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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** |
| Each student in *MGT 609 Project Management* will produce two copies of a 4-page essay that is specified by the instructor and used also as part of the normal course requirements. | The assessment will be performed on a sample of students by the Howe School's Humanities Faculty using Rubrics 1 and 2 for this goal. | Students who score below (20) will be referred to Stevens tutoring and will be required to complete MGT 897 Technical Writing Webinar Series. |

The MSM 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 – INTRO

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 2007

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will be effective communicators.*

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

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***April 2007*

**ASSESSOR:***Heather Brown & David Silverstein*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***16 Students – MGT 671*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **5** | **11** | **7.2** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **4** | **11** | **1** | **4.9** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **0** | **10** | **6** | **6.5** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **9** | **7** | **6.5** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.27** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **10** | **6** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Students perform relatively poorly on the grammar and sentence structure trait.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Review options by which students can receive web-based instruction on grammar and sentence construction. (Finalize recommendation later.)*

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

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***April 2007*

**ASSESSOR:***Robin Whitney*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***16 Students – MGT 671*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **5** | **11** | **7.6** |
| 2: Voice & Body Language | **2** | **9** | **5** | **6.3** |
| 3: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **7** | **9** | **7.6** |
| 4: Ability to Answer Questions | **0** | **2** | **8** | **8.6** |
| 5: Content | **0** | **4** | **12** | **8.3** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **7.68** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **8** | **8** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Everyone can benefit from tips on presentation skills, from body language and voice projection to the organization and delivery of the material. While the students in this class are no different, there are marked contrasts between those who obviously are experienced at presenting and those who are not. Hence, the best advice is to “practice, practice, practice,” make sure that every effort is made to gain some eye contact with each person in the audience, or at least scan each section of the room, and summarize rather than read the slides verbatim. (Note: The slides were professional and conformed to Prof. Savitz’ guidelines.)*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*The students with ESL issues in particular need to practice, perhaps even tape record themselves, and work with the tutors in the Humanities Resource Center.*

# 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 masters 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 be effective communicators.*

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

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***November 2009*

**ASSESSOR:***David Silverstein*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***41 Students – MGT 680/ MGT 898 (Instructor: E. Henik)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **5** | **17** | **19** | **6.9** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **11** | **23** | **7** | **5.2** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **5** | **21** | **15** | **6.3** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **3** | **23** | **15** | **6.7** |
| **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** | **18** | **15** |

**COMMENTS:**

*While some scored well on all traits, many students displayed a lack of basic sentence structure and grammar rules (i.e., comma splices, run-on sentences, ambiguous pronoun usage, etc). Traits 2 & 3, which primarily indicate grammar level considerations, were the most problematic for students. Students scored better on organization and development (Traits 1 & 4), illustrating an overall ability to engage material at a conceptual level, without the skills to communicate the material at the fundamental structural level.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Overall, more should be done to encourage students to focus on their written communication. Hopefully, the new process of including written feedback to the students adds more value to each student’s review and progress, but there is presently no way to assess that value. Therefore, it may be useful to send out a survey at the end of the assessment process asking students about the utility of the process & comments. Also, encouraging course instructors to place a higher value on the grammatical level of written communication will set a better example and precedent for students to do likewise.*

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

**ASSESSMENT DATE:**

**ASSESSOR:**

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:**

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

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

**COMMENTS:**

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

# 10. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: SPRING 2010

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will be effective communicators.*

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

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***March-May 2010*

**ASSESSOR:***Jonathan Fitzgerald*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***53 Students – MGT 610-A-B-W1-WS / MGT 680-A-VO-WS / MGT 699-A-WS / MGT 898 (Instructors: Lechler / Curtis / Keeney / Zultner / Lazer / Henik / Rahman)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **1** | **22** | **30** | **7.4** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **7** | **31** | **15** | **6.1** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **6** | **25** | **22** | **6.5** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **19** | **34** | **7.9** |
| **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)* | **9** | **16** | **28** |

