

Communication Studies Program Assessment Report 2014-2015

I. Introduction of the Communication Studies Major Program

Located exclusively at the Klamath Falls campus, the Communication Studies program offers courses in a variety of communication contexts, including technical, rhetorical, interpersonal, group, and organizational communication. The program serves primarily Communication Studies majors, but also serves a group of students in other fields interested in communication-related course work to complement their chosen major.

Enrollment Trends

For Fall 2014, there were 37 total Communication Studies majors: 7 freshmen, 8 sophomore, 7 juniors, and 11 seniors. There were also 3 non-admit students.

The retention rate for 2013-2014 was 80%.¹

The program revision was approved by the CPC in Winter 2014. New courses are currently being rolled out (including the new technology sequence, the first course of which was assessed this year). As the new courses were designed to more completely meet the PSLOs, more and more data points will be available in the coming years (including the new Gender and Communication course to assess the new Diverse Perspectives ISLO and PSLO next year). For this year, due to the revisions, the data sets are small, but they should increase in the coming years.

II. Program Purpose, Mission Statement, and Objectives

Program Purpose, Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes

Communication faculty reviewed the current program objectives and learning outcomes to provide feedback for change to the program. All of the most recent modifications to the program mission, educational objectives, and learning outcomes are included in the sections below. Although the student learning detailed in this report was assessed in a classroom setting, students had other opportunities to demonstrate their learning in Communication student clubs, honor societies, externships, and regional academic conferences. In April 2015, three COM majors presented original research at the Northwest Communication Association annual convention.

Communication Studies Program Mission Statement

The Communication Studies Program prepares students for the challenges of a society that is shaped by communication. As participants in the program, students develop and integrate knowledge, creativity, ethical practice, and skills. Students also examine and produce work in oral, written, and visual communication and practice skills in group and intercultural communication.

Program Education Objectives

After completion of the Communication Studies program, students should be able to:

¹ The most recent retention data provided to the department was for the 2013-2014 school year.

1. Apply appropriate communication skills across settings, purposes, and audiences.
2. Demonstrate knowledge of communication theory and application.
3. Practice critical thinking to develop innovative and well-founded perspectives related to the students' emphases.
4. Build and maintain healthy and effective relationships.
5. Use technology to communicate effectively in various settings and contexts.
6. Demonstrate appropriate and professional ethical behavior.

Expected Program Student Learning Outcomes

Students with a bachelor's degree in Communication Studies should be able to:

1. Demonstrate critical and innovative thinking.
2. Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication.
3. Apply communication theories.
4. Understand opportunities in the field of communication.
5. Use current technology related to the communication field.
6. Respond effectively to cultural communication differences.
7. Communicate ethically.
8. Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges.

Information about the Objectives

The program objectives are reviewed annually, most recently throughout CSAC meetings in the 2014-2015 academic year. The department meets with their advisory board twice per year, and the advisory board last reviewed the program objectives in May 2014.

III. Three-Year Cycle for Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

The eight learning outcomes will be assessed, two or three each year, on a three-year cycle as demonstrated in Table 1.

Note: Due to approved changes to the major, the PSLO rubrics are being redesigned to better serve our students. The curriculum changes were approved by the COM advisory board in Fall 2013 and by the CPC in Winter 2014. The new technology course rolled out this year, and other courses will roll out next year.

Learning Outcomes	'11-'12	'12-'13	'13-'14	'14-'15	'15-'16	'16-'17
PSLO 1: Critical Thinking	•		•			
PSLO 2: Competence in Comm				•		•
PLSO 3: Communication Theory	•					•
PSLO 4: Opportunities in Field						•
PSLO 5: Use of Technology				•		
PSLO 6: Cultural Communication		•			•	
PSLO 7: Ethics		•			•	
PSLO 8: Group Communication		•			•	

Table1: Communication Studies Assessment Cycle

IV. Summary of 2014-2015 Assessment Activities

The Communication Studies faculty will conducted formal assessment of Competence in Communication (PSLO 2) and Use of Technology (PSLO 5).

Competence in Communication was assessed in COM407 (Propaganda) and in COM106 (Introduction to Communication Research). Use of Technology was assessed in our new COM109 course Technology and Communication.

