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# 1. INTRODUCTION: LEARNING GOAL #1

**Goal: Students can communicate effectively in writing and oral presentations.**

*Objective 1: Students will be able to write effectively.*

*Objective 2: Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

A major educational objective of the Howe School education is to ensure that all of our graduates have effective written and oral communications skills.

While many of our students have strong communications skills, other students, especially foreign students, need special training in this area. In the past, all academic programs and individual instructors have made an effort to assess and improve the communications skills of their students. An advantage of the AACSB assessment process is that it helps us take a more organized and uniform approach to achieving this crucial educational objective.

The communications learning goal as described in this report is the same for all undergraduate and graduate programs in the Howe School and is assessed using the same learning objectives, traits and rubrics as described in Sections 2 and 3 of this report.

In spring 2009, the Howe School developed a new web-based Writing Resource Center at <http://howe.stevens.edu/academics/aacsb-information/writing-resource-center/>.

This website is intended for use by:

1. Instructors wishing to help students improve their written and oral skills.
2. Students seeking information on Howe School communication skill requirements and the resources that are available at Stevens to help them meet these requirements.
3. Students seeking guidance on issues ranging from basic grammatical skills to the required format of master and PhD theses.

# 2. LEARNING OBJECTIVES AND TRAITS

The following table outlines the specific learning objectives and corresponding traits for the Howe School’s written and oral communications skill assessment:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective 1:** *Students will be able to write effectively.* | |
| **Traits** |  |
| Trait 1: | Logical Flow |
| Trait 2: | Grammar & Sentence Structure |
| Trait 3: | Spelling & Word Choice |
| Trait 4: | Development of Ideas |
| **Objective 2:** *Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.* | |
| **Traits** |  |
| Trait 1: | Organization & Logic |
| Trait 2: | Voice Quality |
| Trait 3: | Physical Presence |
| Trait 4: | Use of Slides to Enhance Communication |
| Trait 5: | Transitions/Time Management/Q&A |

# 3. RUBRICS

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Writing Rubric**  *Goal: Students will be able to communicate effectively in writing.* | | | | |
| **Trait** | **Poor (0)** | **Good (5)** | **Excellent (10)** | **Score** |
| **Trait 1:**  **Logical Flow** | Unclear introduction or conclusion. Does not use a sequence of material to lead reader through the paper. Draws illogical conclusions | Develops ideas through effective use of paragraphs, transitions, opening and concluding statements. Generally well structured to suggest connection between sub-topics. | Maintains clear focus, uses structure to build the paper's conclusions. Presents analysis using sequence of ideas, clarity of flow and continuous voice or point of view. |  |
| **Trait 2:**  **Grammar & Sentence Structure** | Frequently uses inappropriate grammar and incomplete or poorly structured sentences which interfere with comprehension. | Generally complies with standard English grammar and sentence usage. | Sophisticated use of English language, using varied sentence structured, phrasing and cadence. Grammar is error-free |  |
| **Trait 3:**  **Spelling & Word Choice** | Frequent misspellings. Poor or limited choice of words for expression of ideas. | Has proofread or checked spelling, and uses vocabulary correctly. Minor errors. | Demonstrates good use of words to support written expression of topic. Spelling is error-free. |  |
| **Trait 4:**  **Development of Ideas** | Many unsupported statements offered. Uses flawed or unclear reasoning. | Most statements supported, ideas explained with examples and written with sufficient explanation. | Shows thoughtful reasoning and explores alternatives. Uses existing, supported ideas to develop well-formed, readable output. |  |
| **Does not meet expectations: 0 – 19; Meets: 20-29; Exceeds: 30-40 Total Score:** | | | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation Rubric**  *Goal: Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.* | | | | |
| **Trait** | **Poor (0)** | **Good (5)** | **Excellent (10)** | **Score** |
| **Trait 1:  Organization & Logic** | Fails to introduce topic; no evidence of or poor logical flow of topic. | Prepares listeners for sequence and flow of topic. Loses place occasionally but flow and structure are still clear. | Engages listeners with overview, guides listeners through connections between sections, and alerts audience to key details and concepts. |  |
| **Trait 2: Voice Quality** | Cannot be heard or understood well due to volume, mumbling, speed, monotone delivery, and/or heavily accented English. | Clear delivery with well-modulated voice. Displays some confidence and enthusiasm, but may also contain flatter periods or sound overly rehearsed. | Exemplary delivery, with a voice that sounds fully engaged, conveys enthusiasm and confidence, and relates to the audience well. |  |
| **Trait 3: Physical Presence** | Turns away from audience or uses distracting gestures, such as pacing or tugging clothing. Speaker seems stiff, awkward or uncomfortable. Little eye contact. | Speaker is relaxed in front of the room and keeps distracting movements and gestures to a minimum. Generally faces audience and makes eye contact. | Speaker’s body language is superb and fully engages the room. Strong, consistent eye contact to the entire audience. Uses confident gestures to underscore key verbal points. |  |
| **Trait 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Communications** | Misspelled, too busy, too much text, too many slides for allotted time, and/or poor use of graphics like charts. | Slides are readable, containing a reasonable amount of material per slide. Good use of graphics or illustrations. | Slides are well written/designed, engaging to the audience, and used as support to verbal content presentation. |  |
| **Trait 5: Transitions Time Management Q&A** | Transitions are awkward or non-existent. Speakers go over time limits. Answers are disorganized or non-responsive. | Transitions are smooth. Speakers generally stay within time limits. Speakers respond to questions well and provide sufficient response. | Transitions are professional and very smooth. Speakers respond convincingly and address all aspects of question. |  |
| **Does not meet expectations: 0 – 19; Meets: 20-35; Exceeds: 36-50 Total Score:** | | | |  |

# 4. ASSESSMENT PROCESS

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Where & when measured?** | **How measured?** | **Criterion** |
| Students are assessed in the fall and spring semesters in the required course: *MGT 609 Project Management.* | Student presentations are video-taped, and student essays are assessed for writing skills. Feedback is provided to each individual student.  Sampling: Rubrics are completed for a sample of 30 students in each semester. | Students who score below (20) will be referred to Stevens tutoring and will be required to complete MGT 897 Technical Writing Webinar Series. |

The MSIS program assesses the communication learning skills of all students in *MGT 609 Project Management*. The instructor in the selected class collects written essays/case studies from students as part of the normal coursework. These writing samples are holistically graded by staff in the Howe School’s Business Communications Center. Feedback to students consists of a grade (*0 to 10; 0-3 = Does Not Meet Expectations; 4-7 = Meets Expectations; 8-10 = Exceeds Expectations*) plus a short description of the meaning of each score (see Appendix B). The instructor managing the learning goal receives a list of the students and their scores – which is used for AACSB reporting purposes.

# 5. RESULTS OF LEARNING GOAL ASSESSMENT – INTRODUCTION

The results of the initial learning goal assessments carried out to date are included below.

**Explanation**

Each learning goal has a number of learning objectives, and performance on each objective is measured using a rubric that, in turn, contains a number of desired “traits.” Students are scored individually on each trait.

The grading sheets for each student are used to develop a Summary Results Sheet for each learning goal objective. A selection of these summaries is included below.

The first table in the Summary Results Sheet for a learning objective/trait gives the counts of students falling in each of the three categories:

* Does Not Meet Expectations
* Meets Expectations
* Exceeds Expectations

The right-hand column in the table is used to record the average score of the students on each trait. This table provides an indication of the relative performance of students on each trait.

The second table on each sheet provides the counts of students who fall in each of the above three categories for the overall learning objective.

The person doing the assessment provides explanatory comments and recommendations on the bottom of the Results Summary Sheet. The recommendations improve content or pedagogy changes for the next time the course is given.

# 6. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: SPRING 2008

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will communicate effectively in written and oral communications.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #1:***Students will be able to write effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***April 4, 2008*

**ASSESSOR:***Heather Brown*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***13 Students – MGT 680 (Saturday)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **8** | **9** | **7.6** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **4** | **8** | **5** | **5.6** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **0** | **8** | **9** | **7.5** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **7** | **10** | **7.6** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **7.1** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **1** | **3** | **9** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Students were relatively weak on only one trait – grammar and sentence structure. Three students (18%) did not meet expectations with respect to written skills. The criterion of 85% of students meeting or exceeding expectations was not met for this objective.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Improve student performance on grammar and sentence structure by additional instruction. Improve essay format – best to grade 4–page essays that are not full of bullet points.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #2:***Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***April 4, 2008*

**ASSESSOR:***Heather Brown*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***13 Students – MGT/MIS 680 (Saturday)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **7** | **6** | **8.2** |
| 2: Voice & Body Language | **0** | **4** | **9** | **7.2** |
| 3: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **4** | **9** | **8.2** |
| 4: Ability to Answer Questions | **0** | **5** | **8** | **7.9** |
| 5: Content | **0** | **3** | **10** | **8.8** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **8.04** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **4** | **9** |

**COMMENTS:**

*This was a particularly strong group of students. I was pleased with the way that they heeded the criticisms from the first group of (non-graded) presentations and then improved for the final (graded) assignment.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Going forward, it may be useful to provide the students with more written instruction/texts to consult, in order to better prepare an oral presentation. Most often, this is each student’s first formal setting to learn how to become effective business communicators via a public presentation. As opposed to the writing segment of the assessment, which students have assumedly had previous instruction with, this facet of their studies is often brand new to them. Students often asked for reading materials, pointers, or a punch list of sorts to help them knock out the show-stopping errors from the onset.*

# 7. SPECIFIC STEPS TAKEN IN 2008-09

The current assessment process was continued in fall-spring 2008-09. It was decided to implement an improved process that will involve all students in fall 2009.

