

# ANALYSIS OF CORE LEARNING OUTCOMES

## A. Overview

### 1. Academic Year:

2015-16

### 2. Core Learning Outcome Assessed:

Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can: Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. (*Communication*)

### 3. Level at which the competency is assessed:

200-level courses were chosen to reflect assessment of work students would be completing towards to the end of their degree.

### 4. Process (es) used to evaluate competency:

#### i) Overview of methodology used for assessment:

During the 2015-2016 academic year, the first Core Learning Outcome (CLO) was assessed: Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. (*Communication*). This was the first year that CGCC assessed its Core Learning Outcomes and an interdisciplinary team, the Core Learning Outcome Assessment Committee, was formed to create a process and develop a rubric for instructors to use in assessing whether students are achieving CLO#1.

The CLO Assessment team adapted two rubrics from AACU's ([Association of American Colleges and Universities](http://www.aacu.org/)) LEAP ([Liberal Education and America's Promise](http://www.aacu.org/)) Value ([Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education](http://www.aacu.org/)) Rubrics (<http://www.aacu.org/>): one for the assessment [of written communication](http://www.aacu.org/) and one for the assessment of [oral communication](http://www.aacu.org/).

Instructors who taught courses that students would be taking towards the end of their degree (sophomore or 200-level courses) were asked to assess student achievement of the Institutional Core Learning Outcome: Communication. These upper level courses were chosen with the understanding that students, in theory, would have had multiple freshman level courses that included communication as a course outcome, allowing CGCC to assess students who were closer to graduation and who had had more instruction and practice in building communication skills. As recommended by the Writing Department, WR 122 was also included in this list of courses, with the rationale that this was the last writing course that most degree-seeking students would take at CGCC before they graduated. In an attempt to minimize workload for faculty, courses were chosen from the list of courses that are already up for Course Outcomes Assessment each term.

The rubrics were not used to grade student artifacts or presentations, they were used to score the student artifacts and to determine whether students who are graduating with degrees from CGCC can "*communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills.*" Instructors were only responsible for scoring student artifacts or presentations using the rubric, and submitting the results to a web form, they were not responsible for analysis of the results.

In looking at the methodology, it's important to remember that assessment of Institutional Core Learning Outcomes is different than Course Assessment or Instructor Evaluations: CGCC is compiling information on student achievement of CLOs in order to be analyzed by the Core Learning Outcomes Committee and shared with the General Education Department to determine where adjustments and improvements need to be made. Assessment of Institutional Core Learning Outcomes is **not** about an individual instructor or an individual course: the purpose is to obtain a snap-shot on a more global perspective of student ability in formal college-level communications.

ii) Summary of timeline and steps in assessment process:

- 1) Week before start of term: The Academic Assessment Coordinator (AAC) looked at the CCOGs of courses up for course assessment for each term and selected those courses that either listed communication as a course outcome or indicated that the CLO Communication was addressed in depth. A list of suggested courses was sent by the AAC to each Department Chair (DC) for consideration. DC's responded confirming the selection or making revisions.
- 2) 2<sup>nd</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> week of term: Once a course was confirmed by the DC, instructors were contacted via email by the AAC informing them that their course had been selected for assessment of the first CLO. Information about this new process of assessing CLOs was provided, as were directions and links to the two rubrics.
- 3) 3<sup>rd</sup> week of term: the AAC contacted the instructor again to determine whether they had an appropriate assignment that could be scored with either the written or oral communication rubric. It should be noted that instructors were not required to create new assessments/assignments/projects for their courses, but were instructed to score student assignment/projects that were already used in the course to measure course level outcomes. The list of courses that would assess this CLO was revised if it was determined that instructors did not have an appropriate assignment for this purpose.
- 4) 6<sup>th</sup> week of term: packets were created by the AAC and Curriculum and Assessment Administrative Assistant (CAAA) and distributed to the instructors. Within the packets were paper copies of either the oral or written communication rubric to be used to score each individual student's assignment, and instructions for submitting the scores on the web form.
- 5) End of term to week after end of term: Instructors scored student assignments using the rubric and input the totals for each category of the rubric in the web form. Adjunct faculty submitted time cards for up to 3 hours to be paid at the Special Project Rate. The AAC compiled the results at the end of each term into an excel table.
- 6) Beginning of summer term: the AAC compiled the results for all terms into two tables: one for Written Communication and one for Oral Communication. Eventually the scores from the two tables were combined to create a meta number for analysis by the CLO Assessment Committee.
- 7) Week before Fall term 2016: The CLO Assessment Committee met to review and analyze results, review the process and make recommendations for improvement to the process. Recommendations were also made towards improving the percentage of students who achieved accomplished or above.
- 8) Fall In-service: Results were shared with faculty
- 9) October Instructional Council (IC) meeting: results, analysis and recommendations will be shared with the IC to determine how CGCC, as an institution, will move forward in the continuous improvement cycle to provide instruction in an attempt to increase the percentage of students who achieved accomplished or above in preparation for the next assessment of CLO#1 (2018-119)