Program Student Learning Outcome 2: Students with a Bachelor's degree in Communication Studies should be able to communicate effectively.

Program Student Learning Outcome 5: Students with a Bachelor's degree in Communication Studies should be able to use technology effectively.

Direct Assessment of PSLO 2

PSLO 2 was assessed at both the 100-level and the 400-level. The 400-level was the original choice, but, due to the small size of the course, the PSLO was also assessed in COM106. The Communication department is unique in that many of the students take 100-level courses, including COM106, with junior-level or senior-level standing. In addition, most of the students in COM407 had upper-division status.

For both courses, the Oregon Tech Written Communication Rubric (attached as an appendix) was used to assess the students' writing. For COM407, Dr. Christian Vukasovich's Propaganda Special Topics class, the final project included a presentation of the paper, so the Oregon Tech Public Speaking Rubric was used (attached as an appendix)

COM106: Introduction to Communication Research Written Communication

The final paper was used to assess written communication. The OIT Written Communication rubric was used to score the final papers. A total of 16 students were assessed. A graphic representation of the assessment results appears below:

Performance Criteria	Assessment Method	Measurement Scale	Minimum Acceptable	Results (% at 3 or 4)
Purpose	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	75%
Organization	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	81%
Support	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	50%
Style	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	81%
Convention	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	75%
Documentation	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	56%

Table 2: COM106: Competence in Communication (Written Communication)—used a rubric to assess the final paper.

Having 80% of students rated at level 3 or 4 shows proficiency. Thus, from the above table, COM students in COM106 are doing well with organization and style, and they are close to benchmark in writing purpose and convention (in fact, the relatively small sample size could skew this data either way). The documentation and support need some work.

Writing was further assessed in COM407: Propaganda.

COM407: Propaganda

Written Communication

The final paper was used to assess written communication. The OIT Written Communication rubric was used to score the final papers. Because many of the COM students opted to work in a group, two papers (one from a group and one from an individual) were used for the assessment. A graphic representation of the assessment results appear below:

Performance Criteria	Assessment Method	Measurement Scale	Minimum Acceptable	Results (% at 3 or 4)
Purpose	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	100%
Organization	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	100%
Support	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	100%
Style	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	100%
Convention	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	100%
Documentation	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	100%

Table 3: COM407: Competence in Communication (Written Communication)—used a rubric to assess the final paper.

Having 80% of students rated at level 3 or 4 shows proficiency. Thus, from the above table, COM students in COM407 were doing well with having purposeful writing that was organized, well-supported, stylistically and conventionally appropriate, and in correct APA. This was a very small group made up of some of the best COM students, so their high scores, while impressive, may not be representative of the entire COM program.

Oral Communication

The final presentation was used to assess oral communication competence. The OIT Public Speaking rubric was used to score the final presentations. Because many of the COM students opted to work in a group, two presentations (one from a group and one from an individual) were used for the assessment. A graphic representation of the assessment results appear below:

Performance Criteria	Assessment Method	Measurement Scale	Minimum Acceptable	Results (% at 3 or 4)
Content	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	100%
Organization	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	100%
Style	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	100%
Delivery	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	50%
Visuals	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	100%

Table 4: COM407: Competence in Communication (Oral Communication)—used a rubric to assess the final presentation.

Having 80% of students rated at level 3 or 4 shows proficiency. Thus, from the above table, COM students in COM407 were doing well with having good content in their speeches, very organized speeches, good style/audience analysis, and powerful visuals that added to their presentations. Only 50% (or 1 of 2) had good delivery. Of course, the small number of assessed students could have skewed this data set. In addition, small group was made up of some of the best COM students, so their overall high scores, while impressive, may not be representative of the entire COM program.

Indirect Assessment of PSLO 2

The exit survey was administered to the 2 seniors graduating from the Communication program in 2015. This survey included two questions asking students to assess their oral and written skills (basically the same question asked twice as a validity check). On both measures, 2 of 2 respondents rated themselves as proficient or very proficient in both written and oral communication.

