

2011 Assessment of General Education Outcomes

Introduction

The 2010-2011 General Education Committee, chaired by Doug Weaver, directed the annual assessment of general education outcomes. These outcomes, established by the General Education Task Force in 2007-2008, represent attributes expected of all Baylor graduates, regardless of major:

- Communication: Communicate effectively and clearly, both in writing and in speaking, in a manner appropriate to the subject, occasion, and audience.
- Critical Thinking: Be proficient in evaluating evidence, articulating arguments, justifying conclusions, and identifying and presenting multiple perspectives.
- Christian Perspective: Demonstrate knowledge of the Christian scriptures and Christian heritage that enables participation in discourse from a Christian perspective.
- Leadership, Civic Engagement, and Service: Demonstrate an understanding of the challenges of a global society with a commitment to social and civic responsibility and service among diverse communities.

Assessments for each outcome followed the protocol established by the 2007-2008 General Education Task Force and were facilitated by Tricia Tolbert, director of assessment and compliance.

Communication and Critical Thinking

The assessment plan calls for written and oral communication to be assessed in alternate years, due to the extensive faculty time required. Critical thinking is assessed along with written communication by examining papers written for senior-level courses across the university, and these outcomes were assessed most recently in 2010. For 2011, faculty focused on assessing students' oral communication abilities, using presentations prepared for senior-level courses. The rationale for this approach is that students are more likely to display their best efforts when the work is a class requirement, rather than an artificial assignment strictly for general assessment purposes.

Methods

Early in the spring semester of 2011, faculty teaching senior-level courses with required oral presentations were asked to participate in the assessment project. Faculty were assured that no individual- or department-level information would be collected. Faculty from five of the eight undergraduate units volunteered to allow their students' presentations to be recorded. Presenters were not identified, and no demographic information was collected. A total of 86 oral presentations ranging in length from five to 45 minutes were collected. The recordings were stored in BearSpace for the duration of the assessment project and later archived on DVDs.

In late May, seven faculty evaluators viewed and assessed the presentations for competence in oral communication. The evaluators were selected from a pool of volunteers by a subcommittee of the General Education Committee and received a stipend for their work. One of the seven had served on the team assessing oral communication in 2009. Led by Dr. Mark Morman of Communication Studies, the faculty scorers first established inter-rater reliability using a standard scoring form (see Appendix). In an attempt to establish scoring reliability across years, the group viewed recorded presentations from the 2009 assessment project and discussed how they were scored. Next, pairs of faculty scorers, working independently, viewed each presentation, scoring them holistically from 4 (Highly Competent) to 1 (Not Competent). If scorers assigned adjacent scores (e.g., 3 and 4 or 2 and 3) for a presentation, a third viewing was considered unnecessary. Non-adjacent scores were resolved by a third scorer. Finally, the scorers indicated areas of weakness for low-scoring presentations (scores below 3), using a checklist on the scoring form.

After the first day of scoring, the faculty submitted their scores for compilation, and the following morning the group reconvened to review the scores and resolve scoring questions from the first day. The same process was followed until all presentations were scored. Only three presentations received non-adjacent scores (e.g., 2 and 4), and those differences were resolved by a third scorer. Six of the presentations, all from the business school, were of a format so different from the others in the sample that the faculty decided to omit them. In the omitted presentations, teams of students were randomly selected to respond to a guest speaker, and their responses were deemed too brief to score. Therefore, 80 of the 86 presentations were scored.

Overall Results

After the faculty completed the evaluation phase of the project, IE staff compiled and analyzed the results. Scores assigned by the viewers of each presentation were added to form a total score, so scores ranged from 8 (two ratings of 4) to 2 (two ratings of 1). Presentations with total scores of 7 or 8 were considered Highly Competent, those with total scores of 5 or 6 were considered Competent, those with total scores of 3 or 4 were considered Minimally Competent, and those with total scores of 2 were considered Not Competent. Table 1 displays the overall results.