### iii) Sampling information:

325 students were enrolled in the 17 200-level courses and 2 WR 122 courses. A total of 269 student artifacts were scored by the instructors of those courses.

278 of those students were enrolled in courses that scored work using the written communication rubric, with 237 of those students completing the assignments. 38 students were enrolled in courses that scored using the oral communication rubric, with 32 students completing those assignments.

### iv) Assessment Instrument(s):

Written and Oral Communication Rubrics were adapted from LEAP Value Rubrics (<http://www.aacu.org/>). The original VALUE initiative in 2007-09 involved teams of faculty and other educational professionals from over 100 higher education institutions engaged over many months to develop 16 VALUE rubrics for the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes. Each rubric was developed from the most frequently identified characteristics or criteria of learning for each of the 16 learning outcomes. Drafts of each rubric were then tested by faculty with their own students' work on over 100 college campuses.

The CLO Assessment Committee's adaptations to the LEAP Rubrics included changes to some of the descriptors and a renaming of the student achievement categories from Capstone (4); Milestones (3 and 2); and Benchmark (1) (LEAP VALUE Rubrics) to Mastery; Accomplished; Developing; Beginning; Not Demonstrated; and Not Applicable (CGCC Communication Rubrics). The CLO Assessment Committee considered the adapted student achievement categories to be more applicable to the standards CGCC currently uses for students.

### v) Data Analysis Procedures:

Once instructors scored the student artifacts using the adapted LEAP Value Rubric for Written and Oral Communication, results were gathered by the AAC and presented to the CLO Assessment Committee. The CLOA Committee analyzed both the results and the process. The analysis was recorded during the meeting and captured in this analysis template.

## B. Results

### 1. Describe results of assessment work related to competency:

Provide detailed results of assessment, including charts, graphs or other visuals

#### Overall Communication Results:

A total of 325 students were enrolled in the courses that participated in the assessment of the CLO Communication. Of those students, 269 students completed the assignments and were scored using the Written or Oral Communication Rubric. A total of 71% of those students scored as accomplished or better when the scores of the Written Communication and Oral Communication Rubrics were combined. 14% were scored into the Developing category and 2% were scored into Beginning.

Total Number of students enrolled in assessed courses:	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable
325						
Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 269						
<b>Totals (Combined Scored Written and Oral Communication Rubric)</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>12%</b>

#### Written Communication:

278 students were enrolled in the courses that participated in the assessment of the CLO Written Communication. Of those students, 237 students completed the Written Assignments and were scored using the Written Communication Rubric. A total of 63% of those students scored as accomplished or better in Written Communication. 20% were scored into the Developing category and 2% were scored into Beginning.

More than 70% of students scored as Accomplished or better in the categories: Audience, Context, Purpose; Content Development; Control of Syntax and Mechanics; and use of Visual Aids. 32% scored below accomplished in Sources of Evidence and the 33% scored below accomplished in the category of Organization and Presentation.

Institutional Core Learning Outcome #1: Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can:								
Written Communication: Total Number of students enrolled 278 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 237	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total numbers for Accomplished or better	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
Written Communication Rubric: Audience, Context and Purpose: TOTALS	76	106	52	3	0	0	182	76.79%
Written Communication Rubric: Content Development: TOTALS	53	120	60	4	0	0	173	73.00%
Written Communication Rubric: Sources and Evidence TOTALS	64	98	51	5	3	16	162	68.35%
Written Communication Rubric: Organization and Presentation: TOTALS	52	106	55	9	0	15	158	66.67%
Written Communication Rubric: Control of Syntax and Mechanics: TOTALS	47	125	61	4	0	0	172	72.57%
Written Communication Rubric: Visual Aids: TOTALS	23	23	5	1	0	190	46	97.9%
Total Percentage of Students Scoring with Written Communication Rubric	<b>22%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>16%</b>		
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better with Written Communication Rubric	<b>63%</b>							

Oral Communication:

38 students were enrolled in the courses that participated in the assessment of the CLO Oral Communication. Of those students, 32 students completed the Oral Assignments and were scored using the Oral Communication Rubric. A total of 79% of those students scored as accomplished or better in Oral Communication. 8% were scored into the Developing category and 3% were scored into Beginning.

