior semin

○ 2. No
○ 3. Don't know

Q23.1.
Does your program have a capstone project(s)?
● 1. Yes
○ 2. No
○ 3. Don't know

<div align="center">

(**Remember**: **Save your progress**)
Save When Completed!

</div>

<div align="right">

ver. 10.**31**.17

</div>

○ 2. No
○ 3. Don't know

ORAL COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can by shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

The type of oral communication most likely to be included in a collection of student work is an oral presentation and therefore is the focus for the application of this rubric.

Definition

Oral communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.

Framing Language

Oral communication takes many forms. This rubric is specifically designed to evaluate oral presentations of a single speaker at a time and is best applied to live or video-recorded presentations. For panel presentations or group presentations, it is recommended that each speaker be evaluated separately. This rubric best applies to presentations of sufficient length such that a central message is conveyed, supported by one or more forms of supporting materials and includes a purposeful organization. An oral answer to a single question not designed to be structured into a presentation does not readily apply to this rubric.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- Central message: The main point/thesis/"bottom line"/"take-away" of a presentation. A clear central message is easy to identify; a compelling central message is also vivid and memorable.
- Delivery techniques: Posture, gestures, eye contact, and use of the voice. Delivery techniques enhance the effectiveness of the presentation when the speaker stands and moves with authority, looks more often at the audience than at his/her speaking materials/notes, uses the voice expressively, and uses few vocal fillers ("um," "uh," "like," "you know," etc.).
- Language: Vocabulary, terminology, and sentence structure. Language that supports the effectiveness of a presentation is appropriate to the topic and audience, grammatical, clear, and free from bias. Language that enhances the effectiveness of a presentation is also vivid, imaginative, and expressive.
- Organization: The grouping and sequencing of ideas and supporting material in a presentation. An organizational pattern that supports the effectiveness of a presentation typically includes an introduction, one or more identifiable sections in the body of the speech, and a conclusion. An organizational pattern that enhances the effectiveness of the presentation reflects a purposeful choice among possible alternatives, such as a chronological pattern, a problem-solution pattern, an analysis-of-parts pattern, etc., that makes the content of the presentation easier to follow and more likely to accomplish its purpose.
- Supporting material: Explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities, and other kinds of information or analysis that supports the principal ideas of the presentation. Supporting material is generally credible when it is relevant and derived from reliable and appropriate sources. Supporting material is highly credible when it is also vivid and varied across the types listed above (e.g., a mix of examples, statistics, and references to authorities). Supporting material may also serve the purpose of establishing the speakers credibility. For example, in presenting a creative work such as a dramatic reading of Shakespeare, supporting evidence may not advance the ideas of Shakespeare, but rather serve to establish the speaker as a credible Shakespearean actor.

ORAL COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

Definition

Oral communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone 4	Milestones 3	2	Benchmark 1
Organization	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation.
Language	Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience.
Delivery	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable.
Supporting Material	A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.
Central Message	Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)	Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.	Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable.	Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation.

Instructions for Oral Presentation

PowerPoint DUE by 12:00pm (Beginning of Class) on the Day You Present

The purpose of the oral presentation is for students to condense, organize, and present the most important aspects of their written project in a coherent fashion.

Students will be given 6-7 minutes to present their projects to the class using presentation software (Powerpoint, etc.—*otherwise, must be compatible with Turnitin [Prezi is not]).* *If not compatible, simply upload a Word document to Turnitin with the content of your presentation.

The final part of your presentation is your response to questions from three (3) different randomly selected peers in class (5 minutes).

See grading rubric next page.

Oral Presentation

Name:_____

Topic:

_____ (5 points)   Clarity of the health communication topic-clear opening statement and verbal and/or visual outline provided of the scope and need/contribution.

_____(5 points)   Background regarding what is the current status of the issue, what has been done about it, what are the implications/what is this important?

_____(5 points)   Discuss and explain your three (3) proposed solutions.

_____ (5 points)   Suggest next steps in research and/or action. Summary-summarize with a "take home message."

_____(5 points)   Responses to 3 questions from your peers. Answers should be informed by your literature review (you are not expected to have all the answers).

2017-2018 Data (N=30)
Results for Oral Communication Skills

Five Criteria (Areas)	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)
Organization	36.7%	43.3%	20.0%	0%
Language	50.0%	40.0%	10.0%	0%
Delivery	46.7%	40.0%	13.3%	0%
Supporting Material	46.7%	33.3%	16.7%	3.3%
Central Message	50.0%	30.0%	20.0%	0%

Standards of performance and expectations: We expect 100% students to have scores of at least 3.0 in all areas of the AAC&U's VALUES Oral Communication Skills at the time of graduation. Based on the data in the table above our goal was partially met our goal in having all students score at least 3.0 all areas, i.e., most of the students met the goal. Most problematic are students' rating for the **Organization, Supporting Material,** and **Central Message** criteria where one-fifth of our sample did not meet the 3.0 expectation.

