

Annual Institutional Assessment Report

Addressing the Results for the 2014-15 and 2015-16 Assessment Endeavors

Updated with Initiatives Approved by 2016 Assessment Summit

November 2016

This report summarizes the assessment work done by the USU Assessment Task Force and USU faculty (both core and adjunct) during the 2014-15 and 2015-16 academic years. Many thanks to our dedicated faculty for their time, energy, and commitment to academic success at USU.

One of the principal purposes of this annual report is to present an overview of all assessment results so that common areas of strength and concern can be identified, discussed, and acted upon. The specifics of the report itself are secondary to how it can help us make changes to better support our students.

Note on Institutional vs. Program Assessment

For these two cycles of the assessment process, student work was evaluated using the same institutional-level rubrics (one for each competency); the results were then used for program-level planning within the programs by program faculty. The asymmetry of this process will be addressed beginning in 2016-17 by creating program-level rubrics that reflect the PLOs aligned with the ILO competencies for that year. There is also expectation that combining program-level rubrics with program faculty assessors will also lead to stronger inter-rater reliability scores.

Note on Very Small Sample Sizes

Several of the sample sizes in this report are so small as to make the percentage calculations awkward. Within the individual program reports, this challenge has been addressed as best befits the program's perspective. For the purposes of this report, however, the percentages remain even for these tiny sample sizes for ease of representing the information. Note that the sample size is listed with each program, and the conclusions drawn from the results should be weighted accordingly.

Note on Benchmarking

The use of benchmarking, especially target percentages and how they apply to the rubrics, has been a lively topic of discussion within the Assessment Task Force. Some programs (all at the graduate level) have chosen to use this data as a pilot effort in order to set benchmarks for future rounds of assessment; these intentions are reflected in the individual program reports; however, for the purposes of this report, the targets remain to allow for an institutional overview to identify areas of shared concern and thus potential institutional-level initiatives.

Note on Course Level Terminology and Rubric Scores

Course levels are noted as I (Introduce), D (Develop), and M (Master), using the most common system at USU for indicating the position of a course on a program's curriculum map. The placement on the map reveals its categorization as an early, middle, or late course, with the content aimed appropriately for the students' experience and competency. USU's assessment rubrics (see appendix) are designed with 4 possible scores, from 0 to 3, with "3" being used for the most skilled student performances. With the

change to programmatic rubrics, the difficulties in using the same rubric and its numbering to score both undergraduate and graduate student work will hopefully be avoided in the future.

2014-2015 Quantitative Reasoning and Information Literacy

Quantitative Reasoning Results

ILO 2. Apply quantitative reasoning to address complex challenges.

For the review of these two competencies, programs selected one course with no restrictions on level. Samples of student work from those courses were evaluated using a common institutional rubric (see appendix and note above).

Undergraduate Programs

| Program | Course Level (Rubric Target) | Target % (of scores) | Rubric Criterion | Achieved % | | Met? | Predominant Score |
|---------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------|------|---------|-------------------|
| GE n=14 | I ("1" or higher) | 80% | Interpret Data | 100% | | Yes | 1 |
| | | | Numerical Analysis | NA | | NA | NA |
| | | | Numerical Problem Solving | 100% | | Yes | 1 |
| | | | Translate Information | 100% | | Yes | 1 and 2 |
| BSHS n=14 | D ("1" and on "2" or higher) | 80% at "1" AND 40% at "2" | Interpret Data | 93% | 36% | Partial | 1 |
| | | | Numerical Analysis | 64% | 21% | No | 1 |
| | | | Numerical Problem Solving | 93% | 21% | Partial | 1 |
| | | | Translate Information | 93% | 36% | Partial | 1 |
| BAM n=12 | I ("1" or higher) | 80% | Interpret Data | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Numerical Analysis | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Numerical Problem Solving | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Translate Information | 100% | | Yes | 3 |
| RN-BSN n=2 | D ("1" and on "2" or higher) | 80% at "1" AND 40% at "2" | Interpret Data | 100% | 100% | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Numerical | 100% | 100% | Yes | 3 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------------------|------|------|-----|---------|
| | | | Analysis | | | | |
| | | | Numerical Problem Solving | 100% | 100% | Yes | 2 and 3 |
| | | | Translate Information | 100% | 100% | Yes | 3 |

