**General Education Assessment: Written Communication Results 2022-23**

# What do we mean by Written Communication?

Virginia Western describes Written Communication as the ability to develop, convey, and exchange ideas in writing, as appropriate to a given context and audience.

Students with strong written communication skills can

* organize content in a logical order
* create a well-stated thesis
* create well-developed paragraphs supporting the thesis
* create a well-developed conclusion
* use proper grammar, spelling, and sentence structure
* use proper word choice

# How do we assess Written Communication?

Written Communication was assessed by 1 direct method of assessment and 2 indirect methods of assessment.

## Direct Assessment Method

Written Communication was assessed by faculty using a [rubric](#Rubric) on selected artifacts; this rubric can be found in Appendix A. The threshold of acceptability was that 75% of students would earn an average rating of 2.00. The target was that students would have an average score of 3.00 or above.

### Population for Direct Assessment Method

1,305 artifacts were assessed for 1,049 unique students for the Written Communication General Education Assessment. This represents 23.6% of the target population, program placed students (n=4,446). The table below provides the respondent populations gender, race/ethnicity, age range, degree type, and course modality.

Table Respondent Population Demographics

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **n** | **Percentage** |
| **Gender** |  |  |
| Female | 685 | 65.30% |
| Male | 349 | 33.27% |
| Not specified | 15 | 1.43% |
| **Race/ Ethnicity** |  |  |
| American Indian | 5 | 0.48% |
| Asian | 43 | 4.10% |
| Black | 106 | 10.10% |
| Hawaiian | \* | 0.10% |
| Hispanic | 91 | 8.67% |
| Not Specified | 13 | 1.24% |
| Two or More | 59 | 5.62% |
| White | 731 | 69.69% |
| **Age Range** |  |  |
| 19 or younger | 424 | 40.42% |
| 20-24 | 354 | 33.75% |
| 25 or older | 271 | 25.83% |
| **Degree Type** |  |  |
| AA | 29 | 2.76% |
| AAS | 289 | 27.55% |
| AS | 567 | 54.05% |
| CERT | 7 | 0.67% |
| CSC | 157 | 14.97% |
| **Modality\*\*** |  |  |
| Face-to-Face | 591 | 45.29% |
| Hybrid | 119 | 9.12% |
| Online Asynchronous | 497 | 38.08% |
| Online Synchronous | 98 | 7.51% |
| *Notes: \* n is less than 5; \*\* students in multiple modalities*  |

## Indirect Assessment Method 1

To assess written communication for graduates, a [graduation survey](#Grad) was conducted which asked graduates to rate their satisfaction with the written communication education they received while at Virginia Western; this survey question can be found in Appendix B. The threshold of acceptability was that 85% of respondents would rate their satisfaction with their written communication education as a 3 or better. The target for this method was that 75% of respondents will rate their satisfaction with their written communication education as a 4 or better.

### Population for Indirect Assessment Method 1

The sample population was 672 with 121 graduates responding. This is a response rate of 18.0%.

Table 2 Respondent Population Demographics

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **n** | **Percentage** |
| **Gender** |  |  |
| Female | 79 | 65.29% |
| Male | 39 | 32.23% |
| Not specified | \* | 2.48% |
| **Race/ Ethnicity** |  |  |
| Asian | 5 | 4.13% |
| Black | 8 | 6.61% |
| Hispanic | 12 | 9.92% |
| Not Specified | 5 | 4.13% |
| Other | \* | 1.65% |
| Two or More | 8 | 6.61% |
| White | 81 | 66.94% |
| **Age Range** |  |  |
| 19 or younger | 15 | 12.40% |
| 20-24 | 60 | 49.59% |
| 25 or older | 46 | 38.02% |
| **Degree Type** |  |  |
| AA | 0 | 0.00% |
| AAS | 26 | 21.49% |
| AS | 66 | 54.55% |
| CERT | \* | 2.48% |
| CSC | 26 | 21.49% |
| *Notes: \* n is less than 5* |

## Indirect Assessment Method 2

To assess written communication with the alumni population, Virginia Western conducted an [alumni survey](#Alumni) which asked alumni to rate their satisfaction with the written communication education they received while at Virginia Western; this survey question can be found in Appendix B. The threshold of acceptability was that 85% of respondents would rate their satisfaction with their written communication education as a 3 or better. The target for this method was that 75% of respondents will rate their satisfaction with their written communication education as a 4 or better.