Table 1: Overall Results for Oral Communication Competence					
Overall Rating	Total Score	# of Presentations	% of Presentations	% by Overall Rating	% Meeting Expectations
Highly Competent	8	7	8.8%	37.5%	81.3%
	7	23	28.8%		
Competent	6	21	26.3%	43.8%	

Table 1: Overall Results for Oral Communication Competence					
Overall Rating	Total Score	# of Presentations	% of Presentations	% by Overall Rating	% Meeting Expectations
	5	14	17.5%		
Minimally Competent	4	12	15.0%	17.5%	
	3	2	2.5%		
Not Competent	2	1	1.3%	1.3%	
Totals		80	100.0%	100.0%	

The results indicate that 30 of the 80 presentations (37.5%) were judged to be Highly Competent by the faculty evaluators. The General Education Task Force had predicted that 25 percent would merit that rating, so the criterion for success was exceeded.

The largest proportion of presentations (43.8%) scored in the Competent range. Adding this group to the Highly Competent group indicates that 81.3 percent of the presentations met or exceeded the faculty's criteria for competence in oral communication. This percentage exceeded the General Education Task Force's prediction of 75 percent.

Fourteen presentations (17.5%) were judged to be Minimally Competent, signifying presentations with a number of weaknesses, but meeting minimally acceptable standards for a Baylor graduate. Only one presentation was judged Not Competent.

Comparison with 2009 Results

For the initial assessment in 2009, a total of 129 oral presentations were collected from upper-level courses in two academic units. Of those, 12 presentations were deemed too brief for scoring, so 117 were scored. In 2011, while five academic units supplied oral presentations, only 86 were collected and 80 of those were scored. Table 2 compares results from the 2009 assessment of oral communication with those from 2011.

Ratings	Percent by Overall Rating		Percent Meeting Faculty Expectations	
	2009	2011	2009	2011
Highly Competent	13.6%	37.5%	72.6%	81.3%
Competent	59.0%	43.8%		
Minimally Competent	19.6%	17.5%		
Not Competent	7.7%	3.8%		

In comparison with 2009, the 2011 assessment yielded a higher percentage of Highly Competent ratings (37.5% vs. 13.6%), as well as a higher percentage meeting faculty expectations for Baylor graduates. These differences might, of course, reflect the different set of raters, despite efforts to standardize ratings across years. The differences also could stem from a more broadly representative sample drawn from the different schools and colleges in 2011.

Areas of Weakness

In addition to assigning holistic scores, the faculty also identified weaknesses in oral presentations with any individual score below 3. About 36 percent – 29 -- of the presentations were in this group. Analysis of the areas of weakness cited by the faculty scorers is summarized in Table 3.

Areas of Weakness	Number Cited	Percent Cited
Introduction	23	79%
Organization	17	59%
Support	12	41%
Conclusion	23	79%
Delivery	26	90%

As Table 3 illustrates, most of the lower-scoring presentations were cited for weaknesses in delivery. The scorers also cited nearly 80 percent of them for weak introductions and conclusions. Organization of the presentations and adequate support for the ideas presented were somewhat less frequently cited as weaknesses. Table 4 presents the complete list of specific weaknesses cited by the faculty scorers, in order of frequency.

Table 4: Specific Weaknesses in Low-Scoring Presentations			
Weakness Area	Specific Weakness	Number Cited	Percent of all with low scores
Delivery:	Eye contact	20	71%
Conclusion:	Review of main points of speech	18	64%
Conclusion:	Ending statement	17	61%
Introduction:	Attention gaining device	15	54%
Introduction:	Signposting/Preview statement	15	54%
Organization:	Major Transitions (i.e., between main sections of speech)	15	54%
Conclusion:	Restatement of purpose/main goal	15	54%
Conclusion:	Restatement of thesis/main idea	14	50%
Delivery:	Posture	14	50%
Organization:	Minor Transitions (i.e., between key points/ideas of speech)	13	46%
Delivery:	Hand gestures	13	46%
Introduction:	Thesis statement/main idea or purpose statement/main goal	10	36%
Delivery:	Facial expression/affect	10	36%
Delivery:	Vocalics (e.g., rate, pitch, tone, volume)	9	32%
Introduction:	Explanation of topic's significance	8	29%
Support:	Use of visual aids	6	21%
Delivery:	Paralanguage (e.g., use of "um" "uh" "ah")	6	21%
Organization:	Overall structure of speech	5	18%
Organization:	Clarity of main points/ideas of speech	5	18%
Support:	Use of source references/internal source citations	5	18%
Delivery:	Dress/Appearance	5	18%
Delivery:	Vocal pronunciation/diction	5	18%

As the table indicates, the specific weakness cited most often by reviewers was failure to maintain eye contact with the audience, which was observed in 71% of the lower-scoring presentations. The next two most frequently cited weaknesses were identified in the presentations' conclusions. Failure to review the main points was cited for 64% of the presentations, and omission of an ending statement was noted in 61% of the presentations. While the use of a different scoring form in 2011 prevents direct comparison with the weaknesses observed in 2009, failure to maintain eye contact was the second most cited weakness in that year's assessment.