**COMMENTS:**

*It is significant that a majority of students exceed the expectations overall. Almost as significant is the small number of students who do not meet expectations. As has been seen in the past, students excel most consistently in the traits of logical flow and development of ideas; that is, on more global-level writing. On the local level, when it comes to grammar and sentence structure, spelling and word choice there is less consistent success. Further instruction in the areas of grammar and sentence structure is necessary.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*My recommendation is that the current practices that have been put into place thus far are succeeding and should be continued. However, that being said, there is some need for improvement on the word and sentence-level, with a particular emphasis on the sentence level. It is recommended that each student, no matter their score, be encouraged to visit the Writing and Communication Center to work one-on-one with a specialist to address his or her individual needs. Additionally, perhaps some specific instruction on writing strong sentences with example papers provided should be implemented in the classroom, and/or be made available online.*

# 11. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: FALL 2010

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will be effective communicators.*

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

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2010*

**ASSESSORS:***Barrie Balter, Jeff Kreisler, Sandy Singer, Jon Whiten*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***80 Students – MGT 680/MGT689 (Instructors: Chlopak, Henik, Holahan, Lazer)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **2** | **58** | **20** | **6.2** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **13** | **54** | **13** | **5.4** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **4** | **63** | **13** | **5.7** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **5** | **59** | **16** | **5.9** |
| **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)* | **30** | **34** | **16** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Overall, students averaged between .5 and 1 full point lower on each of the four traits than the scores for Fall 2009. This is likely due to the fact that three new readers were brought in to perform the assessments, and each was normed on the same sample documents and instructed to err on the side of grading lower, since it was hoped that students who scored below 20 overall would be encouraged to take MGT 897 Technical Writing Webinar Series. It should also be noted that, as in the previous year, although the scores for each trait and the overall scores are slightly lower, students tended to score lower on Traits 2 & 3 (grammar level considerations) than on Traits 1 & 4 (organization and development).This indicates a continued need for additional language and grammar work in order for all students to improve their writing.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Overall, more should be done to encourage students to focus on their grammar and other sentence-level considerations in their writing. One positive step would be to require all students who score less than 20 overall (or who score below average in Traits 2 & 3) to take MGT 897 Technical Writing Webinar Series for additional study and practice in basic grammar and sentence structure skills. Instructors should also help to make students more aware of their grammar problems by marking grammatical errors on their papers and encouraging students whose grammar mistakes are interfering with basic communication to visit the Writing and Communication Center (WCC) for extra feedback and support.*

# 12. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: SPRING 2011

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will be effective communicators.*

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

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***May 2011*

**ASSESSORS:***Jeff Kreisler, Jon Whiten*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***23 Students – MGT 689 (Instructors: Holahan, Lazer)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **18** | **5** | **6.7** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **0** | **18** | **5** | **6.0** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **0** | **16** | **7** | **6.3** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **14** | **9** | **6.8** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.4** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **3** | **14** | **6** |

**COMMENTS:**

*It is significant that both the overall scores and individual trait scores for this group of assessments were about .5 to 1 point higher than the previous semester, and more in keeping with the general average over the previous year. This gives greater credence to the theory that lower scores in Fall 2010 were likely due to the new readers grading rather harshly, a process which moderated this semester. Again, it is worth noting that despite the fluctuations of the average scores across the board, Traits 2 & 3 (grammar and sentence-level considerations) remain the biggest hurdle for most writers, where the scores for logical flow and idea development average consistently higher.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**  
Given the need for improvement on the word and sentence-level for the majority of writers, I would strongly recommend making at least one visit to the Writing and Communication Center (WCC) mandatory for all writers in this program. Although the assessment comments provided to the writers as part of this program are invaluable, there is currently no mechanism to ensure that the writers read, review or process those comments. Even one visit to the WCC would ensure that some of each writer’s basic grammar and sentence-level issues will be diagnosed and discussed, and hopefully come prescriptive steps will be offered. Additionally, providing the students with some “before and after” type examples of sentences and paragraphs in their field that have been written and rewritten to address grammar issues would likely prove to be extremely helpful.