Graduate Programs

| Program | Course Level (Rubric Target) | Target % (of scores) | Rubric Criterion | Achieved % | Met? | Predominant Score |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------|------|-------------------|
| MSSH <i>n=3</i> | D ("2" or higher) | 80% | Interpret Data | 0% | No | 1 |
| | | | Numerical Analysis | 0% | No | 0 |
| | | | Numerical Problem Solving | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | Translate Information | 67% | No | 3 |
| MBA <i>n=6</i> | M ("3") | 80% | Interpret Data | 50% | No | 3 |
| | | | Numerical Analysis | 33% | No | 1 and 3 |
| | | | Numerical Problem Solving | 33% | No | 2 |
| | | | Translate Information | 50% | No | 1 and 3 |
| MSN-FNP <i>n=13</i> | D ("2" or higher) | 80% | Interpret Data | 93% | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Numerical Analysis | 100% | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Numerical Problem Solving | 100% | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Translate Information | 100% | Yes | 3 |
| MAED | Not Assessed (PLO under Review) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Information Literacy Results

ILO 3. Effectively gather, analyze and integrate information from a variety of sources.

For the review of these two competencies, programs selected one course with no restrictions on level. Samples of student work from those courses were evaluated using a common institutional rubric (see appendix and note above).

Undergraduate Programs

| Program | Course Level (Rubric Target) | Target % (of scores) | Rubric Criterion | Achieved % | | Met? | Predominant Score |
|----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------|------|------|-------------------|
| GE <i>n=16</i> | D ("1" and "2" or higher) | 80% at "1" AND 40% at "2" | Select Information | 100% | 81% | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Communicate Information | 94% | 59% | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Cite Information | 100% | 75% | Yes | 2 |
| BSHS <i>n=7</i> | D ("1" and "2" or higher) | 80% at "1" AND 40% at "2" | Select Information | 100% | 100% | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Communicate Information | 100% | 86% | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Cite Information | 100% | 71% | Yes | 2 |
| BAM <i>n=3</i> | M ("2" or higher) | 80% | Select Information | 33% | | No | 1 |
| | | | Communicate Information | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Cite Information | 67% | | No | 2 |
| RN-BSN <i>n=2</i> | D ("1" and "2" or higher) | 80% at "1" AND 40% at "2" | Select Information | 100% | 50% | Yes | 1 and 2 |
| | | | Communicate Information | 100% | 100% | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Cite Information | 100% | 100% | Yes | 2 |

Graduate Programs

| Program | Course Level (Rubric Target) | Target % (of scores) | Rubric Criterion | Achieved % | Met? | Predominant Score |
|--------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------|------|-------------------|
| MSHS <i>n=7</i> | D ("2" or higher) | 80% | Select Information | 57% | No | 1 and 3 |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----|-------------------------|------|-----|---------|
| | | | Communicate Information | 71% | No | 2 |
| | | | Cite Information | 43% | No | 2 |
| MBA n=14 | D ("2" or higher) | 80% | Select Information | 21% | No | 0 |
| | | | Communicate Information | 14% | No | 0 and 1 |
| | | | Cite Information | 6% | No | 0 |
| MAED n=5 | I ("1" or higher) | 80% | Select Information | 100% | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Communicate Information | 100% | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Cite Information | 100% | Yes | 1 |
| MSN-FNP n=15 | I ("1" or higher) | 80% | Select Information | 100% | Yes | 1 |
| | | | Communicate Information | 100% | Yes | 1 |
| | | | Cite Information | 73% | No | 2 |

2015-2016 Written Communication and Oral Communication

ILO 1. Communicate clearly and effectively through writing, speaking and using technology.

