

## Learning Outcomes Assessment Communication– Aggregate Results

---

**Assessment Type:** GEC-History 202

**Year/Term:** 2016-2017

**Level:** History 202

**Learning Outcome:** Communication

**Assessment Method/Tool:** Common Rubric-EPCC

**Measurement Scale:** 3-1

**Sample Size:** 22

---

	Proficient (# of students)		Adequate (# of students)		Developing (# of students)	
<b>Clearly focuses and logically organizes communication</b>	14	64%	6	27%	2	9%
<b>Edits carefully and accurately</b>	12	54%	7	32%	3	14%
<b>Presents convincing evidence</b>	11	50%	9	41%	2	9%
<b>Employs graphics, media, and source materials appropriately and ethically</b>	16	73%	5	23%	1	4%
<b>Averages (based on 22 student sample size)</b>						
		<b>60%</b>		<b>31%</b>		<b>9%</b>

---

**Benchmark:**

**85%**

Institutional benchmark goal for percent of students to meet “Proficient” or “Adequate” levels

**Number Achieving Benchmark:** 20 of how many participants? 22

**Percent Achieving Benchmark:** 91% Actual percentage of students meeting “Adequate” or “Proficient” levels

**Data Analysis: What do these results mean?**

**Closing the Loop:**

GEC Sampling—Communications  
Course Assessed: History 202, Fall 2016  
Dr. Rebecca Hartman

Review of the data for this assessment suggests that students developed significant improvement in their ability to identify and write clearly and with some insight about central concepts in the text through effectively organizing written work that asked them to identify the themes, locate strong supporting evidence, and provide some analysis of the concepts. Over the course of the term, student work demonstrated a general strength in distinguishing between key concepts vs. general information. Another pattern emerged that demonstrated student strength in locating appropriate evidence (supporting quotes) for their conceptual work. One pattern of weakness that emerged was students’ ability to consistently and effectively edit their work for sentence-level patterns of error.

Review of the student artifacts suggests a strong correlation between students’ ability to clearly organize and present written material and their ability to offer more sophisticated critical analysis of the material (both primary and secondary sources) about which they were writing.

As regards methods of improving the teaching of this outcome, at some point, the institution must decide where, or if, we are going to address pervasive sentence-level errors (grammar, spelling, syntax, and punctuation) in students’ written work. While only about 10% of my students exhibited a degree of sentence-level error that impeded meaning, easily 75% of the students exhibited consistent and pervasive sentence-level errors in all of their written assignments.