

General Education

Learning Outcome Assessment

Communication Outcome

(Spring 2022)



Contents

Executive Summary	3
Highlights	3
Background	4
Methods	4
Scoring and Data Analysis	5
Sample.....	5
Findings	6
Appendix A: Representative Courses List	9
Appendix B: Representative Courses Associated by College	9
Appendix C: Rubric	10

Executive Summary

The General Education curriculum provides foundational knowledge in academic disciplines, exposing students to diverse learning perspectives and ways of knowing in Mathematics, Science, Social Sciences, and Arts and Humanities (University System of Georgia). Georgia Institute of Technology (Georgia Tech) General Education (Gen Ed) has six learning outcomes: (1) Communication, (2) Quantitative, (3) Computing, (4) Humanities, Fine Arts, and Ethics, (5) Natural Sciences, Math, and Technology, and (6) Social Sciences. They are assessed in accordance with our established timeline. Nurtured by the Subcommittee on Gen Ed and Policy, the 3-Year Georgia Tech Gen Ed Assessment Plan (2021-2024) sets the framework for good practice in course delivery and assessment, capitalizing on the good judgment of faculty members regarding students' levels of attainment of Gen Ed learning outcomes. Faculty develop signature assignments in their Gen Ed courses, and the assignments, along with student performance, are collected for review and analysis at the end of each semester. To better understand our students' performance, the Office of Academic Effectiveness (OAE) then partnered with faculty to develop a scale for scoring. The general scale is structured to assess each Gen Ed learning outcome on a continuum: 1-Developing, 2-Meets Expectations, 3-Exceeds Expectations.

This report summarizes the evidence of student learning (n = 115) and provides descriptive statistics for the **Communication** outcome to support conversations regarding Gen Ed learning and opportunities for improvement.

Highlights

- **99.1%** (n= 114) of students met the Communication outcome expectations, which means students demonstrated developing or better proficiency in the process of articulating and organizing rhetorical arguments in written, oral, visual, and nonverbal modes, using concrete support and conventional language. Students' performance on the Communication outcome met or exceeded Georgia Tech's acceptable target (80%).
- Comparing student demographics for the Communication outcome, the results indicated that all demographic groups met or exceeded the target of 80%.

Background

An integral part of the delivery of General Education (Gen Ed) at the Georgia Institute of Technology (Georgia Tech) includes the assessment of the learning outcomes. The learning outcomes were approved by the Georgia Tech Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and Faculty Senate, and then by the University System of Georgia's (USG) Council on General Education in April 2011:

- **Communication (Core Area A1)**
Outcome: Student will demonstrate proficiency in the process of articulating and organizing rhetorical arguments in written, oral, visual, and nonverbal modes, using concrete support and conventional language.
- **Quantitative (Core Area A2)**
Outcome: Student will demonstrate the ability to apply basic elements of differential and integral calculus to solve relevant problems.
- **Computing (Institutional Options B)**
Outcome: Student will be able to develop algorithms and implement them using an appropriate computer language and will understand algorithmic complexity and reasonable versus unreasonable algorithms.
- **Humanities, Fine Arts, and Ethics (Core Area C)**
Outcome: Student will be able to describe relationships among languages, philosophies, cultures, literature, ethics, or the arts.
- **Natural Sciences, Math, and Technology (Core Area D)**
Outcome: Student will be able to demonstrate the ability to obtain, analyze, interpret, and criticize qualitative observations and quantitative measurements to explain natural phenomena and to test hypotheses.
- **Social Sciences (Core Area E)**
Outcome: Student will demonstrate the ability to describe the social, political, and economic forces that influence social behavior.

The purpose of this report is to provide assessment results to support conversations regarding Gen Ed learning and opportunities for improvement.

Methods

In the context of Communication at Georgia Tech, most first-year students' initial experiences with the Writing and Communication Program (WCP) are in two of their core courses: English 1101 English Composition I and English 1102 English Composition II. The majority of Georgia Tech students take these courses in their first year, gaining a foundation for the work they will do in their other courses and their careers. These courses introduce students to principles that, regardless of major or eventual career, provide a framework for successful communication by giving students opportunities to practice and hone their multimodal strategies in relation to issues and concerns in science and society.

Since ENGL 1101 and ENGL 1102 are the only two courses listed under General Education Core Area A1 Communication outcome, both courses learning outcomes assessment results are presented in this report. The Communication outcome is:

Student will demonstrate proficiency in the process of articulating and organizing rhetorical arguments in written, oral, visual, and nonverbal modes, using concrete support and conventional language.