# 13. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT:  FALL 2011

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will be effective communicators.*

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

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2011*

**ASSESSORS:***WCC Staff*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***54 Students – MGT689 (Instructors: Chlopak, Holahan, Lazer)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **4** | **47** | **20** | **6.3** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **17** | **41** | **13** | **5.4** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **6** | **50** | **15** | **5.8** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **4** | **53** | **14** | **6.0** |
| **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)* | **22** | **33** | **16** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Students in the MSM program scored about average on the Assessment, compared to other sections and recent years. Approximately 30% scored “below expectations” on the overall score. Also following previous trends, this group scored lower on Traits 2 & 3, which deal with grammar and sentence-level issues. This means that they doing better developing their ideas in the broad sense, than getting them across clearly on the page. This is likely (at least partially) due to the high percentage of international students in this program.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*The most effective remediation is already in place; students who scored below expectations were required to take MGT 897 Technical Writing Webinar Series to address their writing challenges. Since the webinar series is weighted more heavily toward grammar and sentence-level issues, it should prove effective at improving some of these scores. It would be highly recommended that we re-assess the students who participate in MGT 897 to quantify the improvement we see. Outside of that, all students should be encouraged to find peers, and peer groups within the class and outside of it, who can assist them with feedback on their documents.*

# 14. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: SPRING 2012

**LEARNING GOAL #1:***Our students will be effective communicators.*

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

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***May 2012*

**ASSESSORS:***WCC Staff*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***53 Students – MGT 689 (Instructors: Holahan, Lazer)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **1** | **34** | **18** | **6.8** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **8** | **37** | **8** | **6.0** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **7** | **35** | **11** | **6.0** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **1** | **37** | **15** | **6.6** |
| **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)* | **10** | **28** | **15** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Again, the MSM group scored in the average range in total score, with approximately 20% of the group scoring “below expectations.” This is slightly better than the previous semester, but not significantly so for this small sample size. Although the overall scores for each trait were up slightly, it is more relevant to note that these MSM students again scored lowest on Traits 2 & 3, which address grammar and sentence-level writing issues. This underscores the need for additional grammar and language practice for these writers.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*The students who failed the assessment were all required to complete the Technical Writing Webinar Series. However, the trend of the students in this program to score lowest on the grammar sections underscores the need to do more. Instructors should continue to provide detailed feedback, and encourage all students to visit the Writing and Communications Center (WCC) on campus. In addition, I would encourage the instructors to form peer review groups within their classes, and dedicate a small amount of class time, before each document is due, to having the students read and proofread their peers’ work. There is not better training for writers than to read and identify errors others are making, in order to develop their own critical eye.*

# 15. 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:***Bruce, Carlson, Grilo, Grullon, Wirstiuk*

**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 | **5** | **23** | **6** | **5.5** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **3** | **25** | **7** | **5.4** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **2** | **24** | **8** | **6.4** |
| **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** | **20** | **5** |

**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:***27 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **22** | **5** | **6.5** |
| 2: Voice & Body Language | **0** | **25** | **2** | **5.8** |
| 3: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **24** | **3** | **5.9** |
| 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) =** | | | |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **25** | **2** |

**COMMENTS:**

*See Spring 2013 Notes*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*See Spring 2013 Notes*

# 16. 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:***Bruce, Grullon*

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **5** | **1** | **7.2** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **0** | **5** | **1** | **6.2** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **0** | **5** | **1** | **6.3** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **5** | **1** | **6.8** |
| **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)* | **0** | **5** | **1** |

**COMMENTS:**

*The majority of the students in the MSM 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 MSM 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:***5 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **1** | **4** | **8.60** |
| 2: Voice & Body Language | **0** | **2** | **3** | **7.95** |
| 3: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **1** | **4** | **8.60** |
| 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) =** | | | | **8.38** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **1** | **4** |