Faculty Recommendations

The faculty scorers offered some observations and recommendations about student presentations, to be shared with other faculty members. Those included:

- Providing a sample grading rubric for oral presentations to faculty and students. Instructors could revise the rubric to address their expectations for the presentations.
- Developing a web-based tutorial on presentation skills for student use. Instructors could refer students to the tutorial when oral presentations are assigned.

Christian Perspective

The Christian Perspective outcome was assessed using both direct and indirect assessment methods. Each year, all students in the two required religion courses are assessed at the end of each course, through a common set of exam questions on key topics related to the Christian scriptures and the Christian heritage. This course-based assessment has been in place for five years, with continuing refinement of the questions. Additionally, seniors' responses to selected questions on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) relevant to this outcome are compared with responses of students from peer institutions.

Methods and Results

Required Religion Courses: The Department of Religion administered a twenty-question multiple-choice exam near the end of the semester in each of the required religion courses, REL 1310 (Fall 2010) and REL 1350 (Spring 2011). The exams were given the same day that course evaluations were completed. The results were compiled and analyzed by the director of undergraduate studies in religion, and overall findings from the last three years are summarized in the table below.

	Course	2009	2010	2011
Number of students examined	REL 1310	2600	2807	2535
	REL 1350	2100	2127	1890
Overall mean exam scores	REL 1310	74%	75%	81%
	REL 1350	73%	73%	72%
Number of the 20 questions answered correctly by 70% or more of students	REL 1310	11	19	16
	REL 1350	15	19	16

Number of questions missed by 30% or more of students	REL 1310	10	2	4
	REL 1350	8	1	1

The faculty set a mean score of 70% on the exams as the criterion for success, and as Table 5 indicates, students exceeded the criterion for both required religion courses for the third year in a row. Moreover, the undergraduate coordinator noted that the mean score for the REL 1310 exam (81%) was the highest since the exam began.

Further analysis of the results revealed that 70 percent or more of the students correctly answered 16 of the 20 questions on each exam, compared with 19 questions in 2010. The undergraduate coordinator noted that four questions on the 1310 exam were missed by more than 30% of the students, so the faculty have revised the wording for two of the questions and will give added emphasis to the topics addressed by the other two questions missed by large numbers of students.

National Survey of Student Engagement: A second, indirect method of assessment providing evidence that students are developing competence for participating in discourse from a Christian perspective utilizes students' responses to questions on the NSSE selected as relevant for this outcome. The next table presents mean responses to these questions for Baylor seniors and seniors at peer (Carnegie class) institutions for the 2006, 2008, and 2010 NSSE. Means in bold text indicate a statistically significant difference between Baylor seniors and seniors in the peer institutions. It should be noted that the list of peer institutions varies each year, depending on which schools opt to administer the NSSE in a particular year.

Table 6: Baylor Seniors' Responses Compared to Peer Seniors' Responses						
NSSE Questions Related to the Christian Perspective Outcome	Baylor Seniors 2008	Peer Seniors 2008	Baylor Seniors 2010	Peer Seniors 2010	Baylor Seniors 2011	Peer Seniors 2011
<i>In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following? (1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=often, 4=very often)</i>						
Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values	2.81	2.70	2.71	2.76	2.78	2.67
Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	2.79	2.80	2.77	2.82	2.80	2.71
Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from	2.89	2.91	2.86	2.95	2.91	2.86

