Area A Schedule

GEO AREA	Assessment Year 2011-12 *Area A2, B, C1*	Assessment Year 2012-13 *Area E and D1*	Assessment Year 2013-14 *Area A1 & Area D2*	Assessment Year 2014-15 *Area C*	Assessment Year 2015-16
Area A 1 Communications			X		
Area A 2 English	X				X

Area A Rubric

AREA A: ORAL COMMUNICATION			
General Education Outcome: Students completing an assignment in Area A courses (SPCH 1A and SPCH 1AH) will critically evaluate public speeches.			
Means of Assessment: A variety of classroom activities or assignments addressing the GEO including the following rubric.			
Criteria for Success: Students must meet expectations by scoring a " 1" using the criteria below.			
PERFORMANCE LEVEL			
3	**2**	**1**	**0**
Student evaluation will: **- summarize the observed speech** **- identify both content and delivery aspects of the speech.** **- consistently utilize terminology consistent with the course text and/or lecture** **- propose strategies the speaker could utilize to improve the content and/or the delivery of the speech, when appropriate.** **- provide at least one detailed description of the speech as support.**	Student evaluation will - summarize the observed speech - identify multiple areas of excellence and areas for improvement, when appropriate. - utilize terminology consistent with the course text and/or lecture.	Student evaluation will - summarize the observed speech - identify at least one area of strength and one area for improvement, but may omit either content or delivery variables - will not consistently utilize terminology consistent with the text and/or lecture.	Students are unable to critically evaluate public speeches.

Area A Courses

A1 Courses: ENGL 1 A, ENGLA H

A2 Courses: SPCH 1A, SPCH 1AH, SPCH 2, SPCH 8, SPCH 8H

Summary Comments – Area A English (September 2009) For the two courses (11 sections) examined, a total of 258 students were assessed out of which 236 met expectations for the GEO (91.5%). Open-ended responses from faculty members assessing this GEO show desires to improve the articulation of standards for the assignment to students. These open-ended responses also suggest that there are plans to develop other course-related exercises to improve the students' understanding of standards for the assignment.

Area English (May 2012): Notes from discussion 5/7/2012
We changed our outcome. The last outcome stated "sources" and we changed it to "text" for this one. It was about 2.5 years ago when we assessed this course. Students had a problem understanding what we meant by "source." We assess every year but not the same course every year as we have a 3-year rotation.

What was learned? We need to be more specific articulating what we want with the SLO. Switching the one word from sources to text indicated a jump in success. Changing the outcome statement was positive.

What are the implications for faculty, students, etc.? We changed the 1A Course Outline of Record. There were some minor changes as a result of the assessment. We need more text-based writing. Changing the word from sources to text was a departmental shift because students were confused about 'sources.' Every student must take 1A to transfer or get a degree. We changed the requirement of just 68 to 1A about 8 years ago and the state made the change 5 years ago.

How does your division plan to use the results related to the GEO? Assessing this semester in week 14 and have everything in TracDat by June30th. At our first department meeting in fall we will have a discussion about the results. Not sure where it will go, but we are excited to have the discussion.

Do you have any concerns about the forms or the process/mechanism? We don't mind TracDat; we don't plan on using the paper document. Process seems satisfactory. We have 41 full-time and 70-something part-time faculty with 60 sections of English 1A per term. *If you can create an orientation that puts the primary focus on SLOs then you can get money for adjuncts.*

Would you like to amend the GEO statements?
We've already done that. Once we assess this time, we'll want to have that discussion again.

Area Speech (Spring 2009) While the department needs to develop a more effective model of teaching direct eye contact, the other 3 categories of organization, body control, and volume seem far exceed our expectations. Faulty method, definitions that did not adequately describe expected performance level, or expecting too little from our students may be the cause in exceeding our expectations. As a result, we are not matching the rigor that we hope to achieve with our Speech 1A students. Therefore, we need to reevaluate what we expect, and develop SLOs to account for Speech 1A rigor. The exam questions were scored using the same criterion the SPCH 1AH students were held to and by the standard of one committee member. The Communication Department SLO Committee should revisit the method of assessment.