

**University Summary Report:  
Oral Communication  
Assessment of Student Learning for  
Graduate Programs**  
October 26, 2021, version 1

**INTRODUCTION**

**Special Note about COVID-19:** It is important to note that a significant amount of the work referenced in this report was completed during the COVID-19 pandemic that began in the Spring of 2020 and continued in the Fall of 2021 when this report was written. This includes the collection, assessment, and analysis of student work in college discussions, and implementing college and University changes - all of which were impacted to some degree.

The Educational Effectiveness Committee, along with other academic committees such as CAPR and the ILO Subcommittee, supported ongoing reflection about student learning for mindful, flexible, and nimble decision making during this dynamic period. Additionally, teaching, learning, and assessment discussions and decision-making related to diversity, inclusion, and social justice issues were a critical part of academic assessment during this time.

---

which aligns the assessment schedule for undergraduate, graduate, and [the Longterm Assessment Plan](#)

Following the schedule for the [ILO Long Term Assessment Plan](#), Cal State East Bay has

Development of these discipline-specific oral communication skills is completed within major courses in a student's degree major. Students who have not mastered general oral communication skills prior to admission may address that deficiency by completing courses which fulfill the undergraduate GE A1 relres ( )

Table 1. Numbers of programs aligned by college for Oral Communication ILO 2020-21.

<b>College</b>	<b>Programs Represented</b>	<b># Programs Aligned to Oral Communication ILO</b>
CBE	Accountancy (not aligned but provided results) Business Administration	2
CEAS	Educational Technology (not aligned but provided results)	1
CLASS	None	0
CSCI	Biological Sciences	1

No common process was specified for collecting or assessing data. Again, some programs were subject to assessment requirements from outside accrediting organizations. Others intended to gather data from small available samples of students completing theses, or from courses with large enrollment and multiple sections. As a result, each program was asked to specify their own assessment process and describe the process when reporting their results. Some programs assessed assignments from all students in an assessed class, and others chose a small number randomly. Most programs used a single assessor to assess each assignment.

**Co-curricular: Communications Laboratory**

The Department of Communication sponsors the



many programs using at least a number of criteria similar to the university rubric criteria. In the absence of a mapping from discipline-specific criteria to university rubric criteria, which might allow for detailed comparisons on a per-criteria basis, a rough comparison was completed using the following method. Scores were averaged across criteria on a per-program basis, rescaled to a 1-4 scale, and then averaged across all programs in a college, and separately across all programs in the university. One might interpret these numbers as estimates of how programs themselves see the proficiency levels of their students, where various programs may hold different expectations as to the manner in which proficiency may be demonstrated by their students.

The results of the assessment of oral communication performance for the Oral Communication ILO on a per-program basis ranged between 3.16 to 3.86 on a 1-4 scale. The interpretation of the ranking values for the university rubric is given below. No programs from CLASS were aligned with the Oral Communication ILO.

Table 3. Average score on all Oral Communication criteria on scale of 1-4

	<b>University</b>	<b>CBE</b>	<b>CEAS</b>	<b>CLASS</b>	<b>CSCI</b>
<b>Average score</b>	3.44	3.16	3.86	No assessment done	3.3

**1 – Major Gaps      2 – Some Gaps      3 – Competent      4 – Fully Competent**

Perhaps more useful are some themes that emerged throughout the ILO assessment reports.

- Most programs were satisfied with the oral communication proficiency of their students across most of the criteria that they assessed.
- One program identified one or two criteria in which their students struggled to show proficiency. They have suggested possible solutions for addressing the concerns.
- Programs which identified concerns specified that those concerns could and would be addressed.

- “Many new

### **Support for College and Graduate Advisory Council Discussions**

Please see University Summary Report for contacts and potential meeting format. Possible additional graduate-specific discussion questions include:

1. How do results of graduate assessment compare to undergraduate assessment in departments with both undergraduate and graduate programs? Were results as expected?
2. Were there commonalities between programs in areas of student proficiency or gaps? Can common solutions for addressing gaps be suggested?
3. What is the importance of each criteria within a rubric? Should weights be assigned?
4. Are expectations for proficiency for similar criteria different between programs or colleges? Should they be?
5. Which oral communication interventions are working well, and which are not, for graduate students in particular?
6. What else can be done to improve oral communication skills?