### Population for Indirect Assessment Method 2

The 2442 individuals who either graduated during the 2020-2021 academic year or who attended during the 2020-2021 academic year and did not return for the 2021-2022 academic year were sent the survey. There was a response rate of 5.4% with 133 individuals responding to the survey.

Table 3 Respondent Population Demographics

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **n** | **Percentage** |
| **Gender** |  |  |
| Female | 83 | 62.41% |
| Male | 48 | 36.09% |
| Not specified | \* | 1.50% |
| **Race/ Ethnicity** |  |  |
| Asian | \* | 3.01% |
| Black | 15 | 11.28% |
| Hispanic | 8 | 6.02% |
| Not Specified | \* | 2.26% |
| Two or More | \* | 1.50% |
| White | 101 | 75.94% |
| **Age Range** |  |  |
| 19 or younger | 8 | 6.02% |
| 20-24 | 52 | 39.10% |
| 25 or older | 73 | 54.89% |
| **Degree Type** |  |  |
| AA | \* | 3.01% |
| AAS | 35 | 26.32% |
| AS | 34 | 25.56% |
| CERT | 5 | 3.76% |
| CSC | 55 | 41.35% |
| **Graduation Status** |  |  |
| Did Not Graduate | 39 | 29.32% |
| Graduated | 94 | 70.68% |
| *Notes: \* n is less than 5* |
|  |

# What were our results?

## Direct Assessment:

Method 1: Artifacts-based Assessments

**Overall**

1,305 artifacts were assessed across 1,049 students. Artifacts measured one or more of the written communication learning objectives below and are counted for each one that was assessed. As depicted in Table 1 below, 93.5% of the artifacts met the threshold score of 2.00 for written communication; this exceeds the 75% threshold of acceptability. Additionally, with an average artifact score of 3.23, the target artifact score of 3.00 was achieved.

Table 1. Written Communication by Individual Student Learning Outcomes

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number of artifacts assessed\* (N)** | **Average Score** | **Number that met threshold (n)** | **Percent that met threshold (%)** |
| **Written Communication** | **7191** | **3.23** | **6726** | **93.5%** |
| Create a well-developed conclusion. | 1153 | 3.10 | 1034 | 89.7% |
| Create a well-stated thesis. | 1127 | 3.18 | 1041 | 92.4% |
| Create well-developed paragraphs supporting thesis. | 1172 | 3.14 | 1091 | 93.1% |
| Organize content in a logical order | 1227 | 3.27 | 1171 | 95.4% |
| Use proper grammar, spelling, and sentence structure. | 1292 | 3.28 | 1222 | 94.6% |
| Use proper word choice. | 1220 | 3.36 | 1167 | 95.7% |

\* Artifact counted for each learning outcome that it assesses/it is assessed for.

Below, artifact results are disaggregated by modality, gender, race/ethnicity, age range, and award type. Artifact scores were calculated by averaging the student learning outcome scores assessed, which is why the average score and/or percent that met the threshold may be different than that shown in Table 1.

**Modality**

Written Communication was assessed across four modalities – face-to-face, hybrid, online asynchronous, and online synchronous sections. As depicted in Table 2 below, all modalities met the 75% threshold of acceptability for percentage of students that met the threshold score of 2.00 – 90.0% of students in face-to-face sections met the threshold (N=591), 89.9% of students enrolled in hybrid sections met the threshold (N=119), 94.0% of students enrolled in online asynchronous sections met the threshold (N=497), and 93.9% of students in online synchronous sections met the threshold (N=98).

As shown in Table 2, the average score met the target score of 3.00 in all modalities (3.13, 3.26, 3.37, and 3.25, respectively).