**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.*

# 17. 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:***21 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **16** | **5** | **6.3** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **4** | **13** | **4** | **5.2** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **3** | **14** | **4** | **5.3** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **1** | **15** | **5** | **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)* | **6** | **10** | **5** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Once again, the large majority of students in the MSM/MBA 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 MSM/MBA 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:***43 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **40** | **3** | **5.9** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **41** | **2** | **5.3** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **40** | **3** | **5.3** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **43** | **0** | **5.6** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **33** | **9** | **6.1** |
| **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** | **40** | **3** |

**COMMENTS:**

*A large majority of students in the MSM/MBA 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.*

# 18. 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:***25 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **17** | **8** | **6.7** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **7** | **12** | **6** | **5.0** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **6** | **12** | **7** | **5.1** |
| 4: Development of ideas0 | **0** | **18** | **7** | **6.3** |
| **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)* | **9** | **9** | **7** |

**COMMENTS:**

*The large majority of students in the MSM/MBA 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:***17 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **5** | **12** | **7.7** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **1** | **16** | **0** | **5.3** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **4** | **12** | **1** | **5.2** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **15** | **2** | **6.0** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **7** | **9** | **1** | **4.5** |
| **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)* | **0** | **15** | **2** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Overall scores for presentation skills for students in the MSM/MBA 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.*

# 19. 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:***24 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **1** | **13** | **10** | **6.9** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **2** | **15** | **7** | **6.1** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **2** | **14** | **8** | **6.5** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **1** | **14** | **9** | **6.8** |
| **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)* | **4** | **13** | **7** |

**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:***23 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **9** | **14** | **7.8** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **14** | **9** | **7.2** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **15** | **8** | **6.6** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **21** | **2** | **6.3** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **19** | **4** | **6.8** |
| **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** | **13** | **10** |

**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.*

# 20. 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:***8 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **1** | **7** | **8.0** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **0** | **5** | **3** | **7.0** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **0** | **4** | **4** | **7.3** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **5** | **3** | **6.6** |
| **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** | **5** | **3** |

**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:***4 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **0** | **4** | **8.8** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **2** | **2** | **6.8** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **3** | **1** | **6.5** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **3** | **1** | **6.5** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **2** | **2** | **7.0** |
| **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)* | **0** | **0** | **4** |

**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.*

# 21. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: FALL 2015

NOTE: Beginning this semester, MSM and MBA data are split into separate booklets.

**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:***3 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **2** | **1** | **6.7** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **0** | **3** | **0** | **5.3** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **0** | **2** | **1** | **6.7** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **2** | **1** | **6.7** |
| **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** | **3** | **0** |

**COMMENTS:**

*All of the students in this program meet 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:***Not assessed this semester.*

# 22. 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:***5 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **4** | **1** | **7.4** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **0** | **4** | **1** | **6.0** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **0** | **5** | **0** | **6.8** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **4** | **1** | **6.2** |
| **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)* | **0** | **4** | **1** |

**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:***Not assessed this semester.*

# 23. 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:***4 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 | **0** | **3** | **1** | **6.5** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **0** | **3** | **1** | **6.5** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **0** | **2** | **2** | **6.8** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **2** | **2** | **7.3** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.8** |

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

**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:***9 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 | **1** | **1** | **7** | **7.6** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **3** | **5** | **7.4** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **1** | **6** | **2** | **6.3** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **1** | **6** | **2** | **6.4** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **2** | **7** | **8.3** |
| **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)* | **1** | **1** | **7** |

**COMMENTS:**

*All or most 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.*

# 24. 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:***6 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 | **0** | **2** | **4** | **7.5** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **0** | **4** | **2** | **6.7** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **0** | **4** | **2** | **6.8** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **2** | **4** | **7.8** |
| **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)* | **1** | **2** | **3** |