Scoring and Data Analysis

ENGL 1101 and ENGL 1102 are taught at Georgia Tech to enhance students' communication skills for all majors. Both courses emphasize the composition of research-based multimodal arguments through a rigorous, rhetorically sensitive, and reflective process designed to teach the habits of effective communication. Because composing in multiple modes is a central aim of the Communication outcome, students were asked to develop portfolios demonstrating proficiency in rhetorical arguments in written, oral, visual, and nonverbal modes. Each portfolio includes a Reflective Essay on the first page, a page showcasing the Common First Week Video and process materials through which students developed the video, as well as a series of short, reflective paragraphs through which students narrate their progress through the course. Therefore, the portfolio is identified as the measure of how well students meet the Communication outcome on process and reflection.

The Director of the WCP, the WCP Director of Assessment, and the WCP Assessment Committee refined a WCP Common Feedback rubric intended to assess the Communication outcome. To review the refined rubric's reliability and validity, an application of the rubric on student work took place in April, 2022. The WCP Assessment Committee concluded that the rubric is a clear and useful tool. This WCP Common Feedback rubric (see Appendix C) includes the following seven dimensions: 1) Reflection on Process, 2) Reflection on WOVEN (Written, Oral Visual, Electronic, and Nonverbal), 3) Articulates an Argument, 4) Organizes around Argument, 5) Employs WOVEN modes, 6) Uses Concrete Support, and 7) Uses Conventions Persuasively. The rubric is structured to assess student performance on a continuum: 1-Beginning/Basic, 2-Developing, 3-Competent, 4-Mature/Exemplary.

Seven raters in total who were experienced instructors of the ENGL courses gathered for a scoring day on May 10, 2022, and began with a calibration process led by the WCP Director of Assessment. After sufficient consensus was reached, the scoring process then started. 115 portfolios were selected after a systematic sampling process from 1,511 portfolio submissions. Each de-identified portfolio was read and scored by two raters based on the rubric. If the score awarded by the two raters differed by more than two points, a third rater would read and score.

On average, 80% of students are expected to achieve the Developing level or better.

Sample

The following table indicates the representative nature of the sample by comparing the student demographic information of the sample and the undergraduate student population of the Institute.

Table 1 Sample Size by Student Demographics

Student Demographic	Sample N (%)	Institutional Population N(%)
Gender	Total =115	Total=17,447
Male	75 (65.2%)	10,504 (60.2%)
Female	40 (34.8%)	6,943 (39.8%)
Race/Ethnicity		
White	38 (37.6%)	7,065 (40.5%)
Black or African or American	11 (10.9%)	1,271 (7.3%)
Asian	28 (27.7%)	4,894 (28.1%)
Hispanic or Latino	17 (16.8%)	1,338 (7.7%)
Two or More Races	5 (5.0%)	751 (4.3%)
Unknown	2 (2.0%)	260 (0.1%)
First Generation College Student		
Continuing Generation	98 (97.0%)	13,662 (87.6%)
First Generation	3 (3.0%)	1,932 (12.4%)
Citizenship		
Domestic Student	101 (87.8%)	15,594 (89.4%)
International Student	14 (12.2%)	1,853 (10.6%)
Transfer Student Status		
Non-Transfer Student	114 (99.1%)	16,652 (95.4%)
Transfer Student	1 (0.9%)	795 (4.6%)

Findings

Based on faculty agreement on the score interpretation, the frequency and percentage of achievement were calculated. Overall, **99.1%** (n = 114) of students met or exceeded the Communication outcome expectations.

Table 2 Communication Outcome Overall Performance

Score Interpretation	% (n)	Target Achieved?
Beginning/Basic	0.9% (n = 1)	Yes (99.1%)
Developing	46.1% (n = 53)	
Competent	48.7% (n = 56)	
Mature/Exemplary	4.3% (n = 5)	

Table 3 Communication Outcome Overall Performance

Dimensions N=115	Mean (SD)	Beginning/Basic % (n)	Developing % (n)	Competent % (n)	Mature/Exemplary % (n)	80% Target Achieved?
Reflection on Process	3.0 (0.00)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	100%(115)	0.0%(0)	Yes(100%)
Reflection on WOVEN	2.7 (0.71)	0.9%(1)	39.1%(45)	46.2%(52)	14.5%(17)	Yes(99.1%)