Table 2. Written Communication by Modality

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number of artifacts assessed (N)** | **Average Score** | **Number that met threshold (n)** | **Percent that met threshold (%)** |
| **Overall** | **1305** | **3.23** | **1198** | **91.8%** |
| Face-to-Face | 591 | 3.13 | 532 | 90.0% |
| Hybrid | 119 | 3.26 | 107 | 89.9% |
| Online Asynchronous | 497 | 3.37 | 467 | 94.0% |
| Online Synchronous | 98 | 3.25 | 92 | 93.9% |

**Gender**

As depicted in Table 3 below, all genders met the 75% threshold of acceptability for percentage of students who met the threshold score of 2.00 – 92.1% of female students met the threshold (N=864) 91.0% of male students met the threshold (N=424), and 94.1% students with unspecified gender met the threshold (N=17). Table 3 also establishes the average score met the target score of 3.00 for females, males, and unspecified students (3.28, 3.16, and 3.29, respectively).

Table 3. Written Communication by Gender

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number of artifacts assessed (N)** | **Average Score** | **Number that met threshold (n)** | **Percent that met threshold (%)** |
| **Overall** | **1305** | **3.23** | **1198** | **91.8%** |
| Female | 864 | 3.28 | 796 | 92.1% |
| Male | 424 | 3.16 | 386 | 91.0% |
| Not Specified | 17 | 3.29 | 16 | 94.1% |

**Race/Ethnicity**

As depicted in Table 4 below, all races met the 75% threshold of acceptability for percentage of students who met the threshold score of 2.00 – 100.0% of American Indian students met the threshold (N<10), 82.8% of Asian students met the threshold (N=58), 86.2% of Black students met the threshold (N=130), 100.0% of Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students met the threshold (N<10), 90.8% of Hispanic students met the threshold (N=120), 88.2% of students with an unspecified race/ethnicity met the threshold (N=17), 96.1% of students who identify as two or more races met the threshold (N=77), and 93.0% of White students met the threshold (N=895).

 As shown in Table 4, the average score met the target score of 3.00 for American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Not Specified, Two or More, and White students (3.21, 3.06, 3.20, 3.11, 3.38, and 3.29, respectively). Black and Hawaiian race students met the threshold score of acceptability (2.00) with an average score of 2.98 and 2.67, respectively.

Table 4. Written Communication by Race/Ethnicity

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number of artifacts assessed (N)** | **Average Score** | **Number that met threshold (n)** | **Percent that met threshold (%)** |
| **Overall** | **1305** | **3.23** | **1198** | **91.8%** |
| American Indian | \* | 3.21 | \* | 100.0% |
| Asian | 58 | 3.06 | 48 | 82.8% |
| Black | 130 | 2.98 | 112 | 86.2% |
| Hawaiian | \* | 2.67 | \* | 100.0% |
| Hispanic | 120 | 3.20 | 109 | 90.8% |
| Not Specified | 17 | 3.11 | 15 | 88.2% |
| Two or More | 77 | 3.38 | 74 | 96.1% |
| White | 895 | 3.29 | 832 | 93.0% |

\* Sample size is less than ten students

**Age Range**

As depicted in Table 5 below, all age ranges met the 75% threshold of acceptability for percentage of students who met the threshold score of 2.00 – 90.3% of students 19 or younger met the threshold (N=536), 91.9% of students aged 20-24 met the threshold (N=444), 94.2% of students 25 or older met the threshold (N=325). The average score met the target score of 3.00 for all age ranges (3.17, 3.20, and 3.42, respectively).

Table 5. Written Communication by Age Range

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number of artifacts assessed (N)** | **Average Score** | **Number that met threshold (n)** | **Percent that met threshold (%)** |
| **Overall** | **1305** | **3.23** | **1198** | **91.8%** |
| 19 or younger | 536 | 3.17 | 484 | 90.3% |
| 20-24 | 444 | 3.20 | 408 | 91.9% |
| 25 or older | 325 | 3.42 | 306 | 94.2% |

**Award/Degree Type**

As depicted in Table 6 below, all award types met the 75% threshold of acceptability for percentage of students who met the threshold score of 2.00 – 86.5% of students seeking an Associate of Arts (AA) degree met the threshold (N=37), 94.0% of students seeking an Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degree met the threshold (N=350), 90.8% of students seeking an Associate of Science (AS) degree met the threshold (N=731), 100.0% of students seeking a Certification (CERT) met the threshold (N<10), and 92.2% of students seeking a Career Studies Certificate (CSC) met the threshold (N=180). Additionally, the average score met the target score of 3.00 for AA, AAS, AS, CERT, and CSC students (3.24, 3.41, 3.17, 3.54, and 3.22, respectively).