**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:***1 Student – 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** | **0** | **1** | **9.0** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **1** | **0** | **7.0** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **1** | **0** | **5.5** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **1** | **0** | **7.4** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **0** | **1** | **8.0** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **7.4** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **0** | **1** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Only 1 student assessed this semester. The following comments apply to the entire spring dataset. All or most 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.*

# 25. 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:***18 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** | **7** | **11** | **7.6** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **0** | **12** | **6** | **6.9** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **0** | **12** | **6** | **7.0** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **8** | **10** | **7.1** |
| **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** | **9** | **9** |

**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:***10 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** | **2** | **8** | **8.0** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **7** | **3** | **7.1** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **9** | **1** | **5.9** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **7** | **3** | **6.8** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **6** | **4** | **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)* | **0** | **6** | **4** |

**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.*

# 26. 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:***8 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 | **0** | **3** | **5** | **7.8** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **1** | **3** | **4** | **6.8** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **0** | **4** | **4** | **7.1** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **6** | **2** | **6.4** |
| **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)* | **2** | **2** | **4** |

**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:***6 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** | **0** | **6** | **9.0** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **4** | **2** | **6.9** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **6** | **0** | **6.1** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **4** | **2** | **7.2** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **1** | **5** | **8.8** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **8.7** |

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

**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.*

# 27. OUTCOMES: MSM 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 MSM 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 MSM curriculum. Faculty members instruct students on the basics of oral presentations and students are graded on their oral communication skills in a number of courses in the MSM curriculum.Starting in fall 2009, it is planned to videotape student team presentations in sections of MGT 671 and to provide expert feedback twice per semester.

**After Second Round Review – Fall 2009**

**Written Communications Skills**

Assumedly, the new assessment process, which provides each student written feedback on his/her essay, adds value for the student during review. Since the comments and corrections included in each assessed essay are intended 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. A survey feedback loop for student input on the assessment process has also been proposed for next semester.

**Oral Communications Skills**

*To be included later.*

**After Third Round Review – Spring 2010**

**Written Communications Skills**

In addition to the practices that are currently in place, new and innovative methods such as video-based instruction and further use of online resources should be implemented. As stated above, particular emphasis should be added to the areas of word and sentence level writing, acknowledging that students seem to be maintaining clear focus and logical flow, but tend to drop off a bit in quality when it comes to particulars. The remedy for this lies in a combination of the practices that are currently working and the new methods suggested here.

Furthermore, to assist students in acquiring better writing strategies, we have begun development of an online video-based course (MGT800) for all assessed students. The online course will consist of 13 video modules – each focused on a specific aspect of grammar/style – that students can view at their own convenience. The asynchronous modules will also contain practice exercises to help students better understand and implement the concepts presented. Finally, while MGT800 will become a mandatory course for those students who do not meet the assessment standards, it is our intention that each module be designed as beneficial for all students.

**Oral Communications Skills**

*To be included later.*

**After Fourth Round Review – Spring 2011**

**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 Fifth Round Review – Fall 2011 / Spring 2012**

**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.

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 2007 | 6.2 | 7.7 |
| Fall 2009 | 6.3 |  |
| Spring 2010 | 7.0 |  |
| Fall 2010 | 5.8 |  |
| Spring 2011 | 6.4 |  |
| Fall 2011 | 5.8 |  |
| Spring 2012 | 6.3 |  |
| Fall 2012 | 6.0 | 6.1 |
| Spring 2013 | 6.6 | 8.4 |
| Fall 2013 | 5.8 | 5.6 |
| Spring 2013 | 5.8 | 5.7 |
| Fall 2014 | 6.6 | 7.0 |
| Spring 2015 | 7.2 | 7.1 |
| Fall 2015 | 6.3 | n/a |
| Spring 2016 | 6.6 | n/a |
| Fall 2016 | 6.8 | 7.2 |
| Spring 2017 | 7.2 | 7.4 |
| Fall 2017 | 7.3 | 7.1 |
| Summer 2018 | 6.8 |  |
| Fall 2018 | 7.0 | 8.7 |