More than 75 % of students scored as Accomplished or better in the categories: General Purpose; Organization; Language; and Evidence Based Support. It should be noted that 59% of students scored below accomplished in the category of Delivery.

Oral Communication: Total Number of students enrolled 38 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 32	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total numbers for Accomplished or better	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
<b>Oral Communication Rubric: General Purpose: TOTALS</b>	16	11	3	2	0	0	27	84%
<b>Oral Communication Rubric: Organization: TOTALS</b>	18	9	3	2	0	0	27	84%
<b>Oral Communication Rubric: Language: TOTALS</b>	15	15	2	0	0	0	30	94%
<b>Oral Communication Rubric: Delivery: TOTALS</b>	13	6	1	0	0	12	19	59%
<b>Oral Communication Rubric: Evidence Based Support: TOTALS</b>	17	7	4	0	4	0	24	75%
<b>Total Percentage of Students Scoring with Oral Communication Rubric</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>8%</b>		
<b>Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better with Written Communication Rubric</b>	<b>79%</b>							

## 2. Limitations

What were the limitations of the assessment?

- 1) The sample size for the oral report was relatively small with only 32 student assessments completed using the oral communication rubric. This small sample size may have skewed the total percentages for the results of the oral communication rubric scoring, which seem much higher as compared to the written communication rubric scoring.  
It is also questionable whether samplings from 19 courses and 325 students is sufficient enough to get a broad picture of CGCC student ability, given a total enrollment of 4,657 students with an FTE of 1,063. It should also be noted that of those 325 students whose work was scored, many could have been assessed more than once, if they were enrolled in multiple courses participating in the assessment of CLOs.
- 2) 2015-16 was the first time CGCC faculty scored student work using the assessment instruments, as adapted from the highly regarded AACU LEAP rubrics. The CLO Assessment Committee had concerns that faculty at CGCC as of yet, do not share a common language with respect to the descriptors used for each category of the rubrics. For example, one faculty member scored 12 students in the category of "Delivery" using the Oral Communication Rubric as Not Applicable, while another faculty scored 15 students in the "Organization and Presentation (Written Rubric) as Not Applicable. The CLO Assessment Committee questioned whether faculty understood what was meant by "delivery" for an oral presentation, as it seems safe to assume that delivery would be part of any oral presentation. Similarly, the committee had reservations about why organization and presentation would be considered "not applicable" in a written presentation. The committee questioned whether there might be confusion with the directions for choosing an appropriate assignment, scoring with the rubric or interpreting the explanation for each descriptor. To take this limitation one step further, the committee had reservations about whether the writing and speech department teach skills that are encompassed by the rubric. Similarly, we question whether there any missing skills taught by these two departments that are not captured by the rubric, i.e. perhaps there is a misalignment between the skills, as encompassed by the rubric and the skills taught by these two departments. The committee also acknowledged that students may not know that these are the expectations and language and objectives for communication, since although the rubric is available on the web, students have not been formally informed or educated about CLO assessment. We might begin to consider that if we all (CGCC faculty and students) have common language there may be less confusion.
- 3) The Committee felt concern that students who were scored on an assignment at the beginning of the course would have significantly different scores than those who were scored towards the end of the term, after they had received more instruction. If we want students to be scored when they are at their best, it should be recommended that scoring occur on assignments submitted later in the term.
- 4) Initially, a comment box for analysis was not included when assessment of the CLO occurred during fall term. When providing results, the nursing faculty submitted analysis for the results in a Word document, providing insight into the scoring of their student work. As a result of this insightful analysis, a comments box was included in the web form for winter and spring, so that faculty had the option to provide an explanation or analysis for student scores. The majority of explanations provided an explanation of the assignment such as "*They were not required to use sources for their first argumentative essay.*" The analysis provided by the nursing department did share some insight into why students scored the way that they did. Without comments/analysis/insight provided by the faculty scoring the student work, the committee speculates that it may be missing some valuable information to consider when analyzing the results.