For the review of these two competencies, programs selected two courses at two different levels (when possible). Samples of student work from those courses were evaluated using a common institutional rubric (see appendix and note in the opening section).

Written Communication Results

Undergraduate Programs

| Program | Course Level (Rubric Target) | Target % (of scores) | Rubric Criterion | Achieved % | Met? | Predominant Score |
|---------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------|------|-------------------|
| GE Course 1 n=15 | I ("1" or higher) | 80% | Central Message | 100% | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Organization | 100% | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 100% | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Grammar & Spelling | 100% | Yes | 1 |
| | | | Context & Genre | 100% | Yes | 2 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------|------|-----|---------|
| GE Course 2 n=5 | D ("1" and on "2" or higher) | 80% at "1" AND 40% at "2" | Central Message | 100% | 100% | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Organization | 100% | 100% | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 100% | 100% | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Grammar & Spelling | 100% | 70% | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Context & Genre | 100% | 100% | Yes | 2 |
| BSHS Course 1 n=22 | I ("1" or higher) | 80% | Central Message | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Organization | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Grammar & Spelling | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Context & Genre | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| BSHS Course 2 n=13 | M ("2" or higher) | 80% | Central Message | 69% | | No | 2 |
| | | | Organization | 61% | | No | 2 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 81% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Grammar & Spelling | 77% | | No | 2 |
| | | | Context & Genre | 77% | | No | 2 |
| BAM Course 1 n=10 | D ("1" and on "2" or higher) | 80% at "1" AND 40% at "2" | Central Message | 95% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Organization | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 90% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Grammar & Spelling | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Context & Genre | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| BAM Course 2 n=8 | M ("2" or higher) | 80% | Central Message | 75% | | No | 2 |
| | | | Organization | 75% | | No | 2 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 63% | | No | 1 and 3 |
| | | | Grammar & Spelling | 38% | | No | 1 |
| | | | Context & Genre | 87% | | Yes | 2 |
| RN-BSN n=2 | M ("2" or higher) | 80% | Central Message | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Organization | 100% | | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Supporting | 100% | | Yes | 3 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------------|------|-----|---|
| | | | Content | | | |
| | | | Grammar & Spelling | 100% | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Context & Genre | 100% | Yes | 3 |

Graduate Programs

| Program | Course Level (Rubric Target) | Target % (of scores) | Rubric Criterion | Achieved % | | Met? | Predominant Score |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------|------|------|-------------------|
| MSHS <i>n</i> =17 | M ("3") | 80% | Central Message | 41% | | No | 2 |
| | | | Organization | 20% | | No | 2 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 50% | | No | 3 |
| | | | Grammar & Spelling | 20% | | No | 1 and 2 |
| | | | Context & Genre | 35% | | No | 2 |
| MBA Course 1 <i>n</i> =50 | I ("1" or higher) | 80% | Central Message | 98% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Organization | 98% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 92% | | Yes | 1 |
| | | | Grammar & Spelling | 97% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Context & Genre | 97% | | Yes | 2 |
| MBA Course 2 <i>n</i> =17 | D ("2" or higher) | 80% | Central Message | 13% | | No | 1 |
| | | | Organization | 13% | | No | 2 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 7% | | No | 1 |
| | | | Grammar & Spelling | 3% | | No | 1 |
| | | | Context & Genre | 3% | | No | 2 |
| MAED <i>n</i> =3 | M ("3") | 80% | Central Message | 33% | | No | 2 |
| | | | Organization | 50% | | No | 3 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 33% | | No | 2 |
| | | | Grammar & Spelling | 33% | | No | 2 |
| | | | Context & Genre | 33% | | No | 2 |
| MSN-FNP <i>n</i> =10 | M ("2" & "3") | 20% at "2" AND 80% at "3" | Central Message | 100% | 100% | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Organization | 100% | 80% | Yes | 3 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------------|------|-----|-----|---|
| | | | Supporting Content | 100% | 80% | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Grammar & Spelling | 100% | 80% | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Context & Genre | 100% | 70% | No | 3 |

