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## 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: 1Developing, 2-Meets Expectations, 3-Exceeds Expectations.

This report summarizes the evidence of student learning ( $n=880$ ) and provides descriptive statistics for the Quantitative outcome to support conversations regarding General Education learning and opportunities for improvement.

## Highlights

- 83.4\% ( $\mathrm{n}=734$ ) of students met or exceeded the Quantitative outcome expectations, which means $83.4 \%$ of students demonstrate their abilities to apply basic elements of differential and integral calculus to solve relevant problems. Students' performance on the Quantitative outcome met or exceeded Georgia Tech's acceptable target (80\%).
- Comparing student demographics for the Quantitative outcome, the results indicated that the majority of demographic groups met or exceeded the target of $80 \%$ with the exception of Black or African American, Asian, two or more races, first general education college students, and transfer student subgroups.


## 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 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee at Georgia Tech, the Faculty Senate, and 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 General Education learning and opportunities for improvement.

## Methods

Georgia Tech conducted an intensive review of the Gen Ed learning outcomes and how students demonstrate their learning in these areas by engaging faculty in Gen Ed assessment conversations in the following steps: (1) Study course enrollment and identify representative courses. We examined enrollment patterns for students taking courses in Gen Ed for the last five years. Patterns were determined, too, by class size (large class-100 or more students; middle class-50-99 students; small class-20-49 students). This exercise led to the value that all class sizes would be included in the 3 -year Gen Ed Assessment Plan, as well as coverage of each discipline that contributes to Gen Ed. A total of 39 courses representing the appropriate colleges were selected (See Appendix A and B). (2) Identify or develop signature assignments that align with the outcome. Faculty identified measures
that are tangible, visible, self-explanatory, and provide compelling evidence of what students have learned. (3) Develop performance scale. Faculty met and developed 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. All faculty transformed their scoring to the general scale. The following image indicates our goal for this step.


Figure 1 Scoring Method from Course Level Assessment to Outcome Level Assessment
This three-step process has become the basic collaboration framework across courses and units for meaningful Gen Ed assessment.

## 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 <br> $\mathrm{N}(\%)$ | Institutional <br> Population N(\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | $403(45.8 \%)$ | $10,504(60.2 \%)$ |
| Male | $477(54.2 \%)$ | $6,943(39.8 \%)$ |
| Female | $365(47.7 \%)$ | $7,065(40.5 \%)$ |
| Race/Ethnicity ${ }^{1}$ | $1,271(7.3 \%)$ |  |
| White | $106(13.9 \%)$ | $4,894(28.1 \%)$ |
| Black or African or American | $153(20.0 \%)$ | $1,338(7.7 \%)$ |
| Asian | $89(11.6 \%)$ | $751(4.3 \%)$ |
| Hispanic or Latino | $41(5.4 \%)$ | $260(0.1 \%)$ |
| Two or More Races | $11(1.4 \%)$ |  |
| Unknown | $704(92.0 \%)$ | $13,662(87.6 \%)$ |
| First Generation College Student ${ }^{2}$ | $61(8.0 \%)$ | $1,932(12.4 \%)$ |
| Continuing Generation |  |  |
| First Generation | $765(86.9 \%)$ | $15,594(89.4 \%)$ |
| Citizenship | $115(13.1 \%)$ | $1,853(10.6 \%)$ |
| Domestic Student |  |  |


| Transfer Student Status ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Non-Transfer Student | $853(96.9 \%)$ | $16,652(95.4 \%)$ |
| Transfer Student | $27(3.1 \%)$ | $795(4.6 \%)$ |

## The Quantitative Outcome Statement and Representative Courses

MATH 1552 Integral Calculus and MATH 1712 Survey of Calculus are listed under General Education Core Area A2 Quantitative, which is associated with the following outcome:

## Student will demonstrate the ability to apply basic elements of differential and integral

 calculus to solve relevant problems.
## Measures and Targets for the Quantitative Outcome

In MATH 1552 and MATH1712, students will be asked to respond to two questions:

1. Question 1 will assess the students' ability to compute integrals and derivatives of functions. The student will be asked to compute an integral using an important technique of integration, such as integration by parts or substitution, to evaluate an integral. To solve this problem, the student will also need to demonstrate mastery of techniques to compute derivatives of functions.
2. Question 2 will assess the students' ability to compute limits. The student will be asked to evaluate a problem that involves calculating a limit. To solve this problem, students need to demonstrate a clear understanding of limits.

On average, $80 \%$ of students are expected to achieve "Meets Expectations" or "Exceeds Expectations."

## Data analysis

For the Quantitative outcome, students were asked to respond to 2 questions, and each question addresses a part of the Quantitative outcome. This Quantitative outcome report presents student performance data collected for MATH 1552 and MATH 1712 classes from Spring 2022. The following table indicates the sample size and the scoring methods.

Table 2 Quantitative Scoring

| Course <br> Scoring | Signature Assignment | Scoring Method | $N^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MATH 1552 | 2 questions | $0-10$ | 783 |
| MATH 1712 | 2 questions | $1-6$ | 97 |
| Total |  |  | 880 |

The following table presents score interpretation by courses. Faculty determined this performance scale for the Quantitative outcome achievement.

Table 3 Score Interpretation

| Score Interpretation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Course | Developing | Meets Expectations | Exceeds Expectations |
| MATH 1552 | $0-6$ | $6.25-8.25$ | $8.5-10$ |
| MATH 1712 | $1.0-3.5$ | $4.0-5.0$ | $5.5-6.0$ |

## Findings

Based on faculty agreement on the score interpretation, the frequency and percentage were calculated. Overall, $\mathbf{8 3 . 4 \%}(\mathrm{n}=734)$ of students met or exceeded the Quantitative outcome expectations.