The small number of graduates may have skewed the results. Next year, there will be more graduates, which means more people will take the survey, so the validity should be increased next year.

PSLO 2 Summary and Reflection

Areas of Competence: Both the COM106 and the COM407 written communication assessments showed that COM students can organize papers effectively and have strong writing style; while the purpose and convention criteria were only met with 75% proficiency in COM106, they were at 100% in COM407, and the small sample size could affect these data.

Speaking-wise, the COM407 oral communication assessment showed that the students are able to transfer their strong organizational writing skills into a well-developed and well-supported presentation, with powerful visuals and solid content.

Areas for Improvement: From the COM106 assessment, students still struggle with finding credible support for their claims and with APA use. The support deduction came from the students' lack of academic research. Students who were not competent in this area would either only use a couple of academic sources, rely on popular press sources, and/or use dated sources. Regardless of its form, the students were not finding enough credible sources to support their claims. In addition, many students still struggled with APA formatting (which was seen in the prior Competence in Communication assessment and will be explained below). Students struggled with in-text citations, the reference list, and the cover page and running head formatting, with the in-text citations and reference list proving the most troublesome.

Speaking-wise, the COM407 students earned the 4 on all criteria except for the delivery part. While this may be due to the small number of students included in the assessment, it still points to the need for improved oral communication delivery skills.

Plans for Improvement: Since the last Competence in Communication assessment, COM faculty have made a sincere effort to strengthen APA skills and enforce APA use, but there are still persistent APA issues. It is possible that COM faculty could weight APA use a bit more heavily on major assignments to further encourage students to conform with APA.

In the intro-level sequence courses, departmental faculty could elaborate on what an academic source is and how to use such a source effectively. Given the strong organizational skills, this could be as simple as showing the students that the more credible the source, the better it is for supporting the thesis.

To improve delivery in oral communication, faculty could offer students more time to speak during class activities. This would give some stress-free practice that could help students hone their delivery.

Other Areas for Consideration: In the COM106 assessment, purpose and convention at the 75% mark for competence, but they were at 100% competence in the COM407 assessment. Two things could account for this difference:

1. The COM407 students were among the best and the brightest in the COM program, so they were probably among the competent ones in COM106 (as many students were in both classes).
2. The department is rather small, and both classes had a fairly small sample size, and this small size could affect the results. It will be interesting to see the results as the department continues to grow in size and as the new courses are rolled out in the coming years.

Direct Assessment of PSLO 5

PSLO 5 was assessed in COM109, a new course that was rolled out this year as part of the newly-revised COM major. Like other COM courses, there were several juniors and seniors even though the course was lower-division.

For the assessment, the assessment coordinator found a technical communication rubric and sent it to Dr. Franny Howes, the new Tech Comm professor. Dr. Howes modified the rubric to more closely align with what OIT expects of its graduates. This rubric appears as an appendix.

A mid-term project (consisting of creation of informational comic book or strip; turns in a comic and a one-page memo analyzing the audience and reflecting on the experience and the rhetorical choices made) was used to assess technical communication in COM109, the new Technology course. The new Technical Communication rubric was used to score the projects. A total of 10 students were assessed. A graphic representation of the assessment results appears below:

Performance Criteria	Assessment Method	Measurement Scale	Minimum Acceptable	Results (% at 3 or 4)
Language Use	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	70%
Visual Use	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	80%
Audience Analysis	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	90%
Memo Reflection	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	90%
Stylistics Use	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	50%

Table 5: COM109: Technology Use—used a rubric to assess the mid-term project.

Having 80% of students rated at 3 or 4 shows proficiency. Thus, when it comes to visual use in technical communications, audience analysis, and memo reflection and

use, COM students are proficient. 70% of COM students are proficient with their language use, but this may be due to the small sample size. Only 50% were proficient in stylistics use, which encompasses both grammar/mechanics and use of technical tools.

Indirect Assessment of PSLO 5

The exit survey was administered to the 2 seniors graduating from the Communication program in 2015. This survey included a question asking students to assess their technological communication abilities. This was on a three point scale, with 3 being highly prepared, 2 being prepared, and 1 being not prepared. 1 student rated him/herself as “highly prepared” while 1 student rated him/herself as “prepared.”