# 8. SPECIFIC STEPS IN FALL 2009: REVISED WRITTEN ASSESSMENT PROCESS (OBJECTIVE 1)

The following process was implemented in fall 2009 for ALL Howe School M.Sc. and MBA students:

1. Overall progress on written communication skills was achieved using the current AACSB Learning Goal Rubric – however, the assessment process was more accurately executed and extended to all M.Sc. students.
2. A single “Communications Coordinator” was appointed to manage the communications learning goal for all graduate degree programs.
3. For tracking purposes only, all entering graduate students were automatically enrolled in a newly required, non-credit graduate business communications skills course for zero credit – for which the communications coordinator was the instructor. For future semesters, all students will have to receive a passing grade in this course in order to graduate.
4. The Communications Learning Goal writing skills assessments was conducted in the required courses for each program. Students were required to submit a small 4-page maximum case study or exercise, as part of the normal coursework. One copy of this exercise was sent to the Communications Coordinator for writing skills assessment.
5. Each student was assessed individually by Howe School Communications Program staff. Adequate feedback was provided to each student (i.e., in addition to receiving an overall passing grade, students had their papers marked by the grader to show where organization, content or grammatical errors had occurred).
6. Students who did not receive a passing grade on the test were encouraged to:

a. *Part-time students*

* Take a designated free course in grammatical writing on the web and provide evidence of passing a corresponding test.
* Achieve a passing grade on a second assessment test administered by the Communications Department.

b. *Full-time students*

* Attend free tutoring classes offered by the Howe School’s Communications Department.
* Achieve a passing grade on a second assessment test administered by the Communications Department.

1. Students whose performance on the second assessment test was below a minimum threshold were required to take *COMM 501: Foundations of Technical Communication* or *COMM 500: Foundations of Business & Professional Communications*.

# 9. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: FALL 2009

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will communicate effectively in written and oral communications.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #1:***Students will be able to write effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***October 2009*

**ASSESSOR:***Mary Robin Whitney*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***30 Students – MGT 680/MIS 758/MGT 898 (Instructor: H. Kijne)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **18** | **12** | **6.8** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **10** | **15** | **5** | **5.3** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **2** | **17** | **11** | **6.2** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **18** | **12** | **6.9** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.3** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **7** | **17** | **9** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Students who are English-language challenged performed at low levels in Traits 2 and 3 with respect to grammar and syntax. Those for whom English is their first language performed generally quite well in those traits. Overall, the vast majority of students performed at or above expectations in Traits 1 and 4. Given that they are all working professionals, this is to be expected.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Students underperforming in Traits 2 and 3 must avail themselves of the resources suggested to them: the Writing and Communications Center, various OWLs and English-language immersion at high levels (e.g., nytimes.com, economist.com, Sports Illustrated). The few weaknesses exhibited in logic and idea development (Traits 1 and 4) can be remedied by the students’ making sure they are clear on the topic and create an outline before writing.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #2:***Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2009*

**ASSESSOR:***Mary Robin Whitney*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***30 Students – MGT 680/MIS 758/MGT 898 (Instructor: H. Kijne)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **19** | **11** | **6.1** |
| 2: Voice & Body Language | **10** | **12** | **8** | **4.9** |
| 3: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **5** | **16** | **9** | **5.3** |
| 4: Ability to Answer Questions | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| 5: Content | **0** | **21** | **9** | **6.3** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **5.6** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **10** | **10** | **10** |

**COMMENTS:**

*There is a very clear line of demarcation between those students who are very familiar with their material and have practiced, and those who have not: this impacts all traits. Overall, the results are good. Some of the ESL students were rather deficient, others surprisingly eloquent. A smattering of them had no visual aids (e.g., PPTs). Note that due to time constraints, Trait 4 was not explored.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Students exhibiting weaknesses in Traits 1, 3 and 5 need to become more familiar with their material and practice/time their presentation repeatedly. Being un- or under-prepared also weakens Trait 2, leading to hesitation, repetition and poor vocal modulation. Those with ESL interference must seek assistance from a communications specialist (e.g., WCC, ESL Director) and dedicate themselves to improving their spoken language skills.*

# 10. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: FALL 2010

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will communicate effectively in written and oral communications.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #1:***Students will be able to write effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2010*

**ASSESSOR:***WCC Staff*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***9 Students – MGT 689 (Instructor: H. Kijne)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **2** | **5** | **2** | **5.1** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **1** | **8** | **0** | **4.9** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **0** | **9** | **0** | **5.9** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **6** | **3** | **6.0** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **5.5** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **3** | **5** | **1** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Overall, the students in the MSIS program scored, on average, about the same as the other programs that participate in the Howe Writing Assessment Program. It is notable that these students scored higher in Trait 3 (spelling and word choice) than in Trait 1 (logical flow), which is the opposite of the typical results across the other programs, which generally tend to score higher in Traits 1 & 4 than in Traits 2 & 3. However, given the small sample size of the group (9 participants) not many conclusions can be drawn from this. It could represent an issue with logical flow of arguments in general, or it could simply be a statistical aberration.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Regardless of the validity of the overall statistics given the small sample size, it would be beneficial for all participants to partake of the services of the Writing & Communication Center (WCC) in order to receive a one-on-one consultation on their writing and receive more specific and relevant feedback and learning objectives. Instructors in the MSIS program should consider giving more specific writing feedback when grading papers, and inform students if their writing does not rise to professional standards. These students can be encouraged to visit the WCC, or an instructor can consider making it a mandatory component of their course grade.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #2:***Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***23 October 2010*

**ASSESSOR:***Mary Robin Whitney*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***15 Students – MGT 680/MIS 758/MGT 898 (Instructor: H. Kijne)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **4** | **7** | **4** | **6.1** |
| 2: Voice & Body Language | **5** | **5** | **5** | **5** |
| 3: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **3** | **10** | **2** | **5.3** |
| 4: Ability to Answer Questions | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| 5: Content | **2** | **11** | **3** | **6.3** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **5.6** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **3** | **10** | **2** |

**COMMENTS:**

*It was very clear that the MGT 689 course content was the driver behind this assignment, and that students’ grades for that course would be impacted by their performance here. Some followed the communications guidelines provided during the introductory session in September, but most treated the assignment as a “rough draft”. Overall, the results are acceptable. Note that due to time constraints, Trait 4 was not explored.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Students exhibiting weaknesses in Traits 1, 3 and 5 need to become more familiar with their material and practice/time their presentation repeatedly. Being un- or under-prepared also weakens Trait 2, leading to hesitation, repetition and poor vocal modulation. Those with ESL interference should have some assistance from a communications specialist (e.g., WCC, ESL Director) and dedicate themselves to improving their spoken language skills.. However, that availability on the week-end did not exist, but would have grreatly enhanced the performance of students in need, and the Practicum effort in general.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #2:***Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***11 December 2010*

**ASSESSOR:***Mary Robin Whitney*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***15 Students – MGT 680/MIS 758/MGT 898 (Instructor: H. Kijne)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **1** | **7** | **7** | **7.7** |
| 2: Voice & Body Language | **3** | **9** | **3** | **7** |
| 3: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **2** | **10** | **3** | **6.1** |
| 4: Ability to Answer Questions | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| 5: Content | **2** | **8** | **5** | **7.6** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **7.1** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **1** | **10** | **4** |

**COMMENTS:**

*The students took away a significant amount of Practicum content. The vast majority of students showed improvement across the board, and exhibited evidence of having internalized and actualized the course content and direction provided in October.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*The few who were somewhat deficient obviously had not practiced their presentations, or else were unable to overcome the stress of presenting in public: not everyone is successful at this task. The most effective remediation activities are: reviewing the tips and skills provided in September, taking the constructive criticism given in October, and understanding that everyone’s communications skills can improve with practice,*

# 11. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: FALL 2011

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will communicate effectively in written and oral communications.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #1:***Students will be able to write effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2011*

**ASSESSOR:***WCC Staff*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***54 Students – MGT 689 (Instructor: J. Morabito)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **38** | **16** | **6.7** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **7** | **38** | **9** | **5.7** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **4** | **42** | **8** | **6.0** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **41** | **13** | **6.5** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.3** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **8** | **34** | **12** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Overall, the students in the MSIS program scored, on average, slightly better than past groups. Historically, approximately 20-30% of participants scored “below expectations” on their total score, but for this MSIS group the number was about 15%. The average scores across the four criteria were also higher. This was not due to fewer students scoring below expectation on the four criteria, but rather due to more students exceeding expectations. This may be due to several factors, but it’s worth noting that this group was taught by a new instructor (Morabito) who may have given the group more detailed feedback on their written work. One area where this MSIS group did follow the past trend was in the fact that generally students scored lower on Traits 2 & 3 (grammar) and better on Traits 1 & 4 (development of ideas) which indicates that students still need to a lot more time for careful proofreading.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Instructors in the MSIS program should continue to provide detailed feedback to students on their written work, emphasizing grammar, word choice and sentence-level issues. Of course, all students should be encouraged to partake of the services of the Writing & Communication Center (WCC) in order to receive a one-on-one consultation on their writing and receive more specific and relevant feedback and learning objectives. In addition, all students should be encouraged (with heavy reinforcement by their instructor) to begin writing work early to allow enough time for proofreading. Students should also be encouraged to develop other resources, particularly peer review and feedback, to continue their development and prepare them for the professional world.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #2:***Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2011*

**ASSESSOR:***Mary Robin Whitney*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***7 Students – MGT 689/MIS 758/MGT 898 (Instructor: J. Morabito)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **3** | **4** | **9** |
| 2: Voice & Body Language | **0** | **3** | **4** | **9.3** |
| 3: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **3** | **4** | **9** |
| 4: Ability to Answer Questions | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| 5: Content | **0** | **3** | **4** | **9** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **9.075** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **3** | **4** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Despite the fact that the MIS 758 curriculum was abbreviated this semester, the students delivered very good presentations overall. There is no correlation between native English-language speakers and non-natives ones in their ability to present effectively. Note that due to time constraints, Trait 4 was not explored. Additionally, for the first time in this Assessor’s experience with MIS 758/MGT 680 or 689, the evaluation took place within a group presentation setting, as opposed to past individual efforts; however, each student was required to participate.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Students exhibiting weaknesses in Traits 1, 3 and 5 need to become more familiar with their material and practice/time their presentation repeatedly. Being un- or under-prepared also weakens Trait 2, leading to hesitation, repetition and poor vocal modulation. Those with ESL interference must seek assistance from a communications specialist (e.g., WCC, ESL Director) and dedicate themselves to improving their spoken language skills.*