- 5) While the Writing Department indicated that WR 122 would be an important course to include in the assessment of CLO#1, only two WR 122 instructors participated in the assessment of communication CLO. For various reasons, WR 122 faculty either did not complete the assessment or indicated that they could not participate in the assessment. The CLO Assessment Committee reasoned that the limited number of WR 122 students work assessed for the Communication CLO may have negatively affected the results. It is reasonable to assume that during the next assessment of this CLO, more WR 122 instructors will participate - much like Course Outcomes Assessment, it will take some time for CLO Assessment to become part of the culture at CGCC.
- 6) It cannot be ignored that faculty scoring of their own student artifacts leads to a certain amount of subjectivity in determining the results. The Committee is aware of how this subjectivity may distort results, however at this time, as CGCC is only at the beginning of the process of assessing CLOs, the committee has agreed to table this concern until a later date, instead focusing on creating a culture of CLO assessment, and slowly improving the process with each year.

In summary, it should be noted that 2015-16 was the first time a CLO has been assessed at CGCC, and the newness of this assessment most likely contributed to many of the above limitations noted.

### C. Analysis of Results

Assessment and analysis at this level measures whether degree-seeking students leave with some level of proficiency of the Institutional Core Learning Outcomes (Core Theme B: Transforming Lives – Education; Objective B3)

#### 1. Discussion and Implications

Reflect on what was learned and what the impacts might be (not a repeat of findings). Reflection should include the implications of the findings to the General Education Program.

Overall, 71% of CGCC students scored at accomplished or better with regards to communication. While this may seem like a fairly adequate percentage, we should also consider that this also means that 29% of CGCC students were scored below the accomplished level (these levels are: developing, beginning, or not demonstrated). This result could mean that almost 30% of CGCC students graduating from our institution with a 2-year degree may not have the adequate writing and oral communication skills to transfer and be successful at a 4-year institution, or successfully communicate either in written or oral form in the work place.

Although the committee admits that there may be some limitations to the results, similar findings were implied in the General Education Program Review from 2012. Table 15 of the General Education Program Review, and the preceding discussion of that table compared the grades of all community college transfer students with CGCC students transferring to an OUS school in 2008-09. While that sample was also small, *“it is still worth noting that in every discipline save mathematics, CGCC students’ grades were lower than their counterparts from other community colleges. This suggests that in disciplines other than mathematics, CGCC might not be preparing its students as well as other community colleges, something that calls for further study. The biggest discrepancy falls under the discipline of Foreign Languages, a gap of .66 GPA followed by English Composition with a gap of .52 GPA.”* While a more recent General Education Program Review is currently in progress, it seems that communication skills could be negatively affecting our students as they transfer to 4 year OUS schools.



Assuming that we as an institution want to fix this deficiency, we must ask ourselves where do we go from here? While one of the purposes of the rubric was to provide a snap-shot of student ability in formal college-level communications, the rubric can also be useful in helping the college determine where to focus its attention in terms of making improvements. If we look at the categories that students had the lowest scores: “Source and Evidence”, and “Organization and Presentation” in written communication and “Delivery” in oral communication, it may be possible that faculty could focus more instruction on those three specific areas in an attempt to help more students achieve the level of accomplished in communication. Focused assessment at the course level in these three areas could occur formally, by including “Source and Evidence” and “Organization and Presentation” in rubrics used for written work and “Delivery” in rubrics used to assess oral presentations. On a less formal basis, faculty could focus on including or increasing instruction with regards to “Source and Evidence”, “Organization and Presentation”, and “Delivery” when supporting students in writing papers and presenting oral reports.

As stated previously, most courses include a course outcome that addresses communication or indicate in the CCOG that communication is addressed in-depth. For this reason, it’s important to realize that tackling the shortcoming that many of our students demonstrate in communication should come from all departments, across all disciplines. As a college, we are all responsible for student achievement of the Core Learning Outcomes.

A few other considerations occurred to the committee when analyzing the results:

- i) Students may enroll in General Education courses while concurrently enrolled in WR 121. This would mean that students only need to complete WR 115 in order to meet the General Education pre-requisite. While we would hope that students would have completed WR 121, by the time they enrolled in a 200-level course, it’s very possible that some of the students assessed for communication in these 200-level courses had only earned a “C” in WR 115.
- ii) The analysis of the communication CLO is somewhat speculative. Without including an analysis portion for instructors to complete when filling out the online web form, and a description of what should be included in the analysis/comments portion of the rubric, the committee acknowledges that it may be lacking important information and insight with regards to student achievement of the CLO, Communication. For example, the analysis provided by the nursing department narrowed down the problems that students were having with Organization and Presentation as “Most of the inconsistencies fell into the following: poor introduction, poor transition from one thought to another, lack of/poor conclusive paragraph, or not relating article information to student/nurse practice.” In addition, this being the initial year for CLO assessment, there is no previous assessment with which to compare results. Consequently, it is difficult to determine with a degree of certainty whether there is an instructional opportunity or an assessment anomaly.
- iii) It would be useful to have faculty from the Writing Department and Speech Department provide input into the analysis of the CLO Communication. Their expertise in this area would most likely enhance the findings of the committee and provide insightful recommendations to help the college improve student achievement of the CLO Communication.