The small number of graduates may have skewed the results. Next year, there will be more graduates, which means more people will take the survey, so the validity should be increased next year.

PSLO 5 Summary and Reflection

Areas of Competence: Much like the competence in oral communication criterion, the technological communication criterion assessed how well students could effectively use visuals to convey a message, and, much like in the oral communication assessment, the COM students were able to effectively integrate visuals into their Tech Comm projects. In addition, they demonstrated strong audience analysis skills (which also ties in with effective communication), and they were competent in writing memos and reflecting on their work. Reflection is a useful and transferrable skill that they are learning in the 100-level and should continue throughout their studies at OIT and beyond.

Areas for Improvement: The students need to work on their stylistics. Only 50% were deemed competent at grammar, mechanics, and technical tools use. Closely related (see the rubric), only 70% were assessed as competent in their language use. Oftentimes, style issues and language use issues intersect, so, in a future assessment, it will be interesting to see if these improve together.

Plans for Improvement: While the COM106 students used language effectively, their project went through many drafts. To improve stylistics and language issues across the board, COM faculty could consider requiring additional drafts to catch style issues early in the term with the goal of improving those issues over the course of the term and over the course of the students’ time at OIT.

Other Areas for Consideration

V. Summary of Student Learning

Student Learning Outcome 2: Students with a Bachelor’s degree in Communication should be able to communicate effectively

Strengths: Both the COM106 and the COM407 written communication assessments showed that COM students can organize papers effectively and have strong writing style; while the purpose and convention criteria were only met with 75% proficiency in COM106, they were at 100% in COM407, and the small sample size could affect these data.

Speaking-wise, the COM407 oral communication assessment showed that the students are able to transfer their strong organizational writing skills into a well-developed and well-supported presentation, with powerful visuals and solid content.

Weaknesses: From the COM106 assessment, students still struggle with finding credible support for their claims and with APA use. The support deduction came from the students' lack of academic research. Students who were not competent in this area would either only use a couple of academic sources, rely on popular press sources, and/or use dated sources. Regardless of its form, the students were not finding enough credible sources to support their claims. In addition, many students still struggled with APA formatting (which was seen in the prior Competence in Communication assessment and will be explained below). Students struggled with in-text citations, the reference list, and the cover page and running head formatting, with the in-text citations and reference list proving the most troublesome.

Speaking-wise, the COM407 students earned the 4 on all criteria except for the delivery part. While this may be due to the small number of students included in the assessment, it still points to the need for improved oral communication delivery skills.

Plans for Assessment: Since the last Competence in Communication assessment, COM faculty have made a sincere effort to strengthen APA skills and enforce APA use, but there are still persistent APA issues. It is possible that COM faculty could weight APA use a bit more heavily on major assignments to further encourage students to conform with APA.

In the intro-level sequence courses, departmental faculty could elaborate on what an academic source is and how to use such a source effectively. Given the strong organizational skills, this could be as simple as showing the students that the more credible the source, the better it is for supporting the thesis.

To improve delivery in oral communication, faculty could offer students more time to speak during class activities. This would give some stress-free practice that could help students hone their delivery.

Student Learning Outcome 5: Students with a Bachelor's degree in Communication should be able to use technology effectively.

Strengths: Much like the competence in oral communication criterion, the technological communication criterion assessed how well students could effectively use visuals to convey a message, and, much like in the oral communication assessment, the COM students were able to effectively integrate visuals into their Tech Comm projects. In addition, they demonstrated strong audience analysis skills (which also ties in with effective communication), and they were competent in writing memos and reflecting on their work. Reflection is a useful and transferrable skill that they are learning in the 100-level and should continue throughout their studies at OIT and beyond.

Weaknesses: The students need to work on their stylistics. Only 50% were deemed competent at grammar, mechanics, and technical tools use. Closely related (see the rubric), only 70% were assessed as competent in their language use. Oftentimes, style issues and language use issues intersect, so, in a future assessment, it will be interesting to see if these improve together.

