

Outcomes Data: Professional & Technical Writing

[2019-20](#) [2018-19](#) [2017-18](#) [2016-17](#) [2015-16](#) [2014-15](#) [2013-14](#) [2012-13](#) [2011-12](#) [2010-11](#)

[2019-20](#)

PART 1: DIRECT MEASURES

Having the flagship journal of the field of technical communication, Technical Communication Quarterly, under Dr. Walton's leadership at USU has benefited students enormously. For example, students have access to a new student copy editing internship, which provides students practical copyediting experience and a byline credit in the journal.

Students continue to express appreciation for the project-based assignments, especially where they work with clients and/or produce work that impacts the broader community. Some highlights include document design projects with nonprofit organizations in Cache County, HTML coding projects for USU's CIDI, and marketing projects for SAAVI/Title IX offices.

Preparedness Document" assignment, which asks students to answer typical interview questions. These questions correspond to our learning objectives (above).

Common Learning Objectives in Professional & Technical Writing	Unacceptable: Evidence that the student has developed this literacy is not provided, is unconvincing, or very incomplete.	Marginal: Evidence that the student has developed this literacy is provided, but it is weak or incomplete.	Acceptable: Evidence shows that the student has developed an acceptable level of literacy the objective.	Exceptional: Evidence shows that the student has developed a high level of literacy.
Learning Objective 1: Demonstrates technological literacy	1	2	4	5
Learning Objective 2: Demonstrates rhetorical literacy	2	1	3	6
Learning Objective 3: Demonstrates ethical literacy	0	4	2	6

Part 2: Indirect Measures

Having the flagship journal of the field of technical communication, Technical Communication Quarterly, under Dr. Walton’s leadership at USU has benefited students enormously. For example, students have access to a new student copy editing internship, which provides students practical copyediting experience and a byline credit in the journal.

Students continue to express appreciation for the project-based assignments, especially where they work with clients and/or produce work that impacts the broader community. Some highlights include document design projects with nonprofit organizations in Cache County, HTML coding projects for USU’s CIDI, and marketing projects for SAAVI/Title IX offices.

2018-19

PART 1: DIRECT MEASURES

In October 2019, Jared Colton, Avery Edenfield, Keith Grant-Davie, Rebecca Walton, John McLaughlin, and Ryan Moeller of the Technical Communication and Rhetoric Assessment committee met to evaluate the work of 12 graduating students in the Professional and Technical Writing track. The portfolios are from the Fall of 2018. Faculty worked in pairs to evaluate portfolios according to three literacies of the field.

Common Learning Objectives in Professional & Technical Writing	Unacceptable: Evidence that the student has developed this literacy is not provided, is unconvincing, or very incomplete.	Marginal: Evidence that the student has developed this literacy is provided, but it is weak or incomplete.	Acceptable: Evidence shows that the student has developed an acceptable level of literacy the objective.	Exceptional: Evidence shows that the student has developed a high level of literacy.
Learning Objective 1: Demonstrates technological literacy	1	3	2	6
Learning Objective 2: Demonstrates rhetorical literacy	2	2	4	4
Learning Objective 3: Demonstrates ethical literacy	4	5	2	1

Part 2: Indirect Measures

Feedback from students about their experiences in the Technical Communication and Rhetoric emphasis continue to be very positive. Students appreciate that so many classes include project-based assignments in which they work with actual clients and/or produce work that affects the

broader community beyond the classroom and often beyond the campus. In addition, students are proud of the intellectual work they do engaging with theory. Compared to years past, student feedback suggests that the curriculum is well balanced in addressing critical and applied work.

2017-18

PART 1: DIRECT MEASURES

In January 2019, Jared Colton, Avery Edenfield, Zarah Moeggenberg, Rebecca Walton, John McLaughlin, and Ryan Moeller of the Technical Communication and Rhetoric Assessment committee met to evaluate the work of 12 graduating students in the Professional and Technical Writing track. The portfolios are from the Fall of 2017 and the Spring of 2018. Faculty worked in pairs to evaluate portfolios in light of three learning objects.

Common Learning Objectives in Professional & Technical Writing	Unacceptable:	Marginal:	Acceptable:	Exceptional:
Learning Objective 1: Demonstrates technological literacy by ability to work with current technologies and to research and critique how users work with current technologies	0	1	4	7
Learning Objective 2: Demonstrates rhetorical literacy by ability to select appropriate technologies for stakeholder and unique situations	0	3	8	1

Common Learning Objectives in Professional & Technical Writing	Unacceptable:	Marginal:	Acceptable:	Exceptional:
Learning Objective 3: Demonstrates ethical literacy , which is an awareness of the ethical dimensions of technical communication	0	3	6	3

Part 2: Indirect Measures

Feedback from students about their experiences in the Professional and Technical Writing emphasis continue to be very positive. However, like last year, we continue to receive some conflicting feedback from students re: opportunities to develop technology skills. On the one hand, students express concern that they need to develop additional experience with technology: for example, web design. However, in classes many students choose the least-technological assignment options and push back against assignments with required technological competencies.