Table 6. Written Communication by Award/Degree

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number of artifacts assessed (N)** | **Average Score** | **Number that met threshold (n)** | **Percent that met threshold (%)** |
| **Overall** | **1305** | **3.23** | **1198** | **91.8%** |
| Associate of Arts (AA) | 37 | 3.24 | 32 | 86.5% |
| Associate of Applied Science (AAS) | 350 | 3.41 | 329 | 94.0% |
| Associate of Science (AS) | 731 | 3.17 | 664 | 90.8% |
| Certification (CERT) | \* | 3.54 | \* | 100.0% |
| Career Studies Certificate (CSC) | 180 | 3.22 | 166 | 92.2% |

\* Sample size is less than ten students

## Indirect Assessment:

Method 1: Graduation Survey

**Overall**

As depicted in Table 7 below, 98.3% of graduates answered “Neutral,” “Satisfied,” or “Very Satisfied” regarding their satisfaction with their written communication education – this met the threshold of acceptability of 85%. Additionally, with an average satisfaction score of 4.52, the target satisfaction score of 4.00 was achieved.

Table 7. Overall Written Communication

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number of artifacts assessed (N)** | **Average Score** | **Number that met threshold (n)** | **Percent that met threshold (%)** |
| **Overall** | **121** | **4.52** | **119** | **98.3%** |

**Gender**

As depicted in Table 8 below, all genders met the 85% threshold of acceptability for percentage of graduates who met the threshold satisfaction score of 3.00 – 98.7% of scores from female graduates met the threshold (N=79), 97.4% of scores obtained from male graduates met the threshold (N=39), and 100.0% of the scores from graduates with an unspecified gender met the threshold (N < 10). As shown in Table 8, the average satisfaction score met the target score of 4.00 for females, males, and unspecified genders (4.57, 4.41, and 4.67, respectively).

Table 8. Written Communication by Gender

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number of artifacts assessed (N)** | **Average Score** | **Number that met threshold (n)** | **Percent that met threshold (%)** |
| **Overall** | **121** | **4.52** | **119** | **98.3%** |
| Female | 79 | 4.57 | 78 | 98.7% |
| Male | 39 | 4.41 | 38 | 97.4% |
| Not Specified | \* | 4.67 | \* | 100.0% |

\* Sample size is less than ten graduates

**Race/Ethnicity**

As depicted in Table 9 below, all races met the 85% threshold of acceptability for percentage of graduates who met the threshold satisfaction score of 3.00. The average satisfaction score met the target score of 4.00 for all groups – Asian (4.60), Black (4.25), Hispanic (4.50), Not Specified (4.80), Other (4.00), Two or More races (4.25) and White (4.57) graduates.

Table 9. Written Communication by Race/Ethnicity

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number of artifacts assessed (N)** | **Average Score** | **Number that met threshold (n)** | **Percent that met threshold (%)** |
| **Overall** | **121** | **4.52** | **119** | **98.3%** |
| Asian | \* | 4.60 | \* | 100.0% |
| Black | \* | 4.25 | \* | 100.0% |
| Hispanic | 12 | 4.50 | 12 | 100.0% |
| Not Specified | \* | 4.80 | \* | 100.0% |
| Other | \* | 4.00 | \* | 100.0% |
| Two or More | \* | 4.25 | \* | 100.0% |
| White | 81 | 4.57 | 79 | 97.5% |

\* Sample size is less than ten graduates

**Age Range**

As depicted in Table 10 below, all age ranges met the 85% threshold of acceptability for percentage of graduates who met the threshold satisfaction score of 3.00 – 93.3% of scores from graduates 19 or younger met the threshold (N=15), 98.3% of scores obtained from graduates 20-24 met the threshold (N=60), and 100.0% of the scores from graduates 25 or older met the threshold (N=46). As shown in Table 10, the average satisfaction score met the target score of 4.00 for graduates 19 or younger, aged 20-24, and 25 or older (4.27, 4.50, and 4.63, respectively).