## 2. Recommendations and Action Items

Assessment of Institutional Core Learning Outcomes assesses whether students, regardless of which degree they earn at CGCC, achieve the skills and knowledge that are at the foundation of CGCC's General Education program. Recommendations and Action items should be related to recommendations made in the current General Education Program Review and can include a progress report or revisions on the Gen Ed Program Review recommendations.

i) What actions will be taken as a result of the assessment?

It is recommended by the CLO Assessment Committee that actions be taken by all faculty in their classes, since accountability for student achievement of Core Learning Outcomes is the responsibility of all faculty as indicated by their CCOGs when they specify that they address the CLO, Communication, in depth and/or list some kind of communication course outcome.

The Committee recommends that faculty of CGCC focus on 2 objectives for the next year and a half to be chosen from: "Sources and Evidence" and/or "Organization and Presentation" (for written communication) and /or "Delivery" for oral communication. As Faculty In-Service is in the process of being revamped, there is potential for faculty training opportunities. Training could be developed, led by the writing and speech departments, so that instructors in all courses could add intrinsic teaching and assessment for the 2 objectives. These workshops could also contribute to creating a common language with regard to communication across the campus. This training could be presented during Spring In-service (or as Winter Professional Development Training). Faculty could begin to implement a plan to address increased instruction in these areas starting spring term 2017. Increased instruction, on an institutional level, in these areas could continue and the effectiveness of this focus on these 2 areas could be assessed during the next scheduled assessment of the Communication CLO in 2018-19.

ii) Describe how these action items are related to recommendations from the current General Education Program Review? Include how will these changes affect the General Education program.

As previously stated, the 2012 [General Education Program Review](#) suggested further study with regard to the discrepancy between the gap of GPA in CGCC students and students of other community colleges who transfer to 4 year OUS schools, specifically in the areas of Foreign Languages and English Composition. This assessment and analysis of the CLO Communication is one way to further that recommendation, as it is related to English Composition.

Because almost all 200-level courses have some form of communication component to their course outcomes or indicate that they align with this core learning outcome at an "in-depth" level, the implications of these recommendations will have an effect on instruction beyond the General Education program. All faculty who teach students at the 200-level and most who teach at the 100-level have a responsibility to improve instruction in terms of communication in an effort to improve student accomplishment of CGCC's Core Learning Outcome of Communication.

### 3. Evaluate the assessment strategy

Were the assessment methods accurate indicators of student achievement of the core learning outcome? Why or why not? Suggestions for changes.

Given that the assessment methods, LEAP rubrics developed by the AACU, have been tested and widely adopted by post-secondary institutions across the US, it is probably safe to say that the assessment methods were accurate indicators of student achievement. The process, however, can be greatly improved by providing better directions to faculty, educating faculty regarding the descriptors and encouraging faculty feedback about the scoring process and the rubric. The committee recommends including an evaluation of the process once the scores are submitted. Faculty feedback may help the committee ascertain what portions of the rubric/descriptors faculty struggled to comprehend or apply, and pinpoint areas in the process that can be improved. Doing so would provide greater perspective on the process of assessment of the Core Learning Outcomes.

The committee also recommends including a comment field at the beginning of the rubric, so that instructors can provide a brief summary of the assignment that they are assessing. The committee further recommends providing better instructions for the comments/analysis fields after each objective of the rubric, so that instructors can provide insight and analysis with regards to the scoring of student achievement in each category of the rubric. As noted from the current comments fields, some assignments did not require students to “perform” in all categories. Similarly, it’s not clear why some of the categories were scored as N/A.

Lastly, the committee recommends clearly communicating that student work from the end of term be used for scoring with the rubric. We want to score students at their best, which is generally at the end of term, after they have received sufficient instruction and practice.

### 4. Faculty involvement

Describe faculty involvement in the assessment and analysis process.