Table 6: Baylor Seniors' Responses Compared to Peer Seniors' Responses						
NSSE Questions Related to the Christian Perspective Outcome	Baylor Seniors 2008	Peer Seniors 2008	Baylor Seniors 2010	Peer Seniors 2010	Baylor Seniors 2011	Peer Seniors 2011
his or her perspective						
<i>To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas? (1=very little, 2=some, 3=quite a bit, 4=very much)</i>						
Developing a personal code of values and ethics	3.11	3.05	3.10	2.99	3.13	2.70
Developing a deepened sense of spirituality	2.89	2.56	2.88	2.42	2.92	1.90

In comparing Baylor seniors' responses to those of seniors at peer institutions, statistically significant differences were found for four of the five questions above. For the first two questions, the differences were small, with Baylor seniors reporting serious conversations with students from different backgrounds and examining their own views slightly more frequently than did peer seniors. Given the often perceived homogeneity of Baylor students compared to their peers, finding a significant difference in seniors' responses to the first question might be notable. The mean response, however, indicates they still didn't have such conversations "often." For the last two questions, the differences between Baylor seniors and peer seniors were larger (effect sizes of .41 and .93). Baylor students were much more likely to indicate that their college experience contributed to their development of both a personal code of values and ethics and a deepened sense of spirituality. Responses to the last question in particular continued the pattern from previous years, confirming Baylor's emphasis on spiritual formation and providing some indirect evidence of an attribute related to the Christian Perspective outcome.

Leadership, Civic Engagement, and Service

Central to Baylor's mission and strategic plan, this outcome is fostered by required coursework in modern foreign languages and political science, study abroad opportunities, and co-curricular opportunities for service and mission work. Evidence supporting this outcome was provided by a variety of units on campus, including the Departments of Modern Foreign Languages and Political Science, Student Activities, and the Office of International Studies, as well as by the National Survey of Student Engagement.

Foreign language proficiency: Most Baylor undergraduate degrees require four semesters of foreign language. Competence in at least one foreign language is viewed as essential if Baylor graduates are to fulfill the mission statement's goal of preparing them for worldwide leadership and service. Faculty expect 70 percent of students completing the fourth-semester course to achieve Intermediate-Mid level

proficiency or higher, as defined by the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Language, in reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Faculty examine students near the end of the fourth semester of study and report the results annually. The following table presents the percentages of students in the sample achieving the criterion over the past three years in selected languages. In Spring 2011, French and German faculty examined all students enrolled in 2320; due to higher enrollments, Spanish faculty examined a sample, about 25 percent of those enrolled in 2320.

Proficiency Area	Speaking			Listening			Reading			Writing		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
French	100%	100%	76%	100%	100%	74%	85%	100%	85%	93%	80%	73%
Spanish	100%	96%	75%	90%	92%	75%	77%	96%	100%	80%	52%	94%
German	73%	74%	95%	83%	83%	83%	95%	81%	97%	76%	90%	90%

As the table indicates, large percentages of students achieve Intermediate-Mid level proficiency or higher in a foreign language, and the criterion was met for all proficiency areas in 2011 in these languages. The overall results provide direct evidence that Baylor graduates are developing language skills needed for global leadership and service.

Citizen Formation: Most Baylor students are required to complete PSC 2302, American Constitutional Development, in order to graduate. The goal is for students to develop a sophisticated understanding of the constitutional principles of the national community in which they live, in order to foster effective citizenship. Each spring semester, the Department of Political Science administers a twenty-question exam to a sample of students taking PSC 2302 to assess their understanding of key principles. The criterion for success states that at least 70 percent of the students will answer correctly the questions for each outcome. In Spring 2011, a sample of 406 students— about 33 percent of those enrolled in the course—took the exam. Overall results for the past three years are presented in Table 8.

Learning Outcomes	Percent Answering Correctly		
	2009	2010	2011
Demonstrate a familiarity with the text of the U.S. Constitution.	79%	92%	85%
Demonstrate awareness of theoretical and historical foundations of the Constitution.	74%	86%	79%
Demonstrate an appreciation of the major themes and conflicts in the development of American Constitutional Law.	72%	85%	82%
Demonstrate an ability to interpret judicial opinions as well as an appreciation of different	69%	81%	76%

Table 8: Students Demonstrating Understanding of Constitutional Principles

approaches to Constitutional interpretation.