Looking elsewhere in the data, based on the standards and criteria from the Oral Communication Skills rubric, most students met or exceeded the milestone rating.

For the **Language** criterion, 90% of students met the capstone rating as demonstrated in their comments being rated as imaginative, compelling, and generally supportive of their presentation. This was the strongest area among the five criteria.

The **Delivery** criterion, the second highest rated, 86.7% of students were rated at or above the benchmark, indicating a presentation in which the speakers were confident and polished, and the presentation itself was interesting.

The **Organization, Supporting Material, and Central Message** criteria accounted for 80% of students meeting or exceeding the benchmark. These ratings demonstrate that students made coherent and consistent presentations, they used a variety of supporting materials to support their central thesis, and their central message was compelling.

 Overall, in this sample, a minimum of 80% of students were rated as at least having met milestone 3 on any of the five criteria.

Assessment Plan

1. Suspend the department's portfolio requirement, beginning with the 2006-2008 catalog.

2. Suspend the three common goals for all ComS majors. Redefine department assessment goals exclusively in terms of program exit knowledge, competencies and/or abilities.

3. Retain the existing departmental assessment structure including the departmental assessment committee, subject area committees, and office support staff.

4. Beginning with the 2006-2008 catalog, require all ComS and Jour majors to complete a capstone course: senior seminar (ComS 168, 180, 181, 182, 183, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191), senior project course (ComS 184A/B or 185), Journalism course(s) or senior research course (e.g., a revamped ComS 171).

5. Prior to Fall 2005 area committees will designate a suitable capstone exercise for respective capstone courses. Exercises will facilitate assessment of area exit knowledge, competencies and/or abilities. Area capstone exercises may include papers, projects or research reports. Area committees will, however, designate a single common exercise. Capstone instructors execute capstone exercises.

6. As a graduation requirement students shall submit a *copy* of their capstone exercise to the department office prior to the last day of their final semester of coursework. Faculty who teach the capstone courses are responsible for keeping a copy of the capstone exercises or other relevant documents. Formative evaluation of a random *sample* of capstone exercises by area committees will take place during the following semester (e.g., Spring 07 capstone exercises would be assessed during the Fall 07 semester).

7. Area committees will continue to use the existing "four question" assessment format until area committees can formulate suitable assessment rubrics.

8. The current portfolio assessment plan will remain in force until fall semester 2005. During fall 2005 and Spring 2006 semesters students not including a qualifying capstone course within their graduation petitions will submit a portfolio as per the department's existing assessment plan. Area assessment committees will continue to examine a sample of these portfolios during the 2005-2006 academic year.

9. The department Assessment Committee will, at its discretion, conduct senior surveys, alumni surveys and focus groups as deemed appropriate.

10. The department will include in the 2006-2008 CSUS catalog all necessary enabling language.

COMMUNICATION STUDIES – General COMS B.A.   F O U R ♦ Y E A R P L A N

Minimum total units required for B.A. Degree: 120 ▪ (39 units required from Major department)
▪ Additional courses may be needed to meet requirements in English and/or Math prior to completing GE requirements: A2 & B4
This form is designed to be used in partnership with GE and Major advisors - modifications may be necessary to meet the unique needs of each student. Seek assistance each semester to stay on track and graduate!

YEAR 1

| Sem. 1 | COMS 4/5 (GE A1) | COMS 55 | COMS 8 | GE A2 | GE E (FYS) | 15 UNITS |
| Sem. 2 | COMS 2 (GE A3) | GE B4 | GE C | GE D | FL | 15 UNITS |

YEAR 2

| Sem. 3 | COMS 100A | COMS 100C | GE C2 | GE B1+B3 (4 units) | GE C1 | 16 UNITS |
| Sem. 4 | Elective-UD | Elective-UD | GE B2 | ENGL 20 | FL | 15 UNITS |

YEAR 3

| Sem. 5 | COMS 100B* | COMS 164/168/169/170/171/172 (choose one) | Elective-UD | GE D (GOVT) | GE B5-UD | 15 UNITS |
| Sem. 6 | Theory & Seminar | GE C-UD | GE D+ (US HIST) | Elective | Elective | Elective (ENGL 109) | 18 UNITS |

YEAR 4

| Sem. 7 | Theory & Seminar | Elective-UD | GE D-UD | Elective | Elective | 15 UNITS |
| Sem. 8 | Elective | Elective | Elective | Elective (2 units) | 11 UNITS |

KEY:
- Major requirements
- GE/graduation requirements
- Electives
- Minor requirements

UD — Upper Division
+ — Race & Ethnicity
* — Writing Intensive (Complete WPJ or ENGL 109W/M before enrolling)
FL — If requirement was not met in high school or through testing, substitute two semesters of Foreign Language for electives
( ) — Courses in parentheses are suggested, not required.

NOTES:

TOTAL = 120 UNITS

SACRAMENTO STATE