# 12. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: FALL 2012

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will communicate effectively in written and oral communications.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #1:***Students will be able to write effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2012*

**ASSESSOR:***Carlson, Grilo, Wirstiuk, Grullon, Bruce*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***29 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **1** | **21** | **7** | **6.2** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **3** | **24** | **2** | **5.5** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **3** | **21** | **5** | **5.6** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **1** | **22** | **6** | **6.1** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **5.9** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **5** | **23** | **1** |

**COMMENTS:**

*See Spring 2013 Notes*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*See Spring 2013 Notes*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #2:***Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2012*

**ASSESSOR:***Mary Robin Whitney, Andrew Stein*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***20 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **10** | **10** | **7.0** |
| 2: Voice & Body Language | **1** | **16** | **3** | **5.6** |
| 3: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **1** | **15** | **4** | **6.0** |
| 4: Ability to Answer Questions | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| 5: Content | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.2** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **1** | **17** | **2** |

**COMMENTS:**

*See Spring 2013 Notes*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*See Spring 2013 Notes*

# 13. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: SPRING 2013

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will communicate effectively in written and oral communications.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #1:***Students will be able to write effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***May 2013*

**ASSESSOR:***Carlson, Wirstiuk, Grullon, Bruce*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***25 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **20** | **5** | **6.4** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **4** | **16** | **5** | **5.3** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **1** | **20** | **4** | **6.0** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **1** | **20** | **4** | **6.3** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.0** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **3** | **20** | **2** |

**COMMENTS:**

*The majority of the students in the MSIS program met or exceeded expectations in terms of their writing ability. In general, similar to the other programs, they continue to do better on the criteria that rate logical flow and idea development than on those that rate overall grammar, sentence structure, paragraph structure and word choice. Students in this program were also helped by the new ELC (English Language and Communication) requirements for all international graduate students, who are all required to take 1-2 semesters of ELC courses as part of their graduate curriculum.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Instructors in the MSIS program should continue to provide detailed feedback notes to students, highlighting areas where the students need to improve. Students should take more advantage of the resources of the Writing and Communication Center (WCC) which has plans to begin offering online sessions next fall. Additionally, by the fall we should have 2-3 new writing and communication video tutorials posted online to reinforce basic concepts and provide students with the opportunity to review the material on their own time.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #2:***Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***April 2013*

**ASSESSOR:***Mary Robin Whitney, Andrew Stein*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***18 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **1** | **17** | **8.67** |
| 2: Voice & Body Language | **0** | **6** | **12** | **7.58** |
| 3: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **1** | **17** | **8.67** |
| 4: Ability to Answer Questions | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| 5: Content | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **8.30** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **2** | **16** |

**COMMENTS:**

*All of the students in this program were at or above expectations in their ability to present effectively. In general, organization and the ability to use slides effectively to convey the speaker’s message was strong, likely due to strong modeling of professional techniques by the instructor. The biggest variance came in the trait assessing voice and body language, which is much more closely related to level of public speaking experience and, to some degree, whether or not the presenter was a native speaker. Due to the nature of the projects and the time constraints, Traits 4 & 5 were not assessed.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*The only effective way to improve Trait 2 is to practice public speaking at every opportunity, so all students are encouraged to do so. Some of these opportunities will present themselves in other Stevens’ classes, and some will present themselves in outside situations. Stevens’ ELC classes now feature an even greater emphasis on spoken language, including mandatory work in the Language Lab where students practice English pronunciation. Students should also continue to observe other PowerPoint slideshows (on campus or at workplaces) to see the best (and worst) of professional practices. Also, newer slideshow creators such as Prezi should be explored. This year many students benefitted from two Presentation Video Tutorials that were created and posted online. Viewing of these, and any new, tutorials should be made mandatory for all students.*

# 14. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: FALL 2013

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will communicate effectively in written and oral communications.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #1:***Students will be able to write effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***Nov-Dec 2013*

**ASSESSOR:***Bruce, Hardin, Grullon, Kreisler, Wirtsiuk, Pelphrey, Kephart*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***34 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **1** | **22** | **11** | **6.6** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **8** | **20** | **6** | **5.1** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **2** | **27** | **5** | **5.2** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **3** | **23** | **8** | **6.1** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **5.7** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **13** | **15** | **6** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Once again, the large majority of students in the MSIS program met or exceeded expectations in terms of their overall writing ability. As we have seen in the past, these students tend to do better in the areas of logical flow and development of ideas, indicating that they understand what they want to say and the right way to organize their ideas. Their scores in the areas that rate sentence and paragraph structure, grammar and word choice are somewhat lower. This may be attributable to several factors, including the students having less experience with longer-form writing due to the rise of smartphones and social media, plus the fact that a significant portion of the students are English Language Learners.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Instructors in the MSIS program should continue to provide specific, written feedback to student papers, indicating not just where mistakes have been made but also, in some cases, showing examples of how the writing can be fixed to read smoother or better get across the ideas. As always, the Writing and Communications Center (WCC) can be a great resource to all students, and instructors should encourage students who are in need of additional assistance to take advantage of it. There is also a growing collection of online webinars, seminars and videos (Ted Talks, Khan Academy) that are available to students to allow them to build their skills and understanding of the writing process outside of the classroom.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #2:***Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***Dec 2013*

**ASSESSOR:***Billy Middleton, Mary Robin Whitney, Andrew Stein*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***6 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **6** | **0** | **5.8** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **6** | **0** | **5.3** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **6** | **0** | **5.1** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **6** | **0** | **5.7** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **6** | **0** | **6.0** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **5.6** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **6** | **0** |

**COMMENTS:**

*A large majority of students in the MSIS program were at or above expectations in their overall ability to deliver oral presentations. Scores for Organization and Logic were universally high, but this is likely attributable to the fact that they often model similar presentations done by the instructor. Similarly, time management and Q&A were often not a major factor. The largest variances occurred in the areas of voice quality, physical presence and the slides themselves. Some students are more natural “performers” and some clearly rehearsed more than others. Body language was generally professional, but eye contact was a major issue for some speakers. The quality of the slides varied significantly from group to group, but in most cases the students recognized the flaws in their slides once they were pointed out.*

*It should also be noted that the Presentation Rubric was slightly revised for fall 2013. The criteria for voice and body language were split apart (as these are very different aspects) and several new elements such as time management and transitions were added. We believe that this revised rubric better represents the skills the students will have to master in the outside world.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Perhaps more than with any other kind of business communication, the key to improving public speaking ability is practice. Of course, students can and should rehearse their presentations before they deliver them, but this also means that students should push themselves to speak publicly at every opportunity, not just when it is required by an academic exercise. From a vocal perspective, many students need to work on injecting more enthusiasm into their delivery, and use vocal dynamics to convey engagement and excitement about the material. Maintaining eye contact was a major problem for some speakers, and it is recommended that students rehearse their material while not sitting in front of a computer. If staring at a computer while speaking feels normal, then it is more likely they will disengage from the audience and talk to the screen while presenting.*

# 15. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: SPRING 2014

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will communicate effectively in written and oral communications.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #1:***Students will be able to write effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***Mar-May 2014*

**ASSESSOR:***Bruce, Hardin, Grullon, Kreisler, Pelphrey, Kephart*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***31 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **1** | **15** | **15** | **7.3** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **5** | **19** | **7** | **5.8** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **2** | **22** | **7** | **6.3** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **19** | **12** | **7.1** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.6** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **2** | **19** | **10** |

**COMMENTS:**

*The large majority of students in the MSIS Program continue to meet or exceed expectations in their overall writing ability. These students typically do better in areas dealing with organization of their ideas, supporting arguments, providing specific examples, and generating a clear flow in their writing. While spelling is typically strong (thanks to spell-checkers), certain grammatical issues such as subject-verb agreement, run-on sentences, word choice, and misused or inconsistent punctuation are still present in the writing to various degrees. Faculty are likely not line editing these papers, and students are perhaps unaware of the errors they are repeatedly making.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Students should be encouraged to visit the Writing and Communications Center even if they receive a good grade on a paper. Specialists there can go over the writing and writing style with the student and attempt to highlight areas for continued improvement. Online sessions are now being offered, so even students with full-time employment can utilize the Center. It would also be useful for the instructor to set aside a small amount of class time for peer-to-peer document review, where students can see the writing style (pros and cons) of their fellow students. These sessions would be an opportunity to stress the importance of writing and communications to the entire class.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #2:***Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***Apr-May 2014*

**ASSESSOR:***Billy Middleton, Mary Robin Whitney, Andrew Stein*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***26 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **13** | **13** | **7.1** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **2** | **21** | **3** | **6.0** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **1** | **24** | **1** | **6.4** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **26** | **0** | **6.8** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **22** | **4** | **6.6** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.6** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **1** | **14** | **11** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Overall scores for presentation skills for students in the MSIS program continue to be set at or above expectations. In general, most of the students can accurately and confidently deliver a business level presentation. However, it should be noted that in most classes students are given an overall template to follow, so many of the structural questions and issues are taken out of their hands. Slide quality was perhaps the largest variable from group to group, and represented not so much a gap in talent as a difference in preparation; it was always fairly obvious which groups had put the requisite time and thought into their slides and which groups had not. Physically, many presenters still need to work on fully facing the audience (instead of the screen) while speaking, and maintaining eye contact.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*It is recommended that the instructors encourage their students to practice delivering their presentations while NOT sitting in front of their computers. When speakers become too comfortable with staring at the screen while practicing, it encourages them to disengage from the audience and speak to the screen during the real thing. Students should continue to practice speaking whenever possible, and faculty are encouraged to assign more short, impromptu speaking opportunities so that students understand that public speaking is not only something done for a midterm or a final exam.*