Oral Communication Results

Undergraduate Programs

| Program | Course Level (Rubric Target) | Target % (of scores) | Rubric Criterion | Achieved % | | Met? | Predominant Score |
|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------|--------------------|------------|-----|------|-------------------|
| GE <i>n</i> =10 | I ("1" or higher) | 80% | Central Message | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Organization | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Delivery | 90% | | Yes | 1 |
| | | | Vocabulary | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| BAM Course 1 <i>n</i> =4 | D ("1" and on "2" or higher) | 80% at "1" AND 40% at "2" | Central Message | 88% | 63% | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Organization | 100% | 75% | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 88% | 63% | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Delivery | 88% | 50% | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Vocabulary | 100% | 75% | Yes | 2 |
| BAM Course 2 <i>n</i> =3 | M ("2" or higher) | 80% | Central Message | 50% | | No | 1 |
| | | | Organization | 50% | | No | 1 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 83% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Delivery | 83% | | Yes | 2 |
| | | | Vocabulary | 100% | | Yes | 2 |
| RN-BSN | M ("2" or higher) | 80% | Central Message | 100% | | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Organization | 100% | | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 100% | | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Delivery | 100% | | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Vocabulary | 100% | | Yes | 3 |
| BSHS | Not Assessed (Curriculum under Review) | NA | NA | NA | | NA | NA |

Graduate Programs

| Program | Course Level (Rubric Target) | Target % (of scores) | Rubric Criterion | Achieved % | Met? | Predominant Score |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------|------|-------------------|
| MSHS <i>n</i> =32 | M ("3") | 80% | Central Message | 19% | No | 2 |
| | | | Organization | 19% | No | 2 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 33% | No | 2 |
| | | | Delivery | 27% | No | 2 |
| | | | Vocabulary | 30% | No | 2 |
| MBA <i>n</i> =33 | D ("2" or higher) | 80% | Central Message | 67% | No | 2 |
| | | | Organization | 51% | No | 1 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 76% | No | 2 |
| | | | Delivery | 76% | No | 2 |
| | | | Vocabulary | 71% | No | 2 |
| MAED <i>n</i> =4 | M ("3") | 80% | Central Message | 0% | No | 2 |
| | | | Organization | 0% | No | 2 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 25% | No | 2 |
| | | | Delivery | 37% | No | 2 |
| | | | Vocabulary | 75% | Yes | 3 |
| MSN-FNP <i>n</i> =10 | D ("2" or higher) | 80% | Central Message | 100% | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Organization | 100% | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Supporting Content | 100% | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Delivery | 100% | Yes | 3 |
| | | | Vocabulary | 100% | Yes | 3 |

Number of Changes Planned or Proposed Based on Assessment Results

Quantitative Reasoning Changes

| | |
|---|---|
| Changes to Curriculum | 9 |
| Changes to Pedagogy | 2 |
| Changes to Student Services – Scheduling/Admissions | 1 |
| Changes to Student Support -- Tutoring | 1 |
| Changes to Assessment Process | 2 |

Information Literacy Changes

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Changes to Curriculum | 8 |
| Changes to Pedagogy | 3 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Changes to Student Services – Scheduling/Admissions | 1 |
| Changes to Student Support – Tutoring | 2 |
| Changes to Assessment Process | 2 |

Written Communication Changes

| | |
|---|---|
| Changes to Curriculum | 6 |
| Changes to Pedagogy | 1 |
| Changes to Student Services – Scheduling/Admissions | 1 |
| Changes to Student Support -- Tutoring | 4 |
| Changes to Assessment Process | 1 |

Oral Communication Changes

| | |
|---|---|
| Changes to Curriculum | 6 |
| Changes to Pedagogy | 1 |
| Changes to Student Services – Scheduling/Admissions | 0 |
| Changes to Student Support -- Tutoring | 0 |
| Changes to Assessment Process | 1 |

Addendum: Institutional Initiatives Recommended by 2016 Assessment Summit

Based on discussions of the results presented above, the participants of the 2016 Assessment Summit, recommended the following institutional initiatives:

Quantitative Reasoning

Create and implement Blackboard notices targeted at students in QR courses with reminder of Brainfuse tutoring availability. Track to see if Brainfuse usage improves and re-assess results.