Table 10. Written Communication by Age Range

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number of artifacts assessed (N)** | **Average Score** | **Number that met threshold (n)** | **Percent that met threshold (%)** |
| **Overall** | **121** | **4.52** | **119** | **98.3%** |
| 19 or younger | 15 | 4.27 | 14 | 93.3% |
| 20-24 | 60 | 4.50 | 59 | 98.3% |
| 25 or older | 46 | 4.63 | 46 | 100.0% |

\* Sample size is less than ten graduates

**Award/Degree**

As depicted in Table 11 below, all award types met the 85% threshold of acceptability for percentage of graduates who met the threshold satisfaction score of 3.00 – 100.0% of AAS graduates, 97.0% of AS graduates, 100% of CERT graduates, and 100% of CSC graduates indicated satisfaction levels of “Very Satisfied,” Satisfied,” or “Neutral” for written communication. Additionally, the average satisfaction score met the target score of 4.00 all represented award types – AAS (4.65), AS (4.48), CERT (4.67), and CSC (4.46).

Table 11. Written Communication by Award/Degree Type

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number of artifacts assessed (N)** | **Average Score** | **Number that met threshold (n)** | **Percent that met threshold (%)** |
| **Overall** | **121** | **4.52** | **119** | **98.3%** |
| Associate of Applied Science (AAS) | 26 | 4.65 | 26 | 100.0% |
| Associate of Science (AS) | 66 | 4.48 | 64 | 97.0% |
| Certification (CERT) | \* | 4.67 | \* | 100.0% |
| Career Studies Certificate (CSC) | 26 | 4.46 | 26 | 100.0% |

\* Sample size is less than ten graduates

Method 2: Alumni Survey

**Overall**

As depicted in Table 12 below, 97.7% of the alumni answered “Neutral,” “Satisfied,” or “Very Satisfied” regarding their satisfaction with their written communication education – this met the threshold of acceptability of 85%. Additionally, with an average satisfaction score of 4.29, the target satisfaction score of 4.00 was achieved.

Table 12. Overall Written Communication

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number of artifacts assessed (N)** | **Average Score** | **Number that met threshold (n)** | **Percent that met threshold (%)** |
| **Overall** | **133** | **4.29** | **130** | **97.7%** |

**Gender**

As depicted in Table 13 below, females, males, and individuals with unspecified gender met the 85% threshold of acceptability for percentage of alumni who met the threshold satisfaction score of 3.00 – 98.8% of scores from female alumna met the threshold (N=83), 95.8% of scores obtained from male alumnus met the threshold (N=48), and 100.0% of scores from unspecified-gender alum met the threshold (N<10).

As shown in Table 13, the average satisfaction score met the target score of 4.00 for females, males, and unspecified gendered alum (4.40, 4.10, and 4.50, respectively).

Table 13. Written Communication by Gender

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number of artifacts assessed (N)** | **Average Score** | **Number that met threshold (n)** | **Percent that met threshold (%)** |
| **Overall** | **133** | **4.29** | **130** | **97.7%** |
| Female | 83 | 4.40 | 82 | 98.8% |
| Male | 48 | 4.10 | 46 | 95.8% |
| Not Specified | \* | 4.50 | \* | 100.0% |

\* Sample size is less than ten alumni

**Race/Ethnicity**

As depicted in Table 14 below, all races met the 85% threshold of acceptability for percentage of alumni who met the threshold satisfaction score of 3.00 – 100.0% of scores from Asian alumni met the threshold (N < 10), 100.0% of scores obtained from Black alumni met the threshold (N=15), 100.0% of the scores from Hispanic alumni met the threshold (N < 10), 100.0% of the scores from alumni who did not specify their gender met the threshold (N < 10), 100.0% of the scores from alumni who identify as two or more races met the threshold (N < 10), and 97.0% of the scores from White alumni met the threshold (N=101).

As shown in Table 14, the average satisfaction score met the target score of 4.00 for Asian, Black, Hispanic, Two or More, and White alumni (4.50, 4.40, 4.50, 4.00, and 4.29, respectively). Alumni who did not specify race had a satisfaction score of 3.33; this meets the threshold score of acceptability (3.00).