# 16. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: FALL 2014

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will communicate effectively in written and oral communications.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #1:***Students will be able to write effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***November-December 2014*

**ASSESSOR:***Bruce, Hardin, Pelphrey, Kephart, Minsloff, Ketchum*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***65 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **44** | **21** | **6.6** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **3** | **55** | **7** | **5.2** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **1** | **51** | **13** | **5.9** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **45** | **20** | **6.5** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.0** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **9** | **46** | **10** |

**COMMENTS:**

*A significantly majority of students in this program meets or exceeds expectations in their written communication. By and large, these documents are clearly organized and professionally structured, with enough specific detail and supported arguments. As has been the case for several semesters, the areas which lag behind are those dedicated to paragraph- and sentence-level issues such as grammar, punctuation, word choice and sentence length. The vast majority of these documents would benefit from more deliberate writing, and specifically from more careful and dedicated proofreading.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Instructors should continue to encourage students to begin projects early to allow enough time for attention to the quality of their writing. Students should also be encouraged (or even mandated) to visit the Writing and Communications Center on a regular basis for feedback. It might also be beneficial for instructors to dedicate some portion of class time to peer feedback – where students get to read and evaluate the writing of other members of the class. This can serve as a useful way to highlight common issues and errors that can more easily be recognized when reading a paper that the student did not write.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #2:***Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2014*

**ASSESSOR:***Billy Middleton, Mary Robin Whitney, Andrew Stein****, Zachary Balog***

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***48 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **30** | **18** | **7.4** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **39** | **9** | **6.9** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **32** | **14** | **6.7** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **46** | **2** | **6.3** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **17** | **31** | **7.6** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **7.0** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **31** | **17** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Students in this program continue to perform at or above expectations in the delivery of oral presentations. Although certain issues continue to plague the group overall (such as a lack of enthusiasm and not enough eye contact) the fundamentals of clear organization, stable and professional body language, and speaking loudly and slowly enough, were firmly in evidence. PowerPoint slides were generally strong, with clear labels, good use of color and professional layouts. The consistent negatives were use of small fonts and generally placing too much data/text on the slides.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*The most obvious means of improving presentation skills are obvious and unchanging: be familiar with the material and practice. Beyond that, the two elements that need the most work are eye contact and enthusiasm. For that, it is recommended that students are encouraged, and given opportunities, to practice their presentations in front of a group prior to the official presentation. A mandated peer review practice session, where other members of the group, and of other groups, can see the errors that are being made, and encourage their peers to improve their style, would be most beneficial. It would also be useful if the instructor could grade on their presentation style, which would encourage students to focus more of their attention on their delivery.*

# 17. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: SPRING 2015

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will communicate effectively in written and oral communications.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #1:***Students will be able to write effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***February-April 2015*

**ASSESSOR:***Bruce, Hardin, Pelphrey, Kephart, Minsloff, Ketchum*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***23 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **17** | **6** | **6.7** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **1** | **22** | **1** | **5.6** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **2** | **20** | **3** | **5.7** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **18** | **5** | **6.0** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.0** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **5** | **14** | **4** |

**COMMENTS:**

The majority of students assessed this semester met or exceeded expectations in their writing. In general, overall organization and development of ideas were the strongest aspects of the work. Arguments were supported well, and ideas were explained and linked together clearly. As is often the case with academic work, the papers also showed signs of having been written quickly, with little effective proofreading. All writing would benefit tremendously from going through the drafting process, using multiple revisions to refine both the ideas as well as the sentence structure, word choice, and readability.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Faculty should strongly encourage students to leave extra time for the writing process, and mandate that students to go through multiple drafts for the major writing assignments. Requiring students to bring early drafts to class for a round of peer review can be an effective way to accomplish this. It would also be helpful if faculty could assign one revision assignment during the semester, requiring students to incorporate the written feedback they received from the instructor (and peers) into a subsequent draft.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #2:***Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***April 2015*

**ASSESSOR:***Billy Middleton, Mary Robin Whitney, Andrew Stein*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***16 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **2** | **14** | **8.1** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **2** | **14** | **0** | **5.0** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **7** | **9** | **0** | **4.5** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **5** | **9** | **2** | **4.4** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **7** | **9** | **6.9** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **5.8** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **1** | **14** | **1** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Students in this program perform at or above expectations in all areas of assessment in their oral presentations. Overall structure and professional body language continue to be very strong, and voice quality is generally quite good. Many students need to work on accent reduction, but that is something that develops over time. PowerPoint slides were generally quite strong, but the problem areas continue to be in the layouts (busy slides) and the use of small fonts which make readability difficult.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Familiarity with the material and practice are the two key ways to improve presentation performance. Beyond that, students should be encouraged to limit the amount of data on a slide to 2-3 key points. Often, students design slides to also function as a handout, which generally undermines their clarity in a live presentation. Mandating peer review, where students outside their own group can give them feedback before they present, may go a long way to catching some of the more egregious errors.*

# 18. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: FALL 2015

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will communicate effectively in written and oral communications.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #1:***Students will be able to write effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2015*

**ASSESSOR:***Bruce, Hardin, Grullon, Pelphrey, Kephart*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***85 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **1** | **62** | **22** | **6.3** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **12** | **62** | **11** | **5.4** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **10** | **68** | **7** | **5.5** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **2** | **71** | **12** | **6.1** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **5.8** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **23** | **53** | **9** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Most of the students in this program meet or exceed expectations in their writing. Overall development and support of arguments remain consistently strong. Organization and document structure are generally clear and professional. On the sentence and word level, quality begins to diminish. Sentences are more often long and hard to break down. Word choice is sometimes repetitive or incorrect. Ineffective proofreading often results in poor grammar and/or inconsistent style.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Faculty need to encourage more and more effective proofreading. This can be accomplished by requiring early drafts to be turned in for feedback or setting aside class time for dedicated peer review. Faculty should also require at least one visit to the Writing & Communications Center on campus, where common errors and issues can be pointed out. It would also be helpful for faculty to bring in examples of professional and successful writing for the students to analyze and discuss.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #2:***Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2015*

**ASSESSOR:***Billy Middleton, Mary Robin Whitney, Zachary Balog, Andrew Stein*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***86 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **46** | **40** | **7.5** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **75** | **11** | **6.0** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **71** | **15** | **5.7** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **77** | **9** | **5.2** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **36** | **50** | **6.8** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.2** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **68** | **18** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Students in this program continue to excel at some aspects of presenting, while other areas continue to need work. Overall organization remains very strong, with virtually all of the material presented logically and professionally. Students clearly know how to get their points across. Body language is generally strong. Certain aspects of voice quality, usually volume and clarity, remain relatively high, while enthusiasm and dynamics are much more hit and miss. Some speakers clearly make an attempt to engage the audience, while others have a much flatter delivery. Eye contact is also very inconsistent, with some speakers talking to the screen too much, seemingly because they need to pull data from the slides. The one area where almost all presenters need work is in slide quality. Slides contain too much information, are too cluttered, and text is too small. Despite these issues, when all of the scores are considered, the majority of students in this group perform at or above expectations.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Students should be required to complete their PowerPoint decks at least three days prior to their presentation, so they have time for feedback and the opportunity to avoid some of the slide construction issues that consistently occur. Students should also be encouraged to project these slides onto a screen and view them from the back of a room. Very possibly, some of these problems would then be discovered and addressed. It would also give the speakers more opportunity to rehearse the oral component and get more comfortable with the material, reducing the need to look at the slides while they speak.*

# 19. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: SPRING 2016

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will communicate effectively in written and oral communications.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #1:***Students will be able to write effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***May 2016*

**ASSESSOR:***Pelphrey, Kephart*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***35 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **31** | **4** | **6.2** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **5** | **28** | **2** | **5.0** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **1** | **32** | **2** | **5.7** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **2** | **31** | **2** | **5.6** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **5.7** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **6** | **27** | **2** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Most of the students in this program meet or exceed expectations in their writing. Support of arguments remain consistently strong. Overall development is clear and professional. Organization and document structure are within professional norms. The writing quality at the sentence and word levels begin to diminish. Run-on sentences, wordiness, redundancy and incorrect usage are issues for many writers. Ineffective proofreading often results in poor grammar and/or inconsistent style.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Effective proofreading remains key. Faculty should be modeling this and encourage more peer review and utilization of the Writing and Communications Center. More examples of professional-level writing should be brought to class and analyzed.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #2:***Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***May 2016*

**ASSESSOR:***Billy Middleton, Mary Robin Whitney, Zachary Balog, Andrew Stein*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***53 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **33** | **20** | **7.2** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **46** | **7** | **5.5** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **48** | **5** | **5.5** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **75** | **8** | **5.2** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **37** | **16** | **6.3** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **5.9** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **49** | **4** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Students in this program continue to excel at some aspects of presenting, while other areas continue to need work. Organization remains strong, with students utilizing clear and professional structures. Body language is generally strong. Volume and clarity are usually quite strong, but most speakers need to continue to work on their enthusiasm and vocal dynamics. Eye contact continues to be a major issue for many speakers. Slide quality varies considerably, but most presenters need to work on de-cluttering their slides and using more visual cues to direct the audience’s attention.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Students should be encouraged to start projects early, so they have enough time to focus on the slide quality and practice their delivery. More peer review of the decks, and even of the verbal components, would be very helpful. Aspects like professional transitions between speakers and the importance of projecting enthusiasm should be discussed (and modeled) in class.*

# 20. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: FALL 2016

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will communicate effectively in written and oral communications.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #1:***Students will be able to write effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2016*