The undergraduate coordinator in Political Science noted that while students exceeded the criterion for all four outcomes for the second year in a row, smaller percentages of students demonstrated understanding on each outcome in 2011 than 2010. The coordinator noted that some of the differences stemmed from poorer performance on one or two questions, which he will monitor to see if the problem continues. Variations in performance across sections of the course on the second outcome may indicate differential emphasis on the topics examined, so all instructors will be reminded to address these concepts. Historically, the fourth outcome – constitutional interpretation -- has been the most challenging one for students. Faculty will be encouraged to emphasize these topics, particularly the doctrine of standing, which was the most-missed question for this outcome.

Study Abroad: One of the goals of Baylor’s Study Abroad program is to prepare students to enter a pluralistic and global society. For the past several years, the Center for International Education (CIE) has surveyed students about their study abroad experiences upon their return. In August of 2010, the CIE implemented a new survey through the IRT office with slightly different questions, making direct comparisons with previous years’ results difficult. However, students’ responses to some of the survey questions provide some indirect evidence that students who study abroad are developing skills needed for a pluralistic and global society. Of the 627 Summer and Fall 2010 study abroad participants, 144 responded to the survey, a response rate of 23 percent. Table 9 indicates students’ perceptions of the competencies they gained through study abroad.

Table 9: Responses to Study Abroad Survey

What competencies do you feel were gained during your study abroad or international program?		
Responses	Number	Percent
Ability to adapt to new situations	128	88.9
Independence	121	84.0
Cultural sensitivity	119	82.6
Interest in world events and social issues	114	79.2
Global competencies	84	58.3
Foreign language skills	71	49.3
Leadership skills	63	43.8

The competencies cited most often were related to students’ personal growth and their greater understanding of other cultures.

National Survey of Student Engagement: Seniors’ responses to selected NSSE questions provide some indirect evidence of students’ commitment to social and civic responsibility and service among diverse

communities. The table below compares mean responses for seniors at Baylor with those of seniors at peer institutions. Means in bold text indicate a statistically significant difference in the two groups' responses.

Table 10: Baylor Seniors' Responses Compared to Peer Seniors' Responses						
NSSE Questions Related to the Leadership, Civic Engagement and Service Outcome	Baylor Seniors 2008	Peer Seniors 2008	Baylor Seniors 2010	Peer Seniors 2010	Baylor Seniors 2011	Peer Seniors 2011
<i>In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following? (1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=often, 4=very often)</i>						
Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments	2.71	2.85	2.65	2.89	2.66	2.77
Participated in a community-based project (e.g. service learning) as part of a regular course	1.89	1.86	1.75	1.80	1.80	1.69
Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own	2.80	2.77	2.73	2.77	2.80	2.67
Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values	2.81	2.70	2.71	2.76	2.78	2.69
<i>During the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following? (1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=often, 4=very often)</i>						
Participated in activities to enhance your spirituality (worship, meditation, prayer, etc.)	2.78	2.51	2.71	2.38	2.75	2.10
Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	2.79	2.80	2.77	2.82	2.80	2.71
Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	2.89	2.91	2.86	2.95	2.91	2.86
Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or	2.92	3.00	2.93	3.02	2.99	2.92

Table 10: Baylor Seniors' Responses Compared to Peer Seniors' Responses						
NSSE Questions Related to the Leadership, Civic Engagement and Service Outcome	Baylor Seniors 2008	Peer Seniors 2008	Baylor Seniors 2010	Peer Seniors 2010	Baylor Seniors 2011	Peer Seniors 2011
concept						
<i>Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate? (0=have not decided, do not plan to do, plan to do; 1=done Thus, the mean is the proportion responding "done.")</i>						
Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment	0.65	0.59	0.62	0.61	0.62	0.49
Community service or volunteer work	0.79	0.69	0.77	0.69	.79	.58
Study abroad	0.28	0.23	0.29	0.23	.29	.14
<i>To what extent does your institution emphasize each of the following? (1=very little, 2=some, 3=quite a bit, 4=very much)</i>						
Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds	2.43	2.59	2.49	2.61	2.46	2.49
Attending campus events and activities (special speakers, cultural performances, athletic events, etc.)	2.98	2.78	3.01	2.81	3.08	2.64
<i>To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas? (1=very little, 2=some, 3=quite a bit, 4=very much)</i>						
Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds	2.53	2.72	2.50	2.73	2.55	2.62
Developing a personal code of values and ethics	3.11	3.05	3.10	2.99	3.13	2.70
Contributing to the welfare of your community	2.89	2.81	2.91	2.76	2.91	2.47
Developing a deepened sense of spirituality	2.89	2.56	2.88	2.42	2.92	1.90