Information Literacy

As much work has been initiated and completed at the program and library level, collect student feedback on the new ILit materials.

Written Communication

Budget for and hire a dedicated writing tutor.

Oral Communication

No institutional initiative recommended. Curricular work to be continued at the programmatic level.

Appendix A:

Quantitative Reasoning Rubric

A person who is competent in quantitative reasoning possesses the skills and knowledge necessary to apply the use of logic, numbers, and mathematics to deal effectively with common problems and issues. A person who is quantitatively literate can use numerical, geometric, and measurement data and concepts, mathematical skills, and principles of mathematical reasoning to draw logical conclusions and to make well-reasoned decisions.

| Criteria | 0 – unacceptable | 1 – needs improvement | 2 – good | 3 – excellent |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| Interpretation of data Can the student answer questions related to provided numerical information Example – look at a chart and give the correct temperature for a charted date | Demonstrates very little (if any) understanding of the given information | Demonstrates a limited understanding; can answer questions directly related to the data but with substantial (formulaic) errors | Demonstrates an understanding of the given information; can answer questions directly related to the data with minor (calculation) errors | Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the given information; can correctly answer questions related to the data |
| Analysis: numerical Can the student use provided information to draw conclusions about a related topic Example – Use a graph of past data to make predictions about the future | Conclusion is not presented or is invalid | Draws on data to make predictive conclusions, but with substantial (formulaic) errors | Draws on data to make predictive conclusions, with minor (calculation) errors | Draws on data to make accurate, predictive conclusions |
| Problem solving: numerical Can the student set up problems and calculate the solutions correctly | Did not organize or calculate a mathematical strategy for a given situation | Organizes and calculates a mathematical solution with mistakes in organization AND calculation | Organizes and calculates a mathematical solution with mistakes in organization OR calculation | Correctly organizes and calculates a mathematical solution for a given situation |
| Translate information Can the student correctly translate information from the problem/data set into mathematical symbols, graphs, or tables | Does not present mathematical information correctly | Presents information from the problem into mathematical symbols, graphs, or tables with substantial (formulaic) errors | Presents information from the problem into mathematical symbols, graphs, or tables with minor (calculation) errors | Correctly presents information into mathematical symbols, graphs, or tables |

For lower division courses/assignments, students should either interpret given information from a graph/chart or translate given data into a graph/chart; for upper division and graduate courses/assignments, students should be able to achieve all criteria.

Appendix B:

Information Literacy Rubric

A person who is competent in information literacy is able to find, retrieve, understand, and use information appropriate for his or her purposes without confusing or misleading others about its provenance.

| Criteria | 0 Not Attempted | 1 Attempted but in a simplistic or incomplete way | 2 Achieved | 3 Achieved in a comprehensive way |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| Select Information | - Information selected is not clearly related to research question | - Information selected narrowly and incompletely addresses the research question | - Information selected addresses the research question from a range of relevant perspectives | - Information selected enriches the research question by addressing the complexities of the issue |
| Communicate Information | -Does not distinguish between researched information and own ideas | - Attempts to distinguish between researched information and own ideas - Student attempts to: -Paraphrase -Summarize -Quote | - Distinguishes between researched information and own ideas. - Student: -Paraphrases -Summarizes -Quotes | - Distinguishes carefully and clearly between researched information and own ideas. - Student: -Paraphrases -Summarizes -Quotes -AND uses transitional and introductory phrases |
| Cite Information | -Does not attempt to use APA guidelines for citations and references | -Attempts to use APA guidelines for citations and references but does so inconsistently and/or incompletely: Major Informational components missing (Author, Date, Title, Journal Titles, Publication Information) | -Consistently uses APA guidelines for citations and complete references, but with minor formatting errors: <i>(italics, punctuation, spacing)</i> | - Consistently and correctly uses citations and complete references following APA guidelines |