**ASSESSOR:***Pelphrey, Kephart, Carlson, Minsloff, Cashbaugh, Tremallo*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***100 Students – MGT 609, BIA 650, FIN 623*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **7** | **57** | **36** | **6.5** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **10** | **70** | **20** | **5.9** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **6** | **67** | **27** | **6.2** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **8** | **54** | **38** | **6.5** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.3** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **15** | **54** | **31** |

**COMMENTS:**

*A majority of students in this program meet or exceed expectations in their writing. The ability to support arguments with clear evidence continues to be a strong trait. Overall development is clear and professional. Organization and document structure tend to be clear and professional. Quality at the sentence- and word-level continues to be inconsistent. Some score quite high, while others (often if English is not their primary language) struggle a bit more to clearly articulate their ideas. Poor grammar and awkward or inconsistent style is also common among this group.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Poor proofreading continues to plague this group, and this is something that the faculty can and should address in a very direct way. Asking students to bring in drafts of their work for proofreading exchanges could help the students recognize the most common errors they are committing. Showing students “before” and “after” versions of professional documents, allowing them to see the amount of improvement that stronger proofreading can bring, may be an excellent motivator.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #2:***Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2016*

**ASSESSOR:***Middleton, Balog, Pelphrey, Stein*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***75 Students – MGT 609, BIA 650, FIN 623*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **44** | **31** | **7.4** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **66** | **11** | **6.2** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **1** | **57** | **17** | **5.6** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **65** | **10** | **5.7** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **55** | **20** | **6.5** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.3** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **63** | **12** |

**COMMENTS:**

*All of the students in this group met or exceeded overall expectations for presenting this semester. Organization and Logic (Trait 1) continues to be strong. All presentations were structured clearly and professionally. As usual, there was much local variation in traits 2, 3 and 4, but in general the majority of the scores were in the “Meets Expectations” range. The variations were due to different levels of speaking experience and comfort, as well as different approaches to slide creation. In general, presenters often tried to include too much data on individual slides, often making them muddled and confusing. Poor eye contact continues to plague this group, and most speakers could use improvement in speed and tone of voice.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*No major change in remedial action is recommended. Starting work on the PowerPoint slides early is the key to a successful presentation, both in terms of slide quality and also because it allows additional time for practice and confidence building. Workshopping of presentations as they are being developed, and in-class practice and peer feedback, should continue to be fostered and encouraged.*

# 21. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: SPRING 2017

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will communicate effectively in written and oral communications.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #1:***Students will be able to write effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***May 2017*

**ASSESSOR:***Pelphrey, Kephart, Carlson*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***48 Students – MGT 609, BIA 650, FIN 629*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **3** | **32** | **13** | **6.0** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **9** | **32** | **7** | **5.4** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **3** | **35** | **10** | **5.8** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **4** | **34** | **10** | **5.7** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **5.7** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **11** | **29** | **8** |

**COMMENTS:**

*A majority of students in this program meet or exceed expectations in their writing. The ability to support arguments with clear evidence continues to be a strong trait. Overall development is clear and professional. Organization and document structure tend to be clear and professional. Quality at the sentence- and word-level continues to be inconsistent. Some score quite high, while others (often if English is not their primary language) struggle a bit more to clearly articulate their ideas. Poor grammar and awkward or inconsistent style is also common among this group.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Faculty should make more efforts to workshop documents within the framework of the class, allowing students to read and identify the errors that other writers are making in an attempt to improve their own proofreading skills. If students cannot see their own incorrect grammar and awkward sentence structure, they cannot hope to correct it.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #2:***Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***May 2017*

**ASSESSOR:***Middleton, Balog, Pelphrey*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***43 Students – MGT 609, BIA 650, FIN 629*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **10** | **33** | **7.7** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **19** | **24** | **7.4** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **31** | **12** | **7.1** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **37** | **6** | **6.9** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **37** | **6** | **6.9** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **7.2** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **15** | **28** |

**COMMENTS:**

*All of the students in this group met or exceeded overall expectations for presenting this semester. Organization and Logic (Trait 1) continues to be strong. All presentations were structured clearly and professionally. As usual, there was much local variation in traits 2, 3 and 4, but in general the majority of the scores were in the “Meets Expectations” range. The variations were due to different levels of speaking experience and comfort, as well as different approaches to slide creation. In general, presenters often tried to include too much data on individual slides, often making them muddled and confusing. Poor eye contact continues to plague this group, and most speakers could use improvement in speed and tone of voice.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*The areas of concentration continue to be in eye contact and slide creation. For the physical side, students need to be encouraged (or even mandated) to create their talking points far in advance, to allow themselves adequate time to become familiar with their own material and not need to rely on the slides for support. As for the slides themselves, instructors are encouraged to grade the presentations on slide simplicity and clarity, not just the sum total of information present. Without this, the students are incentivized to create highly-detailed and dense slides which show their knowledge but are not always easy for an audience to digest.*

# 22. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: FALL 2017

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will communicate effectively in written and oral communications.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #1:***Students will be able to write effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2017*

**ASSESSOR:***Pelphrey, Kephart, Hardin*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***105 Students – MGT 609, BIA 650, MGT 635*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **71** | **34** | **6.6** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **10** | **87** | **8** | **5.3** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **4** | **85** | **16** | **5.8** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **2** | **77** | **26** | **6.2** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.0** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **18** | **73** | **14** |

**COMMENTS:**

*The majority of students in this program continue to meet or exceed expectations in their writing. The documents are generally clearly developed and writers continue to use supporting evidence effectively in creating their arguments. As many of these students are non-native English speakers, word- and sentence-level issues continue to be the largest source of problems. Grammar errors and overall inconsistencies in writing style and are also present, and reflect a deficiency in the ability to proofread and recognize certain repeated writing issues.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Writers are strongly encouraged to seek assistance from the Writing & Communication Center on campus to refine and improve their proofreading abilities. Recognizing common errors is the first (and most crucial) step to addressing them. Allowing students extra class time to submit their documents for peer review would also be helpful. Wherever possible, instructors should give out samples of documents (both academic and professional) to model professional-level writing for all students.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #2:***Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2017*

**ASSESSOR:***Middleton, Balog, Pelphrey, Whitney, Stein*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***98 Students – MGT 609, BIA 650, FIN 623*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **16** | **82** | **8.3** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **51** | **47** | **7.3** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **54** | **45** | **6.8** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **64** | **24** | **6.5** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **45** | **53** | **7.7** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **7.3** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **41** | **57** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Most of the students met or exceeded expectations for presenting this semester. The strongest areas continue to be Organization and Logic. This is likely due to the fact that they are given examples of successful pitches in class and model their own pitches on them. Traits 2, 3 and 4 continue to vary (sometimes wildly) from group to group. Different levels of speaking comfort and experience led to wide variations in #2. All students should take every opportunity to speak publicly in order to get more comfortable with the process. Poor and inconsistent eye contact continues to be a problem. In slide creation, the biggest issues were small text size and slides cramped with tables and other data. These are due, at least in part, to students mimicking sample presentations, and so it is recommended that instructors be more aware of pointing out these problems when giving out samples in class.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*As mentioned above, faculty should be aware of the pros and cons of giving out presentation examples to students. They tend to copy what they see, both the good and the bad. Faculty can also make an explicit distinction between what they require in an academic presentation, and the different expectations that may come into play when preparing a presentation for external stakeholders.*

# 23. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: FALL 2018

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will communicate effectively in written and oral communications.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #1:***Students will be able to write effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***Dec 2018*

**ASSESSOR:***Hardin, Kephart, Minsloff, Mendez-Booth*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***68 Students – MGT 609, BIA 650, EMT 635, MGT 635, FE 800*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **3** | **33** | **32** | **6.9** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **7** | **54** | **7** | **5.4** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **4** | **50** | **14** | **5.8** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **4** | **47** | **17** | **6.3** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.1** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **12** | **42** | **14** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Students overall continue to perform better in the technical/sentence-level aspects of writing. Sentences are generally clear and word choice is appropriate for the type of document. Scores tended to be slightly lower in the areas of developing cohesive arguments and supporting points with specific details and facts. Some of this is attributed to the types of documents we assess, which often rely more on recounting information than developing new ideas. However, some of this may be caused by the students not fully grasping the distinction between stating an opinion and supporting an argument.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Given the comments above, it is recommended that faculty read student work with a specific eye toward developing arguments and providing support. Point out were students are presenting their interpretation of data as facts, or when they are making arguments without providing supporting data. This may require rethinking the writing assignments within class, or possibly creating new assignments which can highlight these issues and force students to develop these skills.*

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE #2:***Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2018*

**ASSESSOR:***Middleton, Whitney, Pelphrey, Balog, Stein*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***79 Students – BIA 650, MGT 609, FE 800*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **21** | **58** | **9.1** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **31** | **48** | **8.5** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **28** | **51** | **7.1** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **35** | **44** | **7.2** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **25** | **54** | **8.7** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **8.4** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **10** | **69** |

**COMMENTS:**

*The large majority of students across all of these groups continue to perform at or above expectations in delivering oral presentations. While there is clear variation of style and comfort levels, as well as challenges presented by English Language Learners, almost everyone presents in a professional way. The biggest challenge to the students seems to be breaking out of the restrictive Powerpoint style and finding a way to present their information in a unique, interesting and compelling way. Judging by the general similarity of slide layouts across groups, it can be assumed that most groups are mirroring samples provided by the instructor. What is necessary to pass a course, may not work in all professional environments. Also, since some groups are now presenting remotely it is impossible to assess their physical presence. And there are so many groups presenting that Q&A (a critical component in a “real” presentation( is often abandoned due to time demands.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*It is recommended that faculty focus more attention on the visual representation of class data and include this as a component of the final project grade. Faculty can also provide additional opportunities for oral presentation during the semester (even if these are done in smaller groups) and to encourage peer feedback. Allowing time for a brief Q&A after each presentation would also be greatly beneficial.*

# 24. OUTCOMES: MSIS LEARNING GOAL # 1 AFTER ROUNDS OF ASSESSMENT

**After First Round Review – Fall 2008**

**Written Communications Skills**

The current assessment process does not adequately address the need of the MSIS Program to produce graduates with strong communication skills. While assessments are being performed, too little is being done to ensure improvement of individual students. The plan described in Section 9 below should address this problem.

