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# 1. INTRODUCTION: LEARNING GOAL #1

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This website is intended for use by:

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

# 2. LEARNING OBJECTIVES AND TRAITS

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

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

# 3. RUBRICS

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

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

# 4. ASSESSMENT PROCESS

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Where & when measured?** | **How measured?** | **Criterion** |
| Students are assessed in the fall and spring semesters in the required course: *MGT 609 Project Management and BIA 650.* | Student presentations are video-taped, and student essays are assessed for writing skills. Feedback is provided to each individual student.  Sampling: Rubrics are completed for a sample of 30 students in each semester. | Students who score below (20) will be referred to Stevens tutoring and will be required to complete MGT 897 Technical Writing Webinar Series. |

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

# 5. RESULTS OF LEARNING GOAL ASSESSMENT – INTRODUCTION

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

**Explanation**

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

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

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

* Does Not Meet Expectations
* Meets Expectations
* Exceeds Expectations

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

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

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

# 6. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: SPRING 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, Carlson, Grullon, Wirstiuk*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***12 Students – MGT 609*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **8** | **4** | **7.1** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **1** | **5** | **6** | **6.8** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **0** | **6** | **6** | **7.1** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **1** | **8** | **3** | **6.7** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.9** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **1** | **7** | **4** |

**COMMENTS:**

*The majority of the students in the BI&A 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 BI&A 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:***27 Students – BIA 650*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **4** | **23** | **6.3** |
| 2: Voice & Body Language | **0** | **6** | **21** | **6.5** |
| 3: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **4** | **23** | **6.3** |
| 4: Ability to Answer Questions | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| 5: Content | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.37** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **4** | **23** |

**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.*

# 7. 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:***14 Students – BIA 650*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **8** | **5** | **7.2** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **3** | **6** | **5** | **5.9** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **1** | **8** | **5** | **7.0** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **1** | **8** | **5** | **6.9** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.7** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **2** | **7** | **5** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Once again, the large majority of students in the BI&A 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 BI&A 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:***21 Students – BIA 650*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **14** | **7** | **6.8** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **18** | **3** | **6.4** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **2** | **14** | **5** | **6.3** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **18** | **3** | **6.3** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **21** | **0** | **5.4** |
| **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** | **17** | **4** |

**COMMENTS:**

*A large majority of students in the BI&A 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.*

# 8. 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:***22 Students – BIA650*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **8** | **14** | **7.7** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **3** | **12** | **7** | **5.9** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **0** | **14** | **8** | **6.2** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **3** | **11** | **8** | **6.1** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.5** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **3** | **10** | **9** |

**COMMENTS:**

*The large majority of students in the BI&A 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:***23 Students – BIA 650*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **18** | **5** | **6.9** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **16** | **7** | **6.8** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **18** | **5** | **6.3** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **23** | **0** | **6.6** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **1** | **22** | **0** | **6.6** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.7** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **16** | **7** |

**COMMENTS:**

*Overall scores for presentation skills for students in the BI&A 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.*

# 9. 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:***42 Students – BIA 650*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **2** | **36** | **4** | **5.5** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **5** | **36** | **1** | **4.9** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **2** | **36** | **4** | **5.4** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **4** | **34** | **4** | **5.3** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **5.3** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **12** | **27** | **3** |

**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:***44 Students – BIA 650*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **0** | **44** | **8.0** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **38** | **6** | **6.7** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **32** | **12** | **6.2** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **43** | **1** | **6.2** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **13** | **31** | **7.3** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.9** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **27** | **17** |

**COMMENTS:**

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

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

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

# 10. 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:**

*Pelphrey, Minsloff, Ketchum*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***20 Students – BIA 650*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **13** | **7** | **6.7** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **1** | **14** | **5** | **5.9** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **1** | **12** | **7** | **6.0** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **15** | **5** | **6.2** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.2** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **3** | **12** | **5** |

**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:***26 Students – BIA 650*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **0** | **26** | **8.0** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **16** | **10** | **6.5** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **1** | **14** | **11** | **6.5** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **26** | **0** | **6.6** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **20** | **6** | **7.1** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.9** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **14** | **12** |

**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.*

# 11. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: FALL 2015

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

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

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2015*

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

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***44 Students – BIA 650*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **40** | **4** | **6.1** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **0** | **43** | **1** | **5.3** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **0** | **43** | **1** | **5.5** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **39** | **5** | **6.0** |
| **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** | **42** | **2** |

**COMMENTS:**

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

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

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

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

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2015*

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

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***45 Students – BIA 650*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **21** | **24** | **7.6** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **43** | **2** | **6.1** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **43** | **2** | **5.0** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **45** | **0** | **5.9** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **9** | **36** | **7.6** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.5** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **40** | **5** |