Table 14. Written Communication by Race/Ethnicity

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number of artifacts assessed (N)** | **Average Score** | **Number that met threshold (n)** | **Percent that met threshold (%)** |
| **Overall** | **133** | **4.29** | **130** | **97.7%** |
| Asian | \* | 4.50 | \* | 100.0% |
| Black | 15 | 4.40 | 15 | 100.0% |
| Hispanic | \* | 4.50 | \* | 100.0% |
| Not Specified | \* | 3.33 | \* | 100.0% |
| Two or More | \* | 4.00 | \* | 100.0% |
| White | 101 | 4.29 | 98 | 97.0% |

\* Sample size is less than ten alumni

**Age Range**

As depicted in Table 15 below, all age ranges met the 85% threshold of acceptability for percentage of alumni who met the threshold satisfaction score of 3.00 – 100.0% of scores from alumni aged 19 or younger met the threshold (N < 10), 98.1% of scores obtained from alumni aged 20-24 met the threshold (N=52), and 97.3% of scores from alumni aged 25 or older met the threshold (N=73).

As shown in Table 15, the average satisfaction score met the target score of 4.00 for alumni 19 or younger, 20-24, and 25 or older (4.63, 4.25, and 4.29, respectively).

Table 15. Written Communication by Gender

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number of artifacts assessed (N)** | **Average Score** | **Number that met threshold (n)** | **Percent that met threshold (%)** |
| **Overall** | **133** | **4.29** | **130** | **97.7%** |
| 19 or younger | \* | 4.63 | \* | 100.0% |
| 20-24 | 52 | 4.25 | 51 | 98.1% |
| 25 or older | 73 | 4.29 | 71 | 97.3% |

\* Sample size is less than ten alumni

**Award/Degree**

As depicted in Table 16 below, all awards/degrees met the 85% threshold of acceptability for percentage of alumni who met the threshold satisfaction score of 3.00 – 100.0% of scores from alumni seeking an Associate of Arts (AA) degree met the threshold (N < 10), 97.1% of scores obtained alumni seeking an Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degree met the threshold (N=35), 100.0% of the scores from alumni seeking an Associate of Science (AS) degree met the threshold (N=34), 100.0% of the scores from alumni seeking a Certification (CERT) met the threshold (N < 10), and 96.4% of the scores from alumni seeking to earn a Career Studies Certificate (CSC) met the threshold (N=55). The average satisfaction score met the target score of 4.00 for alumni seeking an AA degree, AS degree, AAS degree, CERT, or CSC (4.50, 4.40, 4.26, 4.20, and 4.24, respectively).

Table 16. Written Communication by Award/Degree Type

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number of artifacts assessed (N)** | **Average Score** | **Number that met threshold (n)** | **Percent that met threshold (%)** |
| **Overall** | **133** | **4.29** | **130** | **97.7%** |
| Associate of Arts (AA) | \* | 4.50 | \* | 100.0% |
| Associate of Applied Science (AAS) | 35 | 4.40 | 34 | 97.1% |
| Associate of Science (AS) | 34 | 4.26 | 34 | 100.0% |
| Certification (CERT) | \* | 4.20 | \* | 100.0% |
| Career Studies Certificate (CSC) | 55 | 4.24 | 53 | 96.4% |

\* Sample size is less than ten alumni

**Graduation Status**

As depicted in Table 17 below, both graduation statuses met the 85% threshold of acceptability for percentage of students who met the threshold satisfaction score of 3.00 – 94.9% of scores from non-graduate alumnus met the threshold (N=39) and 98.9% of scores from students who graduated met the threshold (N=94). As shown in Table 17, the average satisfaction score met the target score of 4.00 for alumni who graduated (4.43). Alumni who did not graduate had satisfaction scores met the threshold score of acceptability (3.97).

Table 17. Written Communication by Graduation Status

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number of artifacts assessed (N)** | **Average Score** | **Number that met threshold (n)** | **Percent that met threshold (%)** |
| **Overall** | **133** | **4.29** | **130** | **97.7%** |
| Non-Graduates | 39 | 3.97 | 37 | 94.9% |
| Graduates | 94 | 4.43 | 93 | 98.9% |

\* Sample size is less than ten alumni

# Comparison of Results from Last Assessment

**Have results changed since the last time this competency was assessed?**

Written Communication was last assessed during the 2019-20 academic year. During that assessment cycle, 91.0% of direct assessment artifacts met the threshold of acceptability of scoring a 2.00 or better (N=150). During this assessment cycle, 91.8% of artifacts met the threshold of acceptability (N=1,306). While overall results for written communication were similar, the sample size increased by 800%, due in large part to the new way of conducting general education assessment, which is described more below.