**Oral Communications Skills**

Oral presentations are an important component of every course in the MSIS curriculum. The current system of videotaping student team presentations in Saturday sections of MGT 680 and providing expert feedback twice per semester is working well. This process needs to be extended to more students in the MSIS curriculum.

**After Second Round Review – Fall 2009**

**Written Communications Skills**

Students underperforming in Traits 2 and 3 must avail themselves of the resources suggested to them: the Writing and Communications Center, various OWLs and English-language immersion at high levels (e.g., nytimes.com, economist.com, Sports Illustrated). The few weaknesses exhibited in logic and idea development (Traits 1 and 4) can be remedied by the students’ making sure they are clear on the topic and create an outline before writing.

**Oral Communications Skills**

Students exhibiting weaknesses in Traits 1, 3 and 5 need to become more familiar with their material and practice/time their presentation repeatedly. Being un- or under-prepared also weakens Trait 2, leading to hesitation, repetition and poor vocal modulation. Those with ESL interference must seek assistance from a communications specialist (e.g., WCC, ESL Director) and dedicate themselves to improving their spoken language skills.

**After Third Round Review – Fall 2010**

**Written Communications Skills**

The Howe Assessment Program has the capability to be a useful tool in diagnosing the writing and communication problems of the participants, and beginning the process of improving those skills through the MGT 897 Technical Writing Webinar Series. However, this program faced two significant hurdles in the past year.

The first was a lack of participation by a significant percentage of the students. Although the program was technically mandatory, there was no mechanism in place to enforce participation. Some students registered on the eLearn website but did not submit documents; others did not even register at all. For students that did submit documents for assessment, there was no way to confirm they read or processed the written feedback they received.

The second hurdle was that there was no required prescriptive process for students who received a “does not meet expectations” grade on their submission. As mentioned previously, it was strongly recommended that these students (approximately 30% of the entire current submission pool) be required to satisfactorily complete MGT 897 Technical Writing Webinar Series within 8 weeks of receiving their grade. MGT 897 is a useful first step in helping these students improve their written communication skills.

As of July 2010, the Howe School Academic Council has approved making the MGT 898 Howe Assessment an official requirement for graduation for all Howe students. Additionally, MGT 897 Technical Writing Webinar Series has been made an official requirement for graduation for all students who do not pass MGT 898.

This action should greatly improve the effectiveness of the entire 898/897 Howe communications program.

**Oral Communications Skills**

*To be included later.*

**After Fourth Round Review – Fall 2011**

**Written Communications Skills**

Beginning in Fall 2011, the Howe Writing Assessment Program (MGT 898) became an official requirement for graduation for all Howe students. At the same time, students who scored “below expectations” on the Assessment are now required to complete the Technical Writing Webinar Series (MGT 897).

The combination of these two programs moves the Howe School a long way toward achieving Learning Objective #1. While no substitute for a formal writing course, the combined Assessment/Webinar serves to make all participants more aware of the importance of clear and effective writing, and of their own specific writing issues and challenges. As the program continues to grow and evolve, it should help provide a clear path to improving the communication skills of all Howe students.

**Oral Communications Skills**

*To be included later.*

The following table shows the average scores on each goal objective for the last 5 years.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Objective 1  Written Communication | Objective 1  Oral Communication |
| Spring 2008 | 7.1 | 8.0 |
| Fall 2009 | 6.3 | 5.6 |
| Fall 2010 | 5.5 | 7.1 |
| Fall 2011 | 6.3 | 9.1 |
| Fall 2012 | 5.9 | 6.2 |
| Spring 2013 | 6.0 | 8.3 |
| Fall 2013 | 5.7 | 5.6 |
| Spring 2014 | 6.6 | 6.6 |
| Fall 2014 | 6.0 | 7.0 |
| Spring 2015 | 6.0 | 5.8 |
| Fall 2015 | 5.8 | 6.2 |
| Spring 2016 | 5.7 | 5.9 |
| Fall 2016 | 6.3 | 6.3 |
| Spring 2017 | 5.7 | 7.2 |
| Fall 2017 | 6.0 | 7.3 |
| Fall 2018 | 6.1 | 8.4 |

# 25. CLOSE LOOP PROCESS – CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORD

**Assurance of Learning**

**Assessment/Outcome Analysis**

**Close Loop Process - Continuous Improvement Record**

**Program:** Master of Science in Information Systems

**Goal 1:** Students can communicate effectively in written and oral communications

**Goal Owner:** Michael Zur Muehlen & Andrew Stein

**Where Measured:** Students are assessed in the fall and spring semesters in the required course: **MGT 609** Project Management.

**How Measured:** Student presentations are video-taped, and student essays are assessed for writing skills. Feedback is provided to each individual student.

Sampling: Rubrics are completed for a sample of 30 students in each semester.