**COMMENTS:**

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

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

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

# 12. 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:***12 Students – BIA 650*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | **0** | **8** | **4** | **6.9** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **1** | **10** | **1** | **5.6** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **0** | **8** | **4** | **6.6** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **10** | **2** | **6.1** |
| **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** | **10** | **2** |

**COMMENTS:**

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

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

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

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

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***May 2016*

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

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:***11 Students – BIA 650*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **0** | **11** | **9.0** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **6** | **5** | **6.8** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **7** | **4** | **6.7** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **11** | **0** | **5.0** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **0** | **11** | **8.6** |
| **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** | **2** | **9** |

**COMMENTS:**

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

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

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

# 13. 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:***90 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 | **10** | **43** | **37** | **6.3** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **7** | **63** | **20** | **6.0** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **3** | **60** | **27** | **6.4** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **12** | **54** | **24** | **6.0** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.2** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **16** | **53** | **21** |

**COMMENTS:**

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

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

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

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

**ASSESSMENT DATE:***December 2016*

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **44** | **31** | **7.4** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **66** | **9** | **6.2** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **1** | **72** | **2** | **5.6** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **65** | **10** | **5.7** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **55** | **20** | **6.5** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.3** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **63** | **22** |

**COMMENTS:**

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

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

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

# 14. 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:***16 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** | **5** | **11** | **7.6** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **1** | **11** | **4** | **6.5** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **1** | **11** | **4** | **6.5** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **7** | **9** | **7.6** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **7.0** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **1** | **8** | **7** |

**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:***24 Students – MGT 609, BIA 650, FIN 629*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | **0** | **7** | **17** | **8.0** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **23** | **1** | **6.5** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **0** | **22** | **2** | **5.4** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **19** | **5** | **6.6** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **20** | **4** | **6.6** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.6** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **21** | **3** |

**COMMENTS:**

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

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

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

# 15. 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:***79 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** | **41** | **38** | **7.5** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **3** | **64** | **12** | **5.8** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **0** | **57** | **22** | **6.3** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **0** | **34** | **45** | **7.5** |
| **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)* | **6** | **45** | **28** |

**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:***86 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** | **19** | **67** | **8.1** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **43** | **43** | **7.2** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **1** | **43** | **42** | **6.8** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **47** | **39** | **6.9** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **25** | **61** | **7.7** |
| **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** | **32** | **54** |

**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.*

# 16. 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:***54 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 | **4** | **28** | **22** | **6.7** |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | **8** | **41** | **4** | **5.3** |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | **4** | **42** | **8** | **5.6** |
| 4: Development of ideas | **7** | **30** | **17** | **6.2** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **5.9** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **12** | **32** | **10** |

**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:***63 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** | **20** | **40** | **7.2** |
| 2: Voice Quality | **0** | **49** | **14** | **7.3** |
| 3: Physical Presence | **2** | **47** | **14** | **6.2** |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | **0** | **45** | **18** | **6.0** |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | **0** | **44** | **19** | **7.6** |
| **Average Grade (Out of 10) =** | | | | **6.6** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Total Students by Category**  *(Based on average score across all traits)* | **0** | **49** | **14** |

**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.*

# 17. RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: SPRING 2019

**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 2019*

**ASSESSOR:**   
*Kephart, Pelphrey*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:**  
*12 Students – BIA 650*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Logical flow | 0 | 7 | 5 | 6.8 |
| 2: Grammar & Sentence Structure | 0 | 9 | 3 | 5.7 |
| 3: Spelling & word choice | 0 | 7 | 5 | 6.6 |
| 4: Development of ideas | 0 | 8 | 4 | 6.3 |
| **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)* | 5 | 3 | 4 |

**COMMENTS:**

*Students this spring continue the trend of struggling (at times) with developing and supporting arguments. Students often try to overwhelm with data and detail, rather than crafting compelling support. Sentence-level aspects seem to at a higher level, which is attributable to many factors, but some is likely due to the increase in resources (live and online) which can point out errors in word usage and grammar and suggest fixes. Even with these challenges, a majority of students continue to perform at or above expectations.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*The two primary recommendations are to craft assignments that require students to produce and support compelling arguments, and to encourage them to use in-person resources (Writing & Communications Center) and online resources to continue to hone their craft and improve their writing.*

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

**ASSESSMENT DATE:**   
*May 2019*

**ASSESSOR:**   
*Middleton*

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS & COURSE:**   
*19 Students – BIA 650*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Average Grade** |
| 1: Organization & Logic | 0 | 14 | 5 | 7.2 |
| 2: Voice Quality | 0 | 13 | 6 | 7.0 |
| 3: Physical Presence | 0 | 16 | 3 | 5.7 |
| 4: Use of Slides to Enhance Comm | 0 | 19 | 0 | 5.5 |
| 5: Transitions, Time Mgt, Q&A | 0 | 18 | 1 | 6.8 |
| **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)* | 0 | 19 | 0 |