There were small but statistically significant differences between Baylor seniors and seniors at peer institutions for most of the selected items. For the last three items, however, the differences were greater (effect sizes of .41, .42, and .93), with Baylor students much more likely to report that the institution had contributed to their development in those areas. These results provide some indirect

evidence that Baylor students are developing skills and attitudes undergirding the Leadership, Civic Engagement, and Service outcome. However, the fact that Baylor seniors' responses to the question about their college experience related to understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds continue to lag behind those of peer seniors may indicate an area where improvement is needed.

Student Organizations' Volunteer Service and Fund-Raising: Further evidence that students are demonstrating a commitment to social and civic responsibility and service is provided by the Office of Student Activities. An online system annually tracks the numbers of hours of service provided and amount of funds raised by the organizations. Data from the past three years are summarized in the following table.

Table 11: Community Service and Fundraising by Student Organizations			
Indicator	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Number of service hours reported by student organizations	69,379	58,346	51,886
Total funds raised by student organizations	\$56,687	\$23,388	\$62,731

While the number of service hours reported has declined over the past three years, the total funds raised by student organizations showed an increase.

Summary and Next Steps

Assessment efforts in 2010-2011 provide rich evidence of the extent to which Baylor students are attaining the General Education Outcomes established by the faculty. The results also suggest some questions that faculty on the General Education Committee may wish to consider.

Oral communication

- Given the number of presentations collected and the fact that not all undergraduate departments or units were represented in the sample, is the ability to make oral presentations a legitimate outcome to be expected of most Baylor graduates? Are oral presentations required in all academic units? If not, should they be?
- If this outcome is expected and required of most Baylor graduates, are there additional means of gathering evidence of students' abilities?
- Are the results of the assessment useful? Do they suggest ways faculty and students could improve future results for this outcome? To which faculty should results be disseminated, and how?

- Are the results worth the investment of resources required to collect and score the presentations?

Christian Perspective

- Are the end-of-course exams and responses to selected NSSE questions adequate means for assessing this outcome? What other means might provide evidence students are reaching this outcome?
- Do the differences between Baylor seniors' NSSE responses and those of seniors at peer institutions merit further discussion? By which groups?

Leadership, Civic Engagement, and Service

- Do the foreign language proficiency testing and PSC 2302 exam provide adequate and sufficient direct measures of student learning for this outcome?
- Are the selected questions from the Study Abroad survey useful in gathering evidence for this outcome?
- Do the differences between Baylor seniors' NSSE responses and those of seniors at peer institutions merit further discussion? By which groups?
- Are there other means for collecting evidence that students are developing in leadership, civic engagement and service?

APPENDIX: Oral Communication Competency Scoring Form

Recording _____ Presenter# _____ Scorer _____

Holistic Scoring: Please assign an overall score of 4, 3, 2, 1, or NA for the organization and delivery of the presentation.

4 = highly competent; 3 = competent; 2 = minimally competent; 1 = not competent; NA = Not applicable for this presentation.

Competency	Score
Overall presentation	

Analytical Scoring: Please circle any area(s) of weakness. If this presentation received a score below 3, please also enter the number/letter (1b, 4a, etc.) of the weak areas on the scoring summary sheet.

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Attention gaining device b. Thesis statement/main idea or purpose statement/main goal c. Signposting/Preview statement d. Explanation of topic’s significance 2. Organization: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Major Transitions (i.e., between main sections of speech) b. Minor Transitions (i.e., between key points/ideas of speech) c. Overall structure of speech d. Clarity of main points/ideas of speech 3. Support: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Use of source references/internal source citations b. Use of visual aids | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Conclusion: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Review of main points of speech b. Restatement of thesis/main idea c. Restatement of purpose/main goal d. Ending statement 5. Delivery: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Eye contact b. Facial expression/affect c. Hand gestures d. Posture e. Dress/Appearance f. Vocalics (e.g., rate, pitch, tone, volume) g. Vocal pronunciation/diction h. Paralanguage (e.g., use of “um” “uh” “ah”) |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|