**Closing the Loop: Actions taken on specific objectives**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective 1** | | *Students will be able to write effectively.* | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2018* | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | *Given the comments above, it is recommended that faculty read student work with a specific eye toward developing arguments and providing support. Point out were students are presenting their interpretation of data as facts, or when they are making arguments without providing supporting data. This may require rethinking the writing assignments within class, or possibly creating new assignments which can highlight these issues and force students to develop these skills.* | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2017* | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | *Writers are strongly encouraged to seek assistance from the Writing & Communication Center on campus to refine and improve their proofreading abilities. Recognizing common errors is the first (and most crucial) step to addressing them. Allowing students extra class time to submit their documents for peer review would also be helpful. Wherever possible, instructors should give out samples of documents (both academic and professional) to model professional-level writing for all students.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Spring 2017* | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | *Faculty should make more efforts to workshop documents within the framework of the class, allowing students to read and identify the errors that other writers are making in an attempt to improve their own proofreading skills. If students cannot see their own incorrect grammar and awkward sentence structure, they cannot hope to correct it.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2016* | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | *Poor proofreading continues to plague this group, and this is something that the faculty can and should address in a very direct way. Asking students to bring in drafts of their work for proofreading exchanges could help the students recognize the most common errors they are committing. Showing students “before” and “after” versions of professional documents, allowing them to see the amount of improvement that stronger proofreading can bring, may be an excellent motivator.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Spring 2016* | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | *Effective proofreading remains key. Faculty should be modeling this and encourage more peer review and utilization of the Writing and Communications Center. More examples of professional-level writing should be brought to class and analyzed.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2015* | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | *Faculty should strongly encourage students to leave extra time for the writing process, and mandate that students to go through multiple drafts for the major writing assignments. Requiring students to bring early drafts to class for a round of peer review can be an effective way to accomplish this. It would also be helpful if faculty could assign one revision assignment during the semester, requiring students to incorporate the written feedback they received from the instructor (and peers) into a subsequent draft.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Spring 2015* | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | *Faculty should strongly encourage students to leave extra time for the writing process, and mandate that students to go through multiple drafts for the major writing assignments. Requiring students to bring early drafts to class for a round of peer review can be an effective way to accomplish this. It would also be helpful if faculty could assign one revision assignment during the semester, requiring students to incorporate the written feedback they received from the instructor (and peers) into a subsequent draft.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2014* | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | *Instructors should continue to encourage students to begin projects early to allow enough time for attention to the quality of their writing. Students should also be encouraged (or even mandated) to visit the Writing and Communications Center on a regular basis for feedback. It might also be beneficial for instructors to dedicate some portion of class time to peer feedback – where students get to read and evaluate the writing of other members of the class. This can serve as a useful way to highlight common issues and errors that can more easily be recognized when reading a paper that the student did not write.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | *Please with improvement with the presentation skills. However the written skills slipped a little. We will continue to enhance our following of the remedial actions.* | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Spring 2014* | |
| **Remedial Action** | | *Students should be encouraged to visit the Writing and Communications Center even if they receive a good grade on a paper. Specialists there can go over the writing and writing style with the student and attempt to highlight areas for continued improvement. Online sessions are now being offered, so even students with full-time employment can utilize the Center. It would also be useful for the instructor to set aside a small amount of class time for peer-to-peer document review, where students can see the writing style (pros and cons) of their fellow students. These sessions would be an opportunity to stress the importance of writing and communications to the entire class.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | *The improvement in both the written and oral skills is following a nice trend.* | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2013* | |
| **Remedial Action** | | *Instructors in the MSIS program should continue to provide specific, written feedback to student papers, indicating not just where mistakes have been made but also, in some cases, showing examples of how the writing can be fixed to read smoother or better get across the ideas. As always, the Writing and Communications Center (WCC) can be a great resource to all students, and instructors should encourage students who are in need of additional assistance to take advantage of it. There is also a growing collection of online webinars, seminars and videos (Ted Talks, Khan Academy) that are available to students to allow them to build their skills and understanding of the writing process outside of the classroom.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Spring 2013* | |
| **Remedial Action** | | *Instructors in the MSIS program should continue to provide detailed feedback notes to students, highlighting areas where the students need to improve. Students should take more advantage of the resources of the Writing and Communication Center (WCC) which has plans to begin offering online sessions next fall. Additionally, by the fall we should have 2-3 new writing and communication video tutorials posted online to reinforce basic concepts and provide students with the opportunity to review the material on their own time.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | *The biggest addition since the prior year’s assessment was the revamping of the ELC (English Language and Communication) courses that almost all international graduate students take at Stevens. These courses focus on writing and speaking, and give the students practical experience in situations that mirror the professional world. Also, the assessment was switched to MGT 609 Project Management, a course with more practical writing assignments which provide a more meaningful assessment.* | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2012* | |
| **Remedial Action** | | *Instructors in the MSIS program should continue to provide detailed feedback notes to students, highlighting areas where the students need to improve. Students should take more advantage of the resources of the Writing and Communication Center (WCC) which has plans to begin offering online sessions next fall. Additionally, by the fall we should have 2-3 new writing and communication video tutorials posted online to reinforce basic concepts and provide students with the opportunity to review the material on their own time.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | *The biggest addition since the prior year’s assessment was the revamping of the ELC (English Language and Communication) courses that almost all international graduate students take at Stevens. These courses focus on writing and speaking, and give the students practical experience in situations that mirror the professional world. Also, the assessment was switched to MGT 609 Project Management, a course with more practical writing assignments which provide a more meaningful assessment.* | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2011* | |
| **Remedial Action** | | *Instructors in the MSIS program should continue to provide detailed feedback to students on their written work, emphasizing grammar, word choice and sentence-level issues. Of course, all students should be encouraged to partake of the services of the Writing & Communication Center (WCC) in order to receive a one-on-one consultation on their writing and receive more specific and relevant feedback and learning objectives. In addition, all students should be encouraged (with heavy reinforcement by their instructor) to begin writing work early to allow enough time for proofreading. Students should also be encouraged to develop other resources, particularly peer review and feedback, to continue their development and prepare them for the professional world.* | |
| **Overview in Fall 2011** | | ***After Fourth Round Review – Fall 2011***  ***Written Communications Skills***  *Beginning in Fall 2011, the Howe Writing Assessment Program (MGT 898) became an official requirement for graduation for all Howe students. At the same time, students who scored “below expectations” on the Assessment are now required to complete the Technical Writing Webinar Series (MGT 897).*  *The combination of these two programs moves the Howe School a long way toward achieving Learning Objective #1. While no substitute for a formal writing course, the combined Assessment/Webinar serves to make all participants more aware of the importance of clear and effective writing, and of their own specific writing issues and challenges. As the program continues to grow and evolve, it should help provide a clear path to improving the communication skills of all Howe students.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2010* | |
| **Remedial Action** | | *Regardless of the validity of the overall statistics given the small sample size, it would be beneficial for all participants to partake of the services of the Writing & Communication Center (WCC) in order to receive a one-on-one consultation on their writing and receive more specific and relevant feedback and learning objectives. Instructors in the MSIS program should consider giving more specific writing feedback when grading papers, and inform students if their writing does not rise to professional standards. These students can be encouraged to visit the WCC, or an instructor can consider making it a mandatory component of their course grade.* | |
| **Overview in Fall 2010** | | ***After Third Round Review – Fall 2010***  ***Written Communications Skills***  *The Howe Assessment Program has the capability to be a useful tool in diagnosing the writing and communication problems of the participants, and beginning the process of improving those skills through the MGT 897 Technical Writing Webinar Series. However, this program faced two significant hurdles in the past year.*  *The first was a lack of participation by a significant percentage of the students. Although the program was technically mandatory, there was no mechanism in place to enforce participation. Some students registered on the eLearn website but did not submit documents; others did not even register at all. For students that did submit documents for assessment, there was no way to confirm they read or processed the written feedback they received.*  *The second hurdle was that there was no required prescriptive process for students who received a “does not meet expectations” grade on their submission. As mentioned previously, it was strongly recommended that these students (approximately 30% of the entire current submission pool) be required to satisfactorily complete MGT 897 Technical Writing Webinar Series within 8 weeks of receiving their grade. MGT 897 is a useful first step in helping these students improve their written communication skills.*  *As of July 2010, the Howe School Academic Council has approved making the MGT 898 Howe Assessment an official requirement for graduation for all Howe students. Additionally, MGT 897 Technical Writing Webinar Series has been made an official requirement for graduation for all students who do not pass MGT 898.*  *This action should greatly improve the effectiveness of the entire 898/897 Howe communications program.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2009* | |
| **Remedial Action** | | *Students underperforming in Traits 2 and 3 must avail themselves of the resources suggested to them: the Writing and Communications Center, various OWLs and English-language immersion at high levels (e.g., nytimes.com, economist.com, Sports Illustrated). The few weaknesses exhibited in logic and idea development (Traits 1 and 4) can be remedied by the students’ making sure they are clear on the topic and create an outline before writing.* | |
| **Overview in Fall 2009** | | ***After Second Round Review – Fall 2009***  ***Written Communications Skills***  *Students underperforming in Traits 2 and 3 must avail themselves of the resources suggested to them: the Writing and Communications Center, various OWLs and English-language immersion at high levels (e.g., nytimes.com, economist.com, Sports Illustrated). The few weaknesses exhibited in logic and idea development (Traits 1 and 4) can be remedied by the students’ making sure they are clear on the topic and create an outline before writing.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Spring 2008* | |
| **Remedial Action** | | *Improve student performance on grammar and sentence structure by additional instruction. Improve essay format – best to grade 4–page essays that are not full of bullet points.* | |
| **Specific Steps taken in Fall 2009** | | *The following process was implemented in fall 2009 for ALL Howe School M.Sc. and MBA students:*   1. *Overall progress on written communication skills was achieved using the current AACSB Learning Goal Rubric – however, the assessment process was more accurately executed and extended to all M.Sc. students.* 2. *A single “Communications Coordinator” was appointed to manage the communications learning goal for all graduate degree programs.* 3. *For tracking purposes only, all entering graduate students were automatically enrolled in a newly required, non-credit graduate business communications skills course for zero credit – for which the communications coordinator was the instructor. For future semesters, all students will have to receive a passing grade in this course in order to graduate.* 4. *The Communications Learning Goal writing skills assessments was conducted in the required courses for each program. Students were required to submit a small 4-page maximum case study or exercise, as part of the normal coursework. One copy of this exercise was sent to the Communications Coordinator for writing skills assessment.* 5. *Each student was assessed individually by Howe School Communications Program staff. Adequate feedback was provided to each student (i.e., in addition to receiving an overall passing grade, students had their papers marked by the grader to show where organization, content or grammatical errors had occurred).* 6. *Students who did not receive a passing grade on the test were encouraged to:*   *a. Part-time students*   * *Take a designated free course in grammatical writing on the web and provide evidence of passing a corresponding test.* * *Achieve a passing grade on a second assessment test administered by the Communications Department.*   *b. Full-time students*   * *Attend free tutoring classes offered by the Howe School’s Communications Department.* * *Achieve a passing grade on a second assessment test administered by the Communications Department.*  1. *Students whose performance on the second assessment test was below a minimum threshold were required to take COMM 501: Foundations of Technical Communication or COMM 500: Foundations of Business & Professional Communications.* | |
| **Specific Steps taken in 2008 - 09** | | *The current assessment process was continued in fall-spring 2008-09. It was decided to implement an improved process that will involve all students in fall 2009.* | |
| **Overview in Fall 2008** | | ***After First Round Review – Fall 2008***  ***Written Communications Skills***  *The current assessment process does not adequately address the need of the MSIS Program to produce graduates with strong communication skills. While assessments are being performed, too little is being done to ensure improvement of individual students. The plan described in Section 9 below should address this problem.* | |
| **Objective 2** | | *Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.* | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2018* | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | *It is recommended that faculty focus more attention on the visual representation of class data and include this as a component of the final project grade. Faculty can also provide additional opportunities for oral presentation during the semester (even if these are done in smaller groups) and to encourage peer feedback. Allowing time for a brief Q&A after each presentation would also be greatly beneficial.* | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2017* | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | *Faculty should be aware of the pros and cons of giving out presentation examples to students. They tend to copy what they see, both the good and the bad. Faculty can also make an explicit distinction between what they require in an academic presentation, and the different expectations that may come into play when preparing a presentation for external stakeholders.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Spring 2017* | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | *The areas of concentration continue to be in eye contact and slide creation. For the physical side, students need to be encouraged (or even mandated) to create their talking points far in advance, to allow themselves adequate time to become familiar with their own material and not need to rely on the slides for support. As for the slides themselves, instructors are encouraged to grade the presentations on slide simplicity and clarity, not just the sum total of information present. Without this, the students are incentivized to create highly-detailed and dense slides which show their knowledge but are not always easy for an audience to digest.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2016* | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | *No major change in remedial action is recommended. Starting work on the PowerPoint slides early is the key to a successful presentation, both in terms of slide quality and also because it allows additional time for practice and confidence building. Workshopping of presentations as they are being developed, and in-class practice and peer feedback, should continue to be fostered and encouraged.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Spring 2016* | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | *Students should be encouraged to start projects early, so they have enough time to focus on the slide quality and practice their delivery. More peer review of the decks, and even of the verbal components, would be very helpful. Aspects like professional transitions between speakers and the importance of projecting enthusiasm should be discussed (and modeled) in class.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2015* | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | *Students should be required to complete their PowerPoint decks at least three days prior to their presentation, so they have time for feedback and the opportunity to avoid some of the slide construction issues that consistently occur. Students should also be encouraged to project these slides onto a screen and view them from the back of a room. Very possibly, some of these problems would then be discovered and addressed. It would also give the speakers more opportunity to rehearse the oral component and get more comfortable with the material, reducing the need to look at the slides while they speak.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2014* | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | *The most obvious means of improving presentation skills are obvious and unchanging: be familiar with the material and practice. Beyond that, the two elements that need the most work are eye contact and enthusiasm. For that, it is recommended that students are encouraged, and given opportunities, to practice their presentations in front of a group prior to the official presentation. A mandated peer review practice session, where other members of the group, and of other groups, can see the errors that are being made, and encourage their peers to improve their style, would be most beneficial. It would also be useful if the instructor could grade on their presentation style, which would encourage students to focus more of their attention on their delivery.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | *Please with improvement with the presentation skills. However the written skills slipped a little. We will continue to enhance our following of the remedial actions.* | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Spring 2014* | |
| **Remedial Action** | | *It is recommended that the instructors encourage their students to practice delivering their presentations while NOT sitting in front of their computers. When speakers become too comfortable with staring at the screen while practicing, it encourages them to disengage from the audience and speak to the screen during the real thing. Students should continue to practice speaking whenever possible, and faculty are encouraged to assign more short, impromptu speaking opportunities so that students understand that public speaking is not only something done for a midterm or a final exam.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | *The improvement in both the written and oral skills is following a nice trend.* | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2013* | |
| **Remedial Action** | | *Perhaps more than with any other kind of business communication, the key to improving public speaking ability is practice. Of course, students can and should rehearse their presentations before they deliver them, but this also means that students should push themselves to speak publicly at every opportunity, not just when it is required by an academic exercise. From a vocal perspective, many students need to work on injecting more enthusiasm into their delivery, and use vocal dynamics to convey engagement and excitement about the material. Maintaining eye contact was a major problem for some speakers, and it is recommended that students rehearse their material while not sitting in front of a computer. If staring at a computer while speaking feels normal, then it is more likely they will disengage from the audience and talk to the screen while presenting.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Spring 2013* | |
| **Remedial Action** | | *The only effective way to improve Trait 2 is to practice public speaking at every opportunity, so all students are encouraged to do so. Some of these opportunities will present themselves in other Stevens’ classes, and some will present themselves in outside situations. Stevens’ ELC classes now feature an even greater emphasis on spoken language, including mandatory work in the Language Lab where students practice English pronunciation. Students should also continue to observe other PowerPoint slideshows (on campus or at workplaces) to see the best (and worst) of professional practices. Also, newer slideshow creators such as Prezi should be explored.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | *As with Objective 1, the redesign of ELC classes contributed greatly to the public speaking skills of a large majority of the students in this program. Many students also benefitted from two Presentation Video Tutorials that were created and posted online. Viewing of these, and any new, tutorials should be made mandatory for all students.* | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2012* | |
| **Remedial Action** | | *The only effective way to improve Trait 2 is to practice public speaking at every opportunity, so all students are encouraged to do so. Some of these opportunities will present themselves in other Stevens’ classes, and some will present themselves in outside situations. Stevens’ ELC classes now feature an even greater emphasis on spoken language, including mandatory work in the Language Lab where students practice English pronunciation. Students should also continue to observe other PowerPoint slideshows (on campus or at workplaces) to see the best (and worst) of professional practices. Also, newer slideshow creators such as Prezi should be explored.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | *As with Objective 1, the redesign of ELC classes contributed greatly to the public speaking skills of a large majority of the students in this program. Many students also benefitted from two Presentation Video Tutorials that were created and posted online. Viewing of these, and any new, tutorials should be made mandatory for all students.* | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2011* | |
| **Remedial Action** | | *Students exhibiting weaknesses in Traits 1, 3 and 5 need to become more familiar with their material and practice/time their presentation repeatedly. Being un- or under-prepared also weakens Trait 2, leading to hesitation, repetition and poor vocal modulation. Those with ESL interference must seek assistance from a communications specialist (e.g., WCC, ESL Director) and dedicate themselves to improving their spoken language skills.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2010* | |
| **Remedial Action** | | *The few who were somewhat deficient obviously had not practiced their presentations, or else were unable to overcome the stress of presenting in public: not everyone is successful at this task. The most effective remediation activities are: reviewing the tips and skills provided in September, taking the constructive criticism given in October, and understanding that everyone’s communications skills can improve with practice,* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2010* | |
| **Remedial Action** | | *Students exhibiting weaknesses in Traits 1, 3 and 5 need to become more familiar with their material and practice/time their presentation repeatedly. Being un- or under-prepared also weakens Trait 2, leading to hesitation, repetition and poor vocal modulation. Those with ESL interference should have some assistance from a communications specialist (e.g., WCC, ESL Director) and dedicate themselves to improving their spoken language skills.. However, that availability on the week-end did not exist, but would have grreatly enhanced the performance of students in need, and the Practicum effort in general.* | |
| **Overview in Fall 2010** | | ***After Second Round Review – Fall 2010***  ***Oral Communications Skills***  *To be included later.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Fall 2009* | |
| **Remedial Action** | | *Students exhibiting weaknesses in Traits 1, 3 and 5 need to become more familiar with their material and practice/time their presentation repeatedly. Being un- or under-prepared also weakens Trait 2, leading to hesitation, repetition and poor vocal modulation. Those with ESL interference must seek assistance from a communications specialist (e.g., WCC, ESL Director) and dedicate themselves to improving their spoken language skills.* | |
| **Overview in Fall 2009** | | ***After Second Round Review – Fall 2009***  ***Oral Communications Skills***  *Students exhibiting weaknesses in Traits 1, 3 and 5 need to become more familiar with their material and practice/time their presentation repeatedly. Being un- or under-prepared also weakens Trait 2, leading to hesitation, repetition and poor vocal modulation. Those with ESL interference must seek assistance from a communications specialist (e.g., WCC, ESL Director) and dedicate themselves to improving their spoken language skills.* | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | |  | |
| **When Assessed:** | | *Spring 2008* | |
| **Remedial Action** | | *Going forward, it may be useful to provide the students with more written instruction/texts to consult, in order to better prepare an oral presentation. Most often, this is each student’s first formal setting to learn how to become effective business communicators via a public presentation. As opposed to the writing segment of the assessment, which students have assumedly had previous instruction with, this facet of their studies is often brand new to them. Students often asked for reading materials, pointers, or a punch list of sorts to help them knock out the show-stopping errors from the onset.* | |
| **Overview in Fall 2008** | | ***After First Round Review – Fall 2008***  ***Oral Communications Skills***  *Oral presentations are an important component of every course in the MSIS curriculum. The current system of videotaping student team presentations in Saturday sections of MGT 680 and providing expert feedback twice per semester is working well. This process needs to be extended to more students in the MSIS curriculum.* | |