Articulates an Argument	2.6 (0.57)	0.0%(0)	41.7%(48)	53.9%(62)	4.3%(5)	Yes(100%)
Organizes around Argument	2.8 (0.60)	1.7%(2)	28.7%(33)	62.6%(72)	7.0%(8)	Yes(98.3%)
Employs WOVEN modes	2.7 (0.70)	2.6%(3)	35.7%(41)	50.4%(58)	11.3%(13)	Yes(97.4%)
Uses Concrete Support	2.6 (0.64)	1.7%(2)	45.2%(52)	46.1%(53)	7.0%(8)	Yes(98.3%)
Uses Conventions Persuasively	2.5 (0.59)	0.9%(1)	55.7%(64)	39.1%(45)	4.3%(5)	Yes(99.1%)

In addition, the following table shows students' performance data by different demographic populations. The results indicated that all demographic groups met or exceeded the target of 80%.

Table 4 Communication Outcome Overall Performance by Demographic

(From All Represented Courses)	Beginning/ Basic n (%within subgroup)	Developing n (%within subgroup)	Competent n (% within subgroup)	Mature/ Exemplary n (% within subgroup)	Overall Score Mean (SD)	80% Target Achieved?
Gender						
Male (n=75)	1 (1.3%)	32 (42.7%)	39 (52.0%)	3 (4.0%)	2.59 (0.60)	Yes (98.7%)
Female (n=40)	0 (0.0%)	21 (52.5%)	17(42.5%)	2 (5.0%)	2.53 (0.60)	Yes (100%)
Race/Ethnicity						
White (n=38)	1 (2.6%)	18 (47.4%)	17 (44.7%)	2 (5.3%)	2.53(0.65)	Yes (97.4%)
Black or African American (n=11)	0 (0.0%)	5(45.5%)	5 (45.5%)	1(9.1%)	2.64(0.67)	Yes (100%)
Asian (n=28)	0 (0.0%)	18 (64.3%)	10(35.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2.36(0.49)	Yes (100%)
Hispanic or Latino (n=17)	0 (0.0%)	8 (47.1%)	8 (47.1%)	1(5.9%)	2.59(0.62)	Yes (100%)
Two or More Races (n=5)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	4 (80.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2.80(0.45)	Yes (100%)
Unknown (n=2)	0 (0.0%)	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2.50(0.71)	Yes (100%)
First-Generation College Student						
Continuing Generation (n=98)	1 (1.0%)	49 (50.0%)	44(44.9%)	4 (4.1%)	2.52(0.60)	Yes (99.0%)
First Generation (n=3)	0 (0.0%)	2 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	2.33(0.58)	Yes (100%)
Citizenship						
Domestic Student (n= 101)	1 (1.0%)	51 (50.5%)	45 (44.6%)	4 (4.0%)	2.51(0.59)	Yes (99.0%)
International student (n=14)	0 (0.0%)	2 (14.3%)	11 (78.6%)	1 (1.0%)	2.93(0.48)	Yes (100%)
Transfer Student Status						

Transfer Student (n=1)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0.0%)	3.00(0.00)	Yes (100%)
Non-Transfer Student (n=114)	1(0.9%)	53 (46.5%)	55 (48.2%)	5 (4.4%)	2.56(0.60)	Yes (99.1%)
Class						
Freshman (n=42)	0 (0.0%)	20 (47.6%)	20 (47.6%)	2 (4.8%)	2.57(0.59)	Yes (100%)
Sophomore (n=61)	0 (0.0%)	28 (45.9%)	30 (49.2%)	3 (4.9%)	2.59(0.59)	Yes (100%)
Junior (n=11)	1(9.1%)	5 (45.5%)	5 (45.5%)	0 (0.0%)	2.36(0.67)	Yes (91.0%)
Senior (n=1)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0.0%)	3.00(0.00)	Yes (100%)

Appendix A: Representative Courses List

Outcomes	Represented Courses	Total
Communication	ENGL 1101, ENGL 1102	2
Quantitative	MATH 1552, MATH 1712	2
Computing	CS 1301, CS 1315, CS 1371	3
Humanities, Fine Arts, and Ethics	Large Class: FREN 1002, SPAN 2001, ID 2202, ID 2241, PHIL 3109, ARCH 2111 Middle Class: LMC 3226, ML 2500 Small Class: LMC 2100, PHIL 4176	10
Natural Sciences, Math, and Technology	CHEM 1310, BIOS 1207DL, EAS 1600, PHYS 2212, MATH 1554, MATH 1711	6
Social Sciences	Large Class: ECON 2100, HIST 2111, HIST 2112, INTA 1200, 2030, POL 1101, PSYC 1101, PSYC 2210, PSYC 2230, SOC 1101 Small Class: ARCH 3135, CP 4020, POL 2101, PUBP 3000, PUBP 3315	15