Plans for Assessment: While the COM106 students used language effectively, their project went through many drafts. To improve stylistics and language issues across the board, COM faculty could consider requiring additional drafts to catch style issues early in the term with the goal of improving those issues over the course of the term and over the course of the students' time at OIT.

VI. Changes as a Result of Previous Assessments

Closing the Loop/Relating This Assessment to Previous Competence in Communication Assessment

In the last Competence in Communication assessment (completed in 2010-2011), students were assessed for competence in both oral and written communication.

The 2010-2011 written communication assessment found that:

1. Some students (44%) did not demonstrate proficient support in developing main ideas.
2. A quarter of students (25%) did not demonstrate proficient style by using appropriate voice, wording, and sentence structure.
3. A quarter of students (25%) did not demonstrate proficient use of conventions to enhance communication.
4. Many students (60%) did not demonstrate proficient use of documentation.

Compared to the previous assessment, the students have improved in their style and their organization, though this could be because of the caliber of students taking the COM407 class and the large number of drafts involved in the COM106 class. The other criterion still need some work. Given that the increased focus on style and organization has resulted in improvement in these areas, faculty should consider working on support and documentation, two things that go hand-in-hand for many communication assignments and two things that still need to improve.

The 2010-2011 oral communication assessment found that:

1. Approximately a quarter of the students (26%) did not demonstrate proficiency in the area of delivery, including limited or no use of gestures, little poise, multiple oral fillers, and heavy reliance on notes.
2. Some students (37%) did not demonstrate proficiency in the area of visuals, including not referring to a visual, distracting visuals, or limited use of the visual.

The students have improved their use of visuals, but this may be due to the small number of presentations that were assessed. While one of the groups showed an improvement in delivery, the other was still not proficient, but there are only two in the sample. It may prove useful to re-assess oral communication competence with a larger sample size.

Plans for further addressing shortcomings are explained above in the “Plans for Improvement.”

Given that this is the first time that technology in communication has been assessed (at least from the reports that this Assessment Coordinator could find on the OIT website), there is not a lot to compare at this point; however, there is a COM309 course, which is the next course in the sequence, and COM309 data could provide an interesting comparison to the COM109 data in a future report.

VII. Curriculum Map (will be refined in the coming years as new COM major courses are being rolled out)

Courses below are coded for the level of competence expected in the course. In each of the courses noted, students demonstrate skills or knowledge in the SLO, and/or students receive feedback on their performance on the SLO.

I = Introduced
R = Reinforced
E=Emphasized

Outcome (PSLO2): Students with a Bachelor’s Degree in Communication Studies should be able to Communicate Effectively

Communication Studies Course	Introduced	Reinforced	Emphasized
COM 104 Intro to Comm	I		
COM 105 Intro to Comm Theory	I	R	
COM 106 Intro to Comm Research	I	R	
COM109 Technology and Comm			
COM 115 Intro to Mass Comm			
COM 205 Intercultural Comm			
COM 216 Grammar and Punct	I		
COM 225 Interpersonal Comm			
COM 226 Nonverbal Comm			
COM 237 Intro to Visual Comm			
COM 248 Digital Media Production	I		
COM 255 Communication Ethics			
COM 256 Public Relations			
COM 276 Democracy and Media			
COM 301 Rhet Theory and Apps.			
COM 309 Applied Technology			
COM 325 Gender and Comm			
COM 326 Comm Research		R	E
COM 345 Organizational Comm I			
COM 346 Health Comm			
COM 347 Negotiation and Con Res			
COM 348 Facilitation			
COM 358 Comm and the Law			
COM 365 Elect Comm and Soc			
COM 407 SPECIAL TOPICS		R	E
COM 415 Multimedia Presentation			
COM 420 Externship			
COM 424 Capstone			
COM 425 Mediation			
COM 426 Mediation Practicum			
COM 437 Training and Dev			
COM 445 Organizational Comm II			
COM 446 Leadership and Comm			
JOUR 211 Publications: Newspaper			
JOUR 311 Advanced Newspaper			
SPE 314 Argumentation		R	E
WRI 328 Technical Journalism		R	E
WRI 350 Document Editing		R	
WRI 415 Technical Editing		R	
WRI 420 Document Design			

Outcome (PSLO1): Students with a Bachelor’s Degree in Communication Studies should be able to use technology effectively.