In 2019-20, results were not disaggregated by gender, race, age range, or award type. Therefore, these comparisons will not be able to be made until the next assessment cycle. Additionally, no indirect assessments were conducted for Written Communication in 2019-20.

**What changes are we making to improve student learning for Written Communication?**

One change that was made since the last assessment cycle was moving general education assessment to Canvas, VWCC’s learning management system. By having the rubric available to all instructors, this allows for artifacts to be collected from any course that assesses one or more written communication student learning outcomes. This helped increase the number of artifacts collected by over 800% – increasing from 150 in 2019-20 to 1,305 in 2022-23.

The governance Assessment Committee will be presented with and review the Written Communication results in Fall 2023. Recommendations will be established by the committee and presented to the Faculty Senate for approval.

# Summary

For the direct, artifact-based assessment (N=1,305), VWCC is meeting its threshold of acceptability of 75% of students earning a 2.00 or better (91.8%). With an average score of 3.23, this also meets the target score. This direct assessment shows that VWCC students are proficient across all aspects of the written communication rubric.

For the two indirect assessments, VWCC graduates and alumni met all targets. According to the 2023 Graduation Survey, 98.3% of VWCC graduates (N=121) rated their satisfaction with their written communication education as 3.00 or better, exceeding the target of 85%. The average satisfaction score for graduates was 4.52. Similarly, in the 2022 Alumni Survey, 97.7% of VWCC alumni (N=133) rated their satisfaction with their written communication education as 3.00 or better out of 5.00. This meets the target of 85%. The average satisfaction score for alumni was 4.29.

In conclusion, while examining overall assessment results, VWCC students are proficient in their written communication skills and meet all thresholds of acceptability. This report will be shared with the governance Assessment Committee for feedback and next steps.

# Appendix A – Written Communication Rubric

| **Written Communication Rubric** |
| --- |
|  | **Excellent-4** | **Good-3** | **Acceptable-2** | **Needs Improvement-1** |
| **Organize content in a logical order** | Student generates abundant and logically sound content. Organizes that content into logical order.  | Student generates sufficient and logically sound content. Organizes that content into logical order.  | Student generates a moderate amount of content. Organizes content with only minor logical weakness.  | Student generates little or logically weak content. Fails to organize content into logical order.  |
| **Create a well-stated thesis** | Presents an introduction featuring a well-stated thesis. | Presents an introduction featuring a thesis.  | Presents an introduction without a thesis. | Does not present an introduction or a well-stated thesis. |
| **Create well-developed paragraphs supporting thesis** | Uses a series of cohesive, well-developed body paragraphs. Supports that thesis through topic sentences relevant to the thesis. Supports each topic sentence thoroughly with relevant information and sound logic.  | Uses a series of cohesive, well-developed body paragraphs. Supports that thesis through topic sentences relevant to the thesis. Supports each topic sentence with sufficient information and sound logic.  |  Uses a series of body paragraphs. Supports that thesis through topic sentences relevant to the thesis. Supports each topic sentence with relevant information and reasonable logic.  |  Does not thoroughly and logically support the thesis through body paragraphs.  |
| **Create a well-developed conclusion** | Ends with a well-developed conclusion that restates the thesis. | Ends with a conclusion that restates the thesis. | Ends with a conclusion. | Does not end with a conclusion. |
| **Use proper grammar, spelling, and sentence structure.** | Rare error in basic grammar and spelling. Sophisticated, varied sentence structure.  | Few errors in basic grammar. Few misspelled words. Some variety of sentence structure.  | Occasional errors in basic grammar. Words occasionally misspelled. Little variety in sentence structure. | Frequent errors in basic grammar. Simple words misspelled. No variety or sophistication in sentence structure. |
| **Use proper word choice** | Precise word choice. More sophisticated vocabulary.  | Word choice generally correct, precise, and effective. Successful attempt at more sophisticated vocabulary | Words occasionally misused. Little attempt beyond everyday vocabulary. | Basic words often misused or confused. No attempt beyond everyday vocabulary. |

# Appendix B – Graduation and Alumni Survey Examples

Image 1. Graduation Survey Written Communication Satisfaction Question



Image 2. Alumni Survey Written Communication Satisfaction Question