## Table 4 Quantitative Outcome Overall Performance

| Score Interpretation | $\%(n)$ | Target Achieved? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Developing | $16.6 \%(n=146)$ |  |
| Meets expectations | $24.5 \%(n=216)$ |  |
| Exceeds expectations | $58.9 \%(n=518)$ | Yes (83.4\%) |

The following table shows students' performance data by different demographic populations. The results indicated that the majority of demographic groups met or exceeded the target of $80 \%$ with the exception of Black or African American ( $70.7 \%, n=106$ ), Asian ( $76.4 \%, n=153$ ), two or more races ( $65.8 \%, n=41$ ), first generation college students ( $77.1 \%, \mathrm{n}=61$ ), and transfer students ( $66.6 \%, \mathrm{n}=853$ ).

Table 5 Quantitative Outcome Overall Performance by Demographic

| (From All Represented | Developing | Meets Expectations | Exceeds Expectations | Overall Score | Target |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Courses) | n (\%within subgroup) | n (\%within subgroup) | n (\% within subgroup) | Mean (SD) | (80\%) <br> Achieved? |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male ( $\mathrm{n}=403$ ) | 55 (13.6\%) | 96 (23.8\%) | 252 (62.5\%) | 2.49 (0.72) | Yes(86.3\%) |
| Female ( $\mathrm{n}=477$ ) | 91 (19.1\%) | 120 (25.2\%) | 266 (55.8\%) | 2.37 (0.78) | Yes(81.0\%) |
| Race/Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |
| White ( $\mathrm{n}=365$ ) | 52(14.2\%) | 101(27.7\%) | 212(58.1\%) | 2.44 (0.73) | Yes(85.8\%) |
| Black or African American $(n=106)$ | 31(29.2\%) | 31(29.2\%) | 44(41.5\%) | 2.12 (0.84) | No(70.7\%) |
| Asian ( $\mathrm{n}=153$ ) | 23 (15.0\%) | 36 (23.5\%) | 94(61.4\%) | 2.46 (0.74) | Yes(84.9\%) |
| Hispanic or Latino ( $\mathrm{n}=89$ ) | 21(23.6\%) | 21(23.6\%) | 47(52.8\%) | 2.29 (0.82) | No(76.4\%) |
| Two or More Races ( $\mathrm{n}=41$ ) | 14(34.1\%) | 8(19.5\%) | 19(46.3\%) | 2.12 (0.90) | No(65.8\%) |
| Unknown ( $\mathrm{n}=11$ ) | 0(0.0\%) | 2(18.2\%) | 9(81.8\%) | 2.82 (0.41) | Yes(100\%) |
| First-Generation College Student |  |  |  |  |  |
| Continuing Generation $(n=704)$ | 127 (18.0\%) | 182 (25.9\%) | 395 (56.1\%) | 2.38 (0.77) | Yes(82.0\%) |
| First Generation ( $\mathrm{n}=61$ ) | 14 (23.0\%) | 17 (27.9\%) | 30 (49.2\%) | 2.26 (0.81) | No(77.1\%) |
| Citizenship |  |  |  |  |  |
| Domestic Student ( $\mathrm{n}=765$ ) | 141 (18.4\%) | 199 (26.0\%) | 425 (55.6\%) | 2.37 (0.78) | Yes(81.6\%) |
| International student $(n=115)$ | 5 (4.3\%) | 17 (14.8\%) | 93 (80.9\%) | 2.77 (0.52) | Yes(95.7\%) |
| Transfer Student Status |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer Student ( $\mathrm{n}=27$ ) | 9 (33.3\%) | 11 (40.7\%) | 7 (25.9\%) | 1.93 (0.78) | No(66.6\%) |
| Non-Transfer Student ( $\mathrm{n}=853$ ) | 137 (16.1\%) | 205 (24.0\%) | 511 (59.9\%) | 2.44 (0.75) | Yes(83.9\%) |

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, | Large Class: | 11 |
| and Ethics | FREN 1002, SPAN 2001, ID 2202, ID 2241, PHIL 3109, |  |
|  | ARCH 2111 |  |
|  | Middle Class: LMC 3226, ML 2500 |  |
| Small Class: CHIN 2001, LMC 2100, PHIL 4176 |  |  |
| Natural Sciences, | CHEM 1310, BIOS 1207DL, EAS 1600, PHYS 2212, MATH | 6 |
| Math, and Technology | 1554, MATH 1711 |  |
| Social Sciences | Large Class: | 15 |
|  | ECON 2100, HIST 2111, HIST 2112, INTA 1200, 2030, POL |  |
|  | 1101, PSYC 1101, PSYC 2210, PSYC 2230, SOC 1101 |  |

## Appendix B: Representative Courses Associated by College

| Represented course <br> associated college | Number of courses <br> from the represented <br> course list | Associated outcome |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Ivan Allen College of <br> Liberal Arts | 20 | Communication, <br> Humanities, Fine Arts, and Ethics, <br> Social Sciences |
| College of Sciences | 11 | Quantitative, <br> Natural Sciences, Math, and Technology, <br> Social Sciences |
| College of Design | 5 | Humanities, Fine Arts, and Ethics, <br> Social Sciences |
| College of Computing | 3 | Computing |