# 28. CLOSE LOOP PROCESS – CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORD

**Assurance of Learning**

**Assessment/Outcome Analysis**

**Close Loop Process - Continuous Improvement Record**

Program: Master of Science in Management

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

Goal Owner: Murrae Bowden & Andrew Stein

Where Measured: Each student in MGT 635 Managerial Judgment and Decision Making will produce two copies of a 4-page essay that is specified by the instructor and used also as part of the normal course requirements.

How Measured: The assessment will be performed on a sample of students by the Howe School's Humanities Faculty using Rubrics 1 and 2 for this goal.

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.* |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | *Students write one paper and make a team presentation. My students are MBA students and writing is generally good. Course is taught online but I plan to meet on a weekly basis in real time to go over assignments.* |
| **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:** | *I changed the assignment to emphasize analysis and critical thinking about a topic related to decision making. Biggest problem was a superficial analysis on the part of a few students. Plan to emphasize a more in depth analysis.* |
| **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:** | *The fall ’14 assessment indicated significant improvements on all writing dimensions. During this past semester we increased our efforts to make people aware of the University resources available to help them with writing. This includes the use of the WCC, especially the online sessions* |
| **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:** | *Results from spring 14 were slightly lower than our results in Fall ’13. We did make efforts to be more specific about improvement suggestions but perhaps more efforts to direct people toward additional resources would help them. This include making them aware of new online resources from the WCC* |
| **When Assessed:** | *Fall 2013* |
| **Remedial Action** | *Instructors in the MSM/MBA 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 MSM 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 MSM 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:** | *Spring 2012* |
| **Remedial Action** | *The students who failed the assessment were all required to complete the Technical Writing Webinar Series. However, the trend of the students in this program to score lowest on the grammar sections underscores the need to do more. Instructors should continue to provide detailed feedback, and encourage all students to visit the Writing and Communications Center (WCC) on campus. In addition, I would encourage the instructors to form peer review groups within their classes, and dedicate a small amount of class time, before each document is due, to having the students read and proofread their peers’ work. There is not better training for writers than to read and identify errors others are making, in order to develop their own critical eye.* |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** |  |
| **When Assessed:** | *Fall 2011* |
| **Remedial Action** | *The most effective remediation is already in place; students who scored below expectations were required to take MGT 897 Technical Writing Webinar Series to address their writing challenges. Since the webinar series is weighted more heavily toward grammar and sentence-level issues, it should prove effective at improving some of these scores. It would be highly recommended that we re-assess the students who participate in MGT 897 to quantify the improvement we see. Outside of that, all students should be encouraged to find peers, and peer groups within the class and outside of it, who can assist them with feedback on their documents.* |
| **Overview in Fall 2011/ Spring 012** | ***After Fifth Round Review – Fall 2011 / Spring 2012***  ***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:** | *Spring 2011* |
| **Remedial Action** | *Given the need for improvement on the word and sentence-level for the majority of writers, I would strongly recommend making at least one visit to the Writing and Communication Center (WCC) mandatory for all writers in this program. Although the assessment comments provided to the writers as part of this program are invaluable, there is currently no mechanism to ensure that the writers read, review or process those comments. Even one visit to the WCC would ensure that some of each writer’s basic grammar and sentence-level issues will be diagnosed and discussed, and hopefully come prescriptive steps will be offered. Additionally, providing the students with some “before and after” type examples of sentences and paragraphs in their field that have been written and rewritten to address grammar issues would likely prove to be extremely helpful.* |
| **Overview in Spring 2011** | ***After Fourth Round Review – Spring 2011***  ***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 2010* |
| **Remedial Action** | *Overall, more should be done to encourage students to focus on their grammar and other sentence-level considerations in their writing. One positive step would be to require all students who score less than 20 overall (or who score below average in Traits 2 & 3) to take MGT 897 Technical Writing Webinar Series for additional study and practice in basic grammar and sentence structure skills. Instructors should also help to make students more aware of their grammar problems by marking grammatical errors on their papers and encouraging students whose grammar mistakes are interfering with basic communication to visit the Writing and Communication Center (WCC) for extra feedback and support.* |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** |  |