2016-17

In November 2017, Jared Colton, Avery Edenfield, Keith Grant-Davie, John McLaughlin, and Ryan Moeller of the Technical Communication and Rhetoric Assessment committee met to evaluate the work of 12 graduating students in the Professional and Technical Writing track. The portfolios are from the Fall of 2016 and the Spring of 2017. Faculty worked in groups of two and three to evaluate portfolios in light of three learning objectives.

Common Learning Objectives in Professional & Technical Writing	Unacceptable:	Marginal:	Acceptable:	Exceptional:
Learning Objective 1: Demonstrates technological literacy by ability to work with current technologies and to research and critique how users work with current technologies	0	0	10	2
Learning Objective 2: Demonstrates rhetorical literacy by ability to select appropriate technologies for stakeholder and unique situations	1	2	4	6
Learning Objective 3: Demonstrates ethical literacy , which is an awareness of the ethical dimensions of technical communication	1	4	3	4

INDIRECT MEASURES

Feedback from students about their experiences in the Professional and Technical Writing emphasis continue to be very positive. However, because we were concerned at the lack of constructive criticism or suggestions for change in previous years, we intentionally solicited feedback in a planning meeting with students in the PTW capstone class. Students still appreciated the opportunity to shape their projects to their own professional interests, but many graduating students reported feeling unsure of their next professional goal, be it grad school or a

career in industry. The majority of the respondents said they would feel more confident if they had more technology training.

2015-16

In November 2016, Jared Colton, Avery Edenfield, Keith Grant-Davie, John McLaughlin, Ryan Moeller, and Rebecca Walton of the Technical Communication and Rhetoric Assessment committee met to evaluate the work of 12 graduating students in the Professional and Technical Writing track. The portfolios are from the Fall of 2015 and the Spring of 2016. Faculty worked in pairs to evaluate portfolios in light of three learning objects.

Common Learning Objectives in Professional & Technical Writing	Unacceptable: Evidence that the student has mastered this objective is not provided, is unconvincing, or very incomplete	Marginal: Evidence that the student has mastered this objective is provided, but it is weak or incomplete	Acceptable: Evidence shows that the student has generally attained the objective	Exceptional: Evidence demonstrates that the student has mastered this objective at a high level
Learning Objective 1: Demonstrates basic literacy in design, grammar and mechanical principles	0	0	6	6
Learning Objective 2: Demonstrates rhetorical literacy by ability to select appropriate technologies for stakeholder and unique situations	0	0	3	9

Common Learning Objectives in Professional & Technical Writing	Unacceptable:	Marginal:	Acceptable:	Exceptional:
Learning Objective 3: Demonstrates ethical literacy , which is an awareness of the ethical dimensions of technical communication	Evidence that the student has mastered this objective is not provided, is unconvincing, or very incomplete	Evidence that the student has mastered this objective is provided, but it is weak or incomplete	Evidence shows that the student has generally attained the objective	Evidence demonstrates that the student has mastered this objective at a high level
	0	1	7	4

INDIRECT MEASURES

Feedback from students about their experiences in the Professional and Technical Writing track has been very positive, including praise for coursework that balances critical reflection and theoretical frameworks with hands-on application of skills. Students appreciate the opportunity to shape some of their projects to their own professional interests, and graduating students report feeling ready for their next professional goal, be it grad school or a career in industry. While we appreciate this positive feedback, the TCR faculty is a bit concerned at the lack of constructive criticism or suggestions for change garnered by our current approach.

2014-15

DIRECT MEASURES (Rubric of Student Work)

Common Learning Objectives in Professional & Technical Writing	Unacceptable: Evidence that the student has mastered this objective is not provided, is unconvincing, or very incomplete	Marginal: Evidence that the student has mastered this objective is provided, but it is weak or incomplete	Acceptable: Evidence shows that the student has generally attained the objective	Exceptional: Evidence demonstrates that the student has mastered this objective at a high level
Learning Objective 1: Demonstrates basic literacy in design, grammar and mechanical principles	0	1	3	8
Learning Objective 2: Demonstrates rhetorical literacy by ability to select appropriate technologies for stakeholder and unique situations	0	2	4	6
Learning Objective 3: Demonstrates ethical literacy , which is an awareness of the ethical dimensions of technical communication	1	1	5	5

2013-14

DIRECT MEASURES (Rubric of Student Work)

Common Learning Objectives in Professional & Technical Writing	Unacceptable: Evidence that the student has mastered this objective is not provided, is unconvincing, or very incomplete	Marginal: Evidence that the student has mastered this objective is provided, but it is weak or incomplete	Acceptable: Evidence shows that the student has generally attained the objective	Exceptional: Evidence demonstrates that the student has mastered this objective at a high level
Learning Objective 1: Demonstrates basic literacy in design and grammar and mechanical principles	0	1	5	6
Learning Objective 2: Demonstrates rhetorical literacy by ability to select appropriate technologies for stakeholder and unique situations	0	2	7	3
Learning Objective 3: Demonstrates ethical literacy , which is an awareness of the ethical dimensions of technical communication	3	3	6	

2012-13

No data available for 2012-13.

2011-12

No data available for 2011-12.

2010-11

No data available for 2010-11.