Communication Studies Course	Introduced	Reinforced	Emphasized
COM 104 Intro to Comm			
COM 105 Intro to Comm Theory			
COM 106 Intro to Comm Research			
COM109 Technology and Comm	I	R	
COM 115 Intro to Mass Comm			
COM 205 Intercultural Comm			
COM 216 Grammar and Punct			
COM 225 Interpersonal Comm			
COM 226 Nonverbal Comm			
COM 237 Intro to Visual Comm	I	R	
COM 248 Digital Media Production	I	R	
COM 255 Communication Ethics			
COM 256 Public Relations			
COM 276 Democracy and Media			
COM 301 Rhet Theory and Apps.			
COM 309 Applied Technology		R	E
COM 325 Gender and Comm			
COM 326 Comm Research			
COM 345 Organizational Comm I			
COM 346 Health Comm			
COM 347 Negotiation and Con Res			
COM 348 Facilitation			
COM 358 Comm and the Law			
COM 365 Elect Comm and Soc			
COM 407 SPECIAL TOPICS			
COM 415 Multimedia Presentation		R	
COM 420 Externship			
COM 424 Capstone			
COM 425 Mediation			
COM 426 Mediation Practicum			
COM 437 Training and Dev			
COM 445 Organizational Comm II			
COM 446 Leadership and Comm			
JOUR 211 Publications: Newspaper			
JOUR 311 Advanced Newspaper			
SPE 314 Argumentation			
WRI 328 Technical Journalism		R	
WRI 350 Document Editing		R	
WRI 415 Technical Editing		R	
WRI 420 Document Design		R	

Appendix: Rubrics

OIT Essay Rubric

Performance Criteria	1 Limited Proficiency	2 Some Proficiency	3 Proficiency	4 High Proficiency
Purpose	Writing has limited or no focus. Purpose and main ideas are unclear and require inference from reader.	Reader can discern the purpose and main ideas although they may be overly broad or simplistic.	Writing is clear and focused. Reader can easily understand the purpose and main ideas.	Purpose and main ideas are exceptionally focused, clear, and interesting.
Organization	Order and structure are unclear. Introduction and conclusion are underdeveloped or missing.	Order and structure are overly formulaic. Introduction and conclusion may be underdeveloped or too obvious.	Order and structure are clear and easy to follow. Introduction draws in the reader and conclusion brings satisfying closure.	Order and structure are compelling and move the reader through the text easily. Introduction draws in the reader and conclusion brings satisfying closure.
Support	Development is minimal. Some supporting details may be irrelevant or repetitious.	Supporting details are relevant, but are limited or rather general. Support may be based on clichés, stereotypes, or questionable sources or evidence.	The main ideas are well developed by supporting details. When appropriate, use of outside sources provides credible support.	Main ideas are well developed by strong support and rich details. When appropriate, use of outside sources provides strong, credible support.
Style	Voice is inappropriate for topic, purpose, or audience. Wording is incorrect or monotonous, detracting from impact. Sentences tend to be choppy, rambling, and awkward.	Voice is inconsistent for topic, purpose, and audience. Wording is quite ordinary, lacking interest, precision, and variety, and may rely on clichés. Sentences tend to be mechanical rather than fluid with an overuse of simple sentence structures.	Voice is generally appropriate for topic, purpose, and audience. Generally, wording conveys message in an interesting, precise, and natural way. Sentences are carefully crafted with variations in structure.	Voice is appropriate for topic, purpose, and audience. Wording is fresh and specific, with a striking and varied vocabulary. Sentences are highly crafted, with varied structure that makes reading easy and enjoyable.
Convention	Numerous errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and/or grammar. Errors sometime impede readability. Substantial editing needed.	Writing contains punctuation, spelling, and/or grammar errors, but they do not impede readability and are not extensive. Moderate need for editing.	Writing demonstrates control of standard writing conventions and uses them effectively to enhance communication. Few errors.	Writing demonstrates strong control of standard writing conventions and uses them well to enhance communication. Very few or no errors.
Documentation	Documentation has major errors or is not present.	Documentation has frequent errors.	Documentation is correct except for a few errors.	Documentation is meticulous.