# APPENDIX A: CURRENT PROCESS

The current assessment and review process for the Howe School Support and Assessment Program (*MGT 898*) is as follows:

1. Essay submissions are requested from participating students. These requests are either sent via course instructors, or via an online submission form (Moodle Portal). Essays are designated as 3- or 4-page papers that utilize paragraph and sentence structure.
2. Essays are collected by the *MGT 898* Course Coordinator (Andrew Stein). Essay collection can occur either through hard-copy format (i.e., course instructors collect a stack of essay and hand them to the Course Coordinator) or through soft-copy (i.e., students submit essays electronically through Moodle, and subsequently to TurnItIn.com – an originality verification service).
3. Essays are then delegated to designated assessors, who have undergone a standardizing and normative process in order to make sure that assessment scores and feedback is consistent across assessors.
4. Assessors review each essay, either in hard-copy or soft-copy, and (1) make grammatical corrections, (2) indicate successful strategies, (3) comment on areas to improve or focus on, and (4) offer suggestions for style, flow and organization. This process is designed to take roughly 20 minutes per essay.
   1. Note: This new assessment process, which provides each student written feedback on his/her essay, is intended to help the student during review. Since the comments and corrections included in each assessed essay are designed to be constructive and forward-looking, it is our hope that this feedback helps the student focus on (1) the successful areas of each essay, and (2) those areas which can be improved upon in future assignments.
5. After each essay is commented on and corrected, the assessor scores the essay on each of four key metrics, noted on the Writing Rubric (see Section 3).
6. After the assessment process is completed for all essays in a particular course, the scores are tallied and essays are either (a) returned to the course instructor as hard-copies, who then distributes the essays to each individual student, or (b) returned to the individual student as soft-copies via email.
7. As part of the returned materials, students also receive one of two letters indicating either a successful level of assessment or an unsuccessful level. Both of these letters, however, detail the writing and communication support services available to all Howe School students, which are as follows:
   1. **On Campus Support:** Free and professional writing and communication specialists are available as part of the Writing & Communications Center (WCC) at Stevens. The WCC is located on campus and appointments are available Monday to Friday.
   2. **Online Materials:** The following link provides online resources that explain and assist in the development of key writing considerations. While an attempt has been made to group the materials by subject matter, several sites offer robust resources that span multiple areas.

# APPENDIX B. PREVIOUS PRESENTATION RUBRIC

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation Rubric**  *Goal: Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.* | | | | |
| **Trait** | **Poor (0)** | **Good (5)** | **Excellent (10)** | **Score** |
| **Trait 1:  Organization & Logic** | Fails to introduce topic; no evidence of or poor logical flow of topic; does not manage time. | Prepares listeners for sequence and flow of topic. Loses place occasionally. Maintains pace, without need to rush. | Engages listeners with overview, guides listeners through connections between sections, and uses time to good effect. |  |
| **Trait 2: Voice & Body Language** | Cannot be heard well due to volume, mumbling, speed, rote delivery, and/or heavily accented English. Turns away from audience or uses distracting gestures, such as scratching or tugging clothing. | Clear delivery with well-modulated voice and self-carriage. | Exemplary delivery, using voice and gestures as part of medium. Uses vocal and physical resources to aid in communicating topic. |  |
| **Trait 3: Use of Slides to Enhance Communications** | Misspelled, too busy, too many slides for allotted time, and/or poor use of graphics like charts. | Slides are readable, containing a reasonable amount of material per slide. Good use of graphics or illustrations. | Slides are well written/designed, and used as support to verbal content presentation. |  |
| **Trait 4: Ability to Answer Questions** | Student does not answer questions that are asked. | Student responds to questions well and provides sufficient response. | Student responds convincingly and addresses all aspects of question. Knows material thoroughly. |  |
| **Trait 5: Content** | Student does not satisfy assignment requirements. Misuses theory or selects poor examples. | Student provides good analysis of subject, satisfying intent of assignment and demonstrating knowledge. | Student shows evidence of strong research and highly competent use of analyses to reach conclusions and recommendations. |  |
| **Does not meet expectations: 0 – 19; Meets: 20-35; Exceeds: 36-50 Total Score:** | | | |  |