Appendix B: Representative Courses Associated by College

Represented course associated college	Number of courses from the represented course list	Associated outcome
Ivan Allen College of Liberal Arts	19	Communication, Humanities, Fine Arts, and Ethics, Social Sciences
College of Sciences	11	Quantitative, Natural Sciences, Math, and Technology, Social Sciences
College of Design	5	Humanities, Fine Arts, and Ethics, Social Sciences
College of Computing	3	Computing

Appendix C: Rubric

X=scale Y=criteria	1 Beginning/Basic	2 Developing	3 Competent	4 Mature/Exemplary
Reflects on Process How well does the essay reflect on how writing process contributes to growth as thoughtful communicator?	Little discussion of process in essay; no discussion of the significance of process	Conclusions about process are broad, not specific; some discussions of the significance of process	Names specific changes made in individual artifacts and discusses differences between drafts; clear discussion of significance of process	Explores process as a major feature; indicates revision went beyond peer or teacher suggestions; makes connections between process on different artifacts
Reflects on WOVEN How well does the essay reflect on how WOVEN contributes to growth as thoughtful communicator?	Little discussion of WOVEN; no discussion of the significance of multimodality	Conclusions about WOVEN are broad, not specific; some discussions of the significance of multimodality	Names specific changes in modes in individual artifacts and discusses differences between modes; clear discussion of significance of process	Explores WOVEN as a major feature; indicates multimodal choices went beyond peer or teacher suggestions; makes connections about multimodality across different artifacts
Articulates an argument How well does the essay articulate an argument about growth as a thoughtful communicator?	Makes an overly general argument; significance is difficult to discern, or not appropriate to the rhetorical situation	Makes a simplistic or implicit argument, or multiple arguments that have no clear connection to one another; gestures towards significance, but does not fully develop it	Makes an explicit and straightforward argument that does not oversimplify the problem or question explores at least one question of the argument in depth	Makes a complex, unified argument that clearly articulates a position or stance; explores multiple implications of the argument in depth
Organizes around argument How is the essay organized around an argument about growth as a thoughtful communicator?	Does not organize essay around argument or attempt is insufficient; uses few effective connections to demonstrate organization; some logical moves necessary to prove the argument are absent	Organizes essay around some unifying claims but overall attempt to support argument is inconsistent; employs simplistic organization	Organizes essay around unifying claims that support the argument throughout; and employs an effective by mechanical scheme	Organizes essay around an argument that develops logically and progressively; adapts typical organizational schemes for the context; achieves substantive coherence
Employs WOVEN modes How well does the essay employ WOVEN modes to support argument about growth as a thoughtful communicator?	Does not include modes other than writing; no attempt to show how different modes and media are woven together in writing process and/or course artifacts	Evidence is mostly written; essay attempts to show how different modes and media are woven together in writing process and/or course artifacts but most attempts are unclear or missing	Evidence is mostly WOVEN; essay mostly shows how different modes and media are woven together in writing process and/or course artifacts but some attempts are unclear	Evidence is fully WOVEN; the essay shows how different modes and media are woven together in the writing process and/or course artifacts in depth or with unexpected insight
Uses concrete support How well does the essay employ evidence to support the argument about growth as a thoughtful communicator?	Little or no attempt to make use of evidence; or evidence used seems to support few or no assertions	Attempts to make use of multiple types of evidence in support of assertions but the attempt is incomplete; only some evidence supports some assertions; essay does not consider the most important evidence	Makes use of multiple types of evidence (paraphrase, quotation, etc.) and/or synthesizes evidence to support and complicate assertions but connection between assertions and evidence sometimes unclear	Makes use of best evidence and/or synthesizes multiple types of evidence (paraphrase, quotation, etc.) to support and complicate assertions throughout essay
Uses conventions persuasively How well does essay use grammar, mechanics, style, citation, etc. to support argument about growth as a communicator?	Omits some important features; pattern of inconsistencies that distract from the argument; uses features that do not support the argument	Uses features that support the argument, but some match imprecisely with content; includes minor errors or inconsistencies	Promotes engagement and supports the argument with features that efficiently use affordances suited to argument and reflection	Persuades with careful, seamless integration of features and content; innovative use of affordances