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Expected Outcome 1: Critical Analysis

Students will demonstrate critical analysis skills in examining text, data, or issues developing new knowledge and placing it within the broader environment of established theoretical and empirical knowledge. Demonstrated skills at the M.S. level will exceed expectations for undergraduate students and at the Ph.D. level will exceed expectations for master’s students.

Assessment Method 1: Content Evaluation of Research Presentations

Assessment Method Description

Content Evaluation of student presentations of research proposals developed by them to apply a student-selected social-psychological theory learned in CADS 7670, Social-Psychological Theories of Clothing Behavior

Five Ph.D. students’ end of term oral and Powerpoint presentations of their self-developed research proposal were made to four graduate faculty (not including the course professor). Proposals included a review of literature, justification of topic, identification of data to be collected, mode of analysis, and potential implications. A critical analysis rubric (1=benchmark, milestones at two levels, to 4=capstone) adapted in 2013 was used. Components were: theoretical/conceptual framework; need for knowledge; data collection/findings; and reflection/implications. Three of the Ph.D. students were in their second year, and two were in their first year.
Findings
On a 4-point scale, average scores ranged from 3.12-3.73, with the lowest being for reflection/implications and the highest for theoretical/conceptual framework. Need for knowledge and data description had similar means (3.48 and 3.45 respectively). In a course focused on understanding and applying existing theories, the doctoral students did best in applying connecting their research objectives to the foundational framework. This performance was close to the capstone level, and some students received scores of 4. Their weakest score, concerning speculation about possible implications, was slightly better than milestone level 3. The other two scores were midway between levels 3 and 4. All four means were higher than the means for the M.S. students, and approaching or nearly reaching the capstone level.

How did you use findings for improvement?
The Ph.D. program requires two theory courses. The means suggested that students were meeting expectations; individual score variations suggested variability that could result from individual performance on this particular assignment. Because the lowest mean score was for reflection and implications, the professor who teaches this and another theory
course with a similar assignment will develop a requirement to be integrated into at least one of the weekly commentaries the students are expected to complete throughout the course. The additional task will be to provide specific suggestions for improving the theoretical and practical implications generated by the content of a required research article for the week. This assignment will ensure that students reflect and critically think about the implications derived from research findings.

Additional Comments

**Expected Outcome 2: Oral Communication Skills**
Students will demonstrate appropriate oral communication skills at the M.S. level that exceed expectations for undergraduate students and at the Ph.D. level exceed expectations for master’s students.

**Assessment Method 1: Evaluation of Oral Presentations of Research Proposals**

**Assessment Method Description**

Evaluations of were conducted of students’ oral presentations (with Powerpoint slides) of research proposals developed by them to apply a student-selected social-psychological theory learned in CADS 7670, Social-Psychological Theories of Clothing Behavior (see also assessment of Critical Analysis)

Five Ph.D. students each orally presented their self-developed research proposal to four graduate faculty (not including the course professor). The rubric was used previously for assessing oral presentations in 2011-12 and 2012-13. These were evaluated on a 4-point scale (1=benchmark, milestones at two levels, to 4=capstone): organization/ language, delivery, message/content, and material to support message. Three of the Ph.D. students were in their second year, and two were in their first year. The 2013-14 group of students was larger than for the previous two assessments.
Findings

The mean scores for the four attributes all occurred in the milestone 3 range: delivery (3.23), message/content (3.3), material to support message (3.51), and organization/language (3.56). For the attribute with the lowest mean, delivery, the three non-native English speakers generally received lower than capstone (4) scores; the two native English speakers, both with teaching experience, generally received scores of 4. Nearly all of the scores for all attributes were either 3 or 4; none were below milestone 2.

How did you use findings for improvement?

As in 2011-12 and 2012-13, the weakest performance was delivery. Noting that these presentations come at the end of the stresses of the term and are paired with a full, written paper and PowerPoint presentation development, the graduate faculty should (a) list the classes taught with oral presentations and what they are, and (b) work from that to devise strategies for enhancing the quality of the students’ professional presentations. These are particularly important for Ph.D. students who are likely to pursue academic careers. One easily implemented strategy for improving delivery is to require a peer-review of the presentation prior to the final class presentations. Each student will be assigned a peer reviewer (student in the same class) who will provide written feedback to the student on his/her presentation delivery. This written feedback will be used to improve various aspects of the delivery. In addition, the prior practice will also directly improve delivery.

### RUBRIC FOR GRADUATE STUDENT ORAL COMMUNICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score based on presentation and response to questions.</th>
<th>CAPSTONE 4</th>
<th>MILESTONE 3</th>
<th>MILESTONE 2</th>
<th>BENCHMARK 1*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Language</td>
<td>Skillful organization and use of terminology</td>
<td>Good organization and use of terminology</td>
<td>Adequate organization and/or use of terminology</td>
<td>Inadequate organization and/or use of terminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Polished, confident delivery without consistent reading</td>
<td>Comfortable delivery with room for improvement</td>
<td>Tentative delivery, too much dependence on reading</td>
<td>Delivery hampers presentation of content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message/Content</td>
<td>Necessary material clearly presented in designated time</td>
<td>Somewhat too much/too little material and/or time</td>
<td>Clearly too much/too little material and/or time</td>
<td>Planning for time and material not apparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material to Support Message</td>
<td>Proficiently provides explanations or support as needed</td>
<td>Good provision of most needed explanations or support</td>
<td>Provides some but not all needed explanations or support</td>
<td>Missing needed explanations or support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*0 may be assigned when the presentation does not meet the Benchmark standing.