| **When Assessed:** | *Spring 2010* |
| **Remedial Action** | *My recommendation is that the current practices that have been put into place thus far are succeeding and should be continued. However, that being said, there is some need for improvement on the word and sentence-level, with a particular emphasis on the sentence level. It is recommended that each student, no matter their score, be encouraged to visit the Writing and Communication Center to work one-on-one with a specialist to address his or her individual needs. Additionally, perhaps some specific instruction on writing strong sentences with example papers provided should be implemented in the classroom, and / or be made available online.* |
| **Overview in Spring 2010** | ***After Third Round Review – Spring 2010***  ***Written Communications Skills***  *In addition to the practices that are currently in place, new and innovative methods such as video-based instruction and further use of online resources should be implemented. As stated above, particular emphasis should be added to the areas of word and sentence level writing, acknowledging that students seem to be maintaining clear focus and logical flow, but tend to drop off a bit in quality when it comes to particulars. The remedy for this lies in a combination of the practices that are currently working and the new methods suggested here.*  *Furthermore, to assist students in acquiring better writing strategies, we have begun development of an online video-based course (MGT800) for all assessed students. The online course will consist of 13 video modules – each focused on a specific aspect of grammar/style – that students can view at their own convenience. The asynchronous modules will also contain practice exercises to help students better understand and implement the concepts presented. Finally, while MGT800 will become a mandatory course for those students who do not meet the assessment standards, it is our intention that each module be designed as beneficial for all students.* |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** |  |
| **When Assessed:** | *Fall 2009* |
| **Remedial Action** | *Overall, more should be done to encourage students to focus on their written communication. Hopefully, the new process of including written feedback to the students adds more value to each student’s review and progress, but there is presently no way to assess that value. Therefore, it may be useful to send out a survey at the end of the assessment process asking students about the utility of the process & comments. Also, encouraging course instructors to place a higher value on the grammatical level of written communication will set a better example and precedent for students to do likewise.* |
| **Overview in Fall 2009** | ***After Second Round Review – Fall 2009***  ***Written Communications Skills***  *Assumedly, the new assessment process, which provides each student written feedback on his/her essay, adds value for the student during review. Since the comments and corrections included in each assessed essay are intended 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. A survey feedback loop for student input on the assessment process has also been proposed for next semester.* |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** |  |
| **When Assessed:** | *Fall 2008* |
| **Remedial Action** | *None* |
| **Specific Steps Taken in 2008- 09** | *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 masters 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.* |
| **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 MSM 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 MSM curriculum. Faculty members instruct students on the basics of oral presentations and students are graded on their oral communication skills in a number of courses in the MSM curriculum. Starting in fall 2009, it is planned to videotape student team presentations in sections of MGT 671 and to provide expert feedback twice per semester.* |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** |  |
| **When Assessed:** | *Spring 2007* |
| **Remedial Action** | *Review options by which students can receive web-based instruction on grammar and sentence construction. (Finalize recommendation later.)* |
| **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.* |
| **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** | *Not assessed this semester.* |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** |  |
| **When Assessed:** | *Fall 2015* |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | *Not assessed this semester.* |
| **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:** |  |
| **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:** |  |
| **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** | *See Spring 2013 Notes* |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** |  |
| **When Assessed:** | *Spring 2007* |
| **Remedial Action** | *The students with ESL issues in particular need to practice, perhaps even tape record themselves, and work with the tutors in the Humanities Resource Center.* |

# 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 Moodle.
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:** | | | |  |