**COMMENTS:**

*Oral presentations continue to be generally strong in this group, with overall development of content being clear and compelling. Students are generally professional in their demeanor, aware of working within time constraints, and display strong verbal abilities. The areas that need work across many of the students is maintianing eye contact and engagement with the audience, using small (and in some cases unreadable) text on slides and charts, and often weak or absent transitions betweek speakers.*

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

*Faculty should encourage students to practice in class (perhaps setting aside time for trial runs) to make sure they engage the audience. It would also be preferred to ask the audience to close their laptops and focus on the speakers to encourage them to reciprocate. Beyond that, faculty could create a style guide (with font size minimums, for example) to help the students adhere to best practices.*

# 18. OUTCOMES: BIA LEARNING GOAL # 1 AFTER ROUNDS OF ASSESSMENT

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 2013 | 6.9 | 6.4 |
| Fall 2013 | 6.7 | 6.3 |
| Spring 2014 | 6.5 | 6.7 |
| Fall 2014 | 5.3 | 6.9 |
| Spring 2015 | 6.2 | 6.9 |
| Fall 2015 | 5.7 | 6.5 |
| Spring 2016 | 6.3 | 7.2 |
| Fall 2016 | 6.2 | 6.3 |
| Spring 2017 | 7.0 | 6.6 |
| Fall 2017 | 6.8 | 7.4 |
| Fall 2018 | 5.9 | 6.6 |
| Spring 2019 | 6.3 | 6.0 |

