

Learning Outcomes Assessment Communication– Aggregate Results

Assessment Type: GEC-Writing 121

Year/Term: 2016-2017

Level: Writing 121

Learning Outcome: Communication

Assessment Method/Tool: Common Rubric-EPCC

Measurement Scale: 3-1

Sample Size: 13

	Proficient (# of students)		Adequate (# of students)		Developing (# of students)	
Clearly focuses and logically organizes communication	10	77%	3	23%	0	0%
Edits carefully and accurately	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%
Presents convincing evidence	9	70%	3	23%	1	7%
Employs graphics, media, and source materials appropriately and ethically	7	54%	6	46%	0	0%
Averages (based on 15 student sample size)						
		72%		26%		2%

Benchmark:

85%

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

Number Achieving Benchmark: 12 of how many participants? 13

Percent Achieving Benchmark: 98% Actual percentage of students meeting “Adequate” or “Proficient” levels

Data Analysis: What do these results mean?

Closing the Loop:

GEC Sampling—Communication
Course Assessed: wr 121, Fall 2016
Dr. Meg Cooke

Over the course of this term (Fall 2016) most of the WR 121 students enrolled in this course demonstrated significant improvement in their ability to effectively join ongoing academic conversations. They were able to identify contributions/claims made by other participants in the field, analyze the evidence used to support those claims, and identify a niche or area for more research. After identifying a niche for more study, they then effectively described their methodology of research and made significant contributions to the conversations in the form of primary claims adequately supported with evidence from their research. Most students were able to utilize sources effectively as support, though some continued to summarize sources or simply restate sources’ claims rather than make their own claims. Most students provided clear theses that were challenging and served as the basis for organization for the body of their paper. Students were able to point to the significance of their contributions in their conclusions and to make suggestions as to where the conversation should go next. Only a few of the students utilized graphics, most used text-based resources effectively, and several utilized interviews and/or surveys. Most of the students who struggled with organization and evidence also demonstrated significant patterns of sentence level errors. The majority, however, provided clean, clear prose, mostly free of error. The biggest difficulty students faced was providing analysis of others’ claims rather than simply reporting claims as information. By end of term, most of the students offered adequate analysis though a few continued to report rather than analyze.

The GEC Communication rubric is useful as a general rubric that can be applied across a broad range of courses. I do not find it specific enough to address all of the key areas of effective contribution to academic conversations that I address in my courses, however. The rubric does not, for example, consider the process through which students choose a conversation to join or the method by which they join that conversation. It does not consider students’ ability to identify claims and/or to distinguish between claims and information. It does not consider how students go about creating a niche within a conversation so that they can truly contribute something to it, i.e. to make an original argument rather than simply report on what others have said. A more specific rubric

might be effective across a broad range of courses if we shared similar objectives and methodology.