Appendix C:

Written Communication Rubric

A person who is competent in written communication is able to clearly communicate, organize, and deliver ideas and information in written format.

| Criteria | 0 Not Attempted | 1 Attempted but in a simplistic or incomplete way | 2 Achieved | 3 Achieved in a comprehensive way |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| Central Message: Written | Central message is not identifiable. | Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the work. Topic is clear. | Central message is clearly articulated (more than an announcement of the topic) and provides direction for the work. | Central message articulates the paper's intention to explore the complexities/challenges of the topic and provides direction for the work. |
| Organization: Written Organizational pattern based on formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields | Organization is not clear at any level. Transitioning between ideas may be absent or illogical. | Work is organized with basic introduction, body, and concluding sections. Transitioning between ideas may be absent or awkward. | Work is organized with well-constructed introduction, body, and concluding sections. Ideas clearly transition from one to the next. | Work is organized with well-designed introduction, body, and conclusion sections. Ideas flow from one to the next, demonstrating an understanding of how they relate to one another. |
| Supporting Content explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities | Insufficient supporting materials. Fails to establish the writer's credibility/authority on the topic. | Appropriate supporting materials are referenced but insufficiently integrated or analyzed. Partially establishes the writer's credibility/authority on the topic. | Appropriate supporting materials are referenced, analyzed, and generally integrated into the work. Establishes the writer's credibility/authority on the topic. | A variety of types of compelling supporting materials are referenced to significantly support the work and establish the writer's credibility/authority on the topic. |
| Delivery: Written Spelling and grammar | Spelling and grammar errors affect comprehension. | Some errors in grammar and spelling but no interference with comprehension. Sentence structure is correct. | Few grammatical or spelling errors. Sentence structure is varied as appropriate to discipline. | Grammatically correct with virtually no misspellings. Sentence structure is varied and demonstrates command of coordination and subordination. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| <p>Context and Genre Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and circumstances surrounding the writing task</p> | <p>Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, and purpose.</p> | <p>Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, and purpose.</p> | <p>Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose.</p> | <p>Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|---|

Appendix D:

Oral Communication Rubric

A person who is competent in oral communication is able to clearly communicate, organize, and deliver ideas and information in spoken format.

| Criteria | 0 Not Attempted | 1 Attempted but in a simplistic or incomplete way | 2 Achieved | 3 Achieved in a comprehensive way |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Central Message: Oral | Central message is not identifiable. | Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation. | Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material. | Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.) |
| Organization: Oral Organizational pattern: specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions | Organizational pattern is not observable within the presentation. | Organizational is intermittently observable within the presentation. | Organizational pattern is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation. | Organizational pattern is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive. |
| Supporting Content explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities | Insufficient supporting materials. Fails to establish the presenter's credibility/ authority on the topic. | Appropriate supporting materials are referenced but insufficiently integrated or analyzed. Partially establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. | Appropriate supporting materials are referenced, analyzed, and generally integrated into the work. Establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. | A variety of types of compelling supporting materials are referenced to significantly support the work and establish the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. |
| Delivery: Oral Delivery techniques: posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness | Delivery techniques detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable. | Delivery techniques make the presentation understandable, but the speaker appears tentative. | Delivery techniques make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable. | Delivery techniques make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident. |
| Vocabulary | Vocabulary is unclear and minimally supports the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not | Vocabulary is mundane and commonplace and partially supports the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in | Vocabulary is thoughtful and generally supports the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is | Vocabulary is imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhances the effectiveness of the presentation. |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| | appropriate to audience. | presentation is appropriate to audience. | appropriate to audience. | Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. |
|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|