# 19. CLOSE LOOP PROCESS – CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORD

Assurance of Learning

Assessment/Outcome Analysis

Close Loop Process - Continuous Improvement Record

**Program:** Master of Science in Business Intelligence & Analytics

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

**Goal Owner:** Edward Stohr & Andrew Stein

**Where Measured:** Students are assessed in the fall and spring semesters in the required course:

**BIA650** Process Optimization and Analytics.

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

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective 1** | | | *Students will be able to write effectively.* | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Spring 2019* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *The two primary recommendations are to craft assignments that require students to produce and support compelling arguments, and to encourage them to use in-person resources (Writing & Communications Center) and online resources to continue to hone their craft and improve their writing.* | | | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment** | | | *Improvements were noted with the remedial actions taken. We will continue these as well as add those noted from this assessment.* | | | |
| **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** | | | *The use of the Writing & Communication center have proved to be very beneficial.* | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Fall 2017* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *Writers are strongly encouraged to seek assistance from the Writing & Communication Center on campus to refine and improve their proofreading abilities. Recognizing common errors is the first (and most crucial) step to addressing them. Allowing students extra class time to submit their documents for peer review would also be helpful. Wherever possible, instructors should give out samples of documents (both academic and professional) to model professional-level writing for all students.* | | | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | |  | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Spring 2017* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *Faculty should make more efforts to workshop documents within the framework of the class, allowing students to read and identify the errors that other writers are making in an attempt to improve their own proofreading skills. If students cannot see their own incorrect grammar and awkward sentence structure, they cannot hope to correct it.* | | | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | |  | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Fall 2016* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *Poor proofreading continues to plague this group, and this is something that the faculty can and should address in a very direct way. Asking students to bring in drafts of their work for proofreading exchanges could help the students recognize the most common errors they are committing. Showing students “before” and “after” versions of professional documents, allowing them to see the amount of improvement that stronger proofreading can bring, may be an excellent motivator.* | | | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | |  | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Spring 2016* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *Effective proofreading remains key. Faculty should be modeling this and encourage more peer review and utilization of the Writing and Communications Center. More examples of professional-level writing should be brought to class and analyzed.* | | | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | |  | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Fall 2015* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *Faculty should strongly encourage students to leave extra time for the writing process, and mandate that students to go through multiple drafts for the major writing assignments. Requiring students to bring early drafts to class for a round of peer review can be an effective way to accomplish this. It would also be helpful if faculty could assign one revision assignment during the semester, requiring students to incorporate the written feedback they received from the instructor (and peers) into a subsequent draft.* | | | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | |  | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Spring 2015* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *Faculty should strongly encourage students to leave extra time for the writing process, and mandate that students to go through multiple drafts for the major writing assignments. Requiring students to bring early drafts to class for a round of peer review can be an effective way to accomplish this. It would also be helpful if faculty could assign one revision assignment during the semester, requiring students to incorporate the written feedback they received from the instructor (and peers) into a subsequent draft.* | | | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | |  | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Fall 2014* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *Instructors should continue to encourage students to begin projects early to allow enough time for attention to the quality of their writing. Students should also be encouraged (or even mandated) to visit the Writing and Communications Center on a regular basis for feedback. It might also be beneficial for instructors to dedicate some portion of class time to peer feedback – where students get to read and evaluate the writing of other members of the class. This can serve as a useful way to highlight common issues and errors that can more easily be recognized when reading a paper that the student did not write.* | | | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | | *The written outcomes were worse than previous semester and disappointing. However the presentations skills improved. We will follow the new remedial action to seek improvement.* | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Spring 2014* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *Students should be encouraged to visit the Writing and Communications Center even if they receive a good grade on a paper. Specialists there can go over the writing and writing style with the student and attempt to highlight areas for continued improvement. Online sessions are now being offered, so even students with full-time employment can utilize the Center. It would also be useful for the instructor to set aside a small amount of class time for peer-to-peer document review, where students can see the writing style (pros and cons) of their fellow students. These sessions would be an opportunity to stress the importance of writing and communications to the entire class.* | | | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | | *The written scores decreased while the presentation skills improved.* | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Fall 2013* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *Instructors in the BI&A 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 BI&A 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.* | | | |
| **Objective 2** | | | *Students will be able to deliver presentations effectively.* | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Spring 2019* |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *Faculty should encourage students to practice in class (perhaps setting aside time for trial runs) to make sure they engage the audience. It would also be preferred to ask the audience to close their laptops and focus on the speakers to encourage them to reciprocate. Beyond that, faculty could create a style guide (with font size minimums, for example) to help the students adhere to best practices.* |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Fall 2018* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *It is recommended that faculty focus more attention on the visual representation of class data and include this as a component of the final project grade. Faculty can also provide additional opportunities for oral presentation during the semester (even if these are done in smaller groups) and to encourage peer feedback. Allowing time for a brief Q&A after each presentation would also be greatly beneficial.* | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Fall 2017* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *Faculty should be aware of the pros and cons of giving out presentation examples to students. They tend to copy what they see, both the good and the bad. Faculty can also make an explicit distinction between what they require in an academic presentation, and the different expectations that may come into play when preparing a presentation for external stakeholders.* | | | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | |  | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Spring 2017* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *The areas of concentration continue to be in eye contact and slide creation. For the physical side, students need to be encouraged (or even mandated) to create their talking points far in advance, to allow themselves adequate time to become familiar with their own material and not need to rely on the slides for support. As for the slides themselves, instructors are encouraged to grade the presentations on slide simplicity and clarity, not just the sum total of information present. Without this, the students are incentivized to create highly-detailed and dense slides which show their knowledge but are not always easy for an audience to digest.* | | | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | |  | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Fall 2016* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *No major change in remedial action is recommended. Starting work on the PowerPoint slides early is the key to a successful presentation, both in terms of slide quality and also because it allows additional time for practice and confidence building. Workshopping of presentations as they are being developed, and in-class practice and peer feedback, should continue to be fostered and encouraged.* | | | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | |  | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Spring 2016* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *Students should be encouraged to start projects early, so they have enough time to focus on the slide quality and practice their delivery. More peer review of the decks, and even of the verbal components, would be very helpful. Aspects like professional transitions between speakers and the importance of projecting enthusiasm should be discussed (and modeled) in class.* | | | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | |  | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Fall 2015* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *Students should be required to complete their PowerPoint decks at least three days prior to their presentation, so they have time for feedback and the opportunity to avoid some of the slide construction issues that consistently occur. Students should also be encouraged to project these slides onto a screen and view them from the back of a room. Very possibly, some of these problems would then be discovered and addressed. It would also give the speakers more opportunity to rehearse the oral component and get more comfortable with the material, reducing the need to look at the slides while they speak.* | | | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | |  | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Fall 2014* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *The most obvious means of improving presentation skills are obvious and unchanging: be familiar with the material and practice. Beyond that, the two elements that need the most work are eye contact and enthusiasm. For that, it is recommended that students are encouraged, and given opportunities, to practice their presentations in front of a group prior to the official presentation. A mandated peer review practice session, where other members of the group, and of other groups, can see the errors that are being made, and encourage their peers to improve their style, would be most beneficial. It would also be useful if the instructor could grade on their presentation style, which would encourage students to focus more of their attention on their delivery.* | | | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | | *The written outcomes were worse than previous semester and disappointing. However the presentations skills improved. We will follow the new remedial action to seek improvement.* | | | |
| **When Assessed:** | | | *Spring 2014* | | | |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | | | *It is recommended that the instructors encourage their students to practice delivering their presentations while NOT sitting in front of their computers. When speakers become too comfortable with staring at the screen while practicing, it encourages them to disengage from the audience and speak to the screen during the real thing. Students should continue to practice speaking whenever possible, and faculty are encouraged to assign more short, impromptu speaking opportunities so that students understand that public speaking is not only something done for a midterm or a final exam.* | | | |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | | | *The written scores decreased while the presentation skills improved.* | | | |
| **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. 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.* | | | |

# 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:** | | | |  |