OIT Public Speaking Rubric

Performance Criteria	1 Limited Proficiency	2 Some Proficiency	3 Proficiency	4 High Proficiency
Content	Few or no attributed sources. Supporting materials lack credibility and/or don't relate to thesis. Limited or no attempt to	Some attributed sources used. Supporting materials are somewhat credible and/or don't clearly relate to thesis. Attempt to inform or persuade.	Adequate number of credible and appropriately attributed sources used. Supporting materials relate to thesis. Informs or persuades.	A variety of credible and appropriate sources used. Supporting materials relate in an exceptional way to a focused thesis. Informs or persuades.
Organization	Lacks organizational structure. Introduction and/or conclusion missing. No transitions used.	Organizational structure present but unclear with underdeveloped introduction and conclusion. Transitions are awkward.	Appropriate organizational pattern used and easy to follow with developed introduction and satisfying conclusion. Main points are smoothly connected with transitions	Organizational pattern is compelling and moves audience through speech with ease. Introduction draws in the audience and conclusion is satisfying. Main points are smoothly connected with transitions.
Style	No understanding of audience regarding topic or purpose of speech. Little enthusiasm and passion for topic. No regard for time constraints.	Some understanding of audience regarding topic or purpose of speech. Some enthusiasm and passion for topic. Some regard for time constraints.	Competent understanding of audience regarding topic and purpose. Enthusiasm and passion for topic. Speech given within time constraints.	Thorough understanding of audience regarding topic and purpose. Clear enthusiasm and passion for topic. Speech given within time constraints.
Delivery	No gestures or eye contact. Monotone voice or insufficient volume. Little poise. Reading of notes only. Abundant oral fillers and nonverbal distractions.	Some gestures and eye contact. Ineffective use of language and voice. Little poise. Heavy reliance on notes. Multiple oral fillers and nonverbal distractions.	Adequate use of gestures, eye contact, language, and voice. Poised with minor reliance on notes. Limited oral fillers and nonverbal distractions.	Effective use of gestures, eye contact, vivid language, and voice to add interest to speech. Poised with use of notes for reference only. No oral fillers and verbal distractions
Visuals	No visuals or poorly designed and documented visuals that distract from speech or do not create interest. Limited reference to visuals or so much reference delivery is hindered.	Visuals present, but simply designed with limited use of documentation. Visuals are referred to but do not create interest. Visuals may interfere with delivery.	Well-designed and documented visuals that clarify speech and create interest. Visuals are referred to and sufficiently discussed, while not interfering with delivery	Well-designed and documented visuals that clarify speech, create interest, and hold attention of the audience. Visuals are sufficiently discussed and effectively integrated into speech.

Technical Communication Rubric

	Poor 1	Fair 2	Good 3	Excellent 4
Language Use	Language very superficial	Some attention is paid to language, but does not really explain or illuminate	Language explains and illuminates	Skillful use of language to explain and illuminate
Visual Use	Very basic visuals with very basic arrangement	Visuals developed purposefully, but need some refinement	Development and arrangement of visuals is good	Skillful development and arrangement of visuals
Audience Analysis	The audience is not really considered; the concept is not fully developed; may include ethical lapses	The concept is not fully developed; the audience may not be fully considered	Concept is developed and audience is considered; though there are a couple of lapses	Well developed concept and appropriate scope, tone, and content for the intended audience
Memo Reflection	Memo not thoughtful or reflective and may be superficial or extremely short; no justification of choices	Choices articulated but not really justified; memo is underdeveloped	Memo is thoughtful and reflective; choices justified, though not fully	Thoughtful reflective memo, thinking about and justifying your choices
Stylistics Use	English needs editing; content may be illegible; the visual is either very lacking in refinement or is not present; technology may be used incorrectly with obvious visual flaws	Some lapses in English use; the visual needs some polishing; some tech tools used, but others not evident or could be improved	English use is pretty good; the visual seems polished; formatting is good; use of tech tools evident	Correct use of edited English, polished visual editing, good use of available technological tools, and correct formatting