18 Faculty were involved in the assessment of the CLO:

Bill Noonan, Katie Kissinger, John Evans, Diana Bailey, Lorie Saito, Stephen Shwiff, Leigh Hancock, Scott Stein (fall term)

Diane Uto, John Copp, Tess Fegel, Jennifer Hanlon-Wilde, Tom Kaser, Mandy Webster (winter term)

Keri Byers, Emilie Miller, John Copp, Tess Fegel, Dan Hall, Chauna Ramsey (spring term)

3 faculty and the instructional coordinator were involved in analysis process: Diana Lee-Greene, Zip Krummel, Kristen Kane and Susan Lewis (missing: Dan Ropek)

## 5. Additional comments

While assessment of the CLOs is in part, to comply with the requirements for NWCCU and accreditation, it's important to state that CGCC's commitment to the assessment of CLOs is the result of our promise to students that: Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can:

1. Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. (*Communication*)
2. Creatively solve problems by using relevant methods of research, personal reflection, reasoning, and evaluation of information. (*Critical thinking and Problem-Solving*)
3. Apply the knowledge, skills and abilities to enter and succeed in a defined profession or advanced academic program. (*Professional Competence*)
4. Appreciate cultural diversity and constructively address issues that arise out of cultural differences in the workplace and community. (*Cultural Awareness*)
5. Recognize the consequences of human activity upon our social and natural world. (*Community and Environmental Responsibility*)

Assessment of CLOs also furthers our attainment of Core Theme B: Transforming Lives – Education and aligns with CGCC's Value of Excellence.

Results, analysis and committee recommendations will be shared with the Instructional Council during the October 2016 meeting. The results and analysis documents will also be shared with faculty through a faculty-wide email and be posted on the Academic Assessment/Institutional Core Learning Outcomes webpage in an effort towards transparency for our students and community.

## D. Feedback from CAO, Directors and Department Chairs:

## E. Appendices

Include any assessment method (i.e. rubric), table of results, comments from instructors

1. [AACU LEAP VALUE Rubrics](#)
2. [AACU LEAP VALUE Rubric: Written Communication](#)
3. [AACU LEAP VALUE Rubric: Oral Communication](#)
4. [Institutional Core Learning Outcome Assessment Schedule](#)
5. [General Education Program Review](#)

6. Analysis Submission from Nursing Department: In accordance with Administrative Rule 010.030.000 – Data Publishing, this submission is not available for viewing in order to protect the confidentiality of individual students. Please contact Kristen Kane, Academic Assessment Coordinator, if you have any questions.

## 7. Comments from Analysis Portion of Written Communication Rubric

Audience, Context and Purpose: Analysis/Comments	Content Development: Analysis/Comments	Sources and Evidence: Analysis/Comments	Organization and Presentation: Analysis/Comments	Control of Syntax and Mechanics: Analysis/Comments	Visual Aids: Analysis/Comments
		They were not required to use sources for their first argumentative essay.			No visual aids for this assignment.
The indicators generally following the grading for the students' General Argument Paper, which required research in support of the paper's thesis.					
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Students participated in group research and prep. for this assignment.	Student's studied research techniques over the term. They also evaluated (weekly) written reports from past student's in order to increase the substance of their outcomes.	Student's were required to present research and documentation twice per week. After 6 weeks student's increased their skills in research development and written documentation of their interpretations and outcomes.	Over 6 weeks of the term student's were required to assess and present research findings and produce written documentation of their findings. A weekly written paper was required involving their research and data outcomes.	Because of their required weekly presentations and written assignments-the students developed their skills of oral and written communication in a style that was fluent and meaningful.	The students used power point-music-videos and interviews and guest speakers for their presentations in a very successful manner.
				Our cumulative unit of study in conventions is effective in teaching students to avoid common errors while recognizing the need for peer review to catch those errors not always obvious to student writers.	

## 8. Comments from Analysis Portion of Oral Communication Rubric

General Purpose: Analysis/Comments	Organization: Analysis/Comments	Language: Analysis/Comments	Delivery: Analysis/Comments	Evidence Based Support: Analysis/Comments
<p>Student's are allowed library research time in order for me to supervise their choices in the journals and abstracts they will be utilizing for their reports.</p>	<p>Examples of reports on located in the library for review-this enables students a better understanding regarding how to organize their data collection and the creation of the overall project in a successful manner.</p>	<p>In class we review language skills issues that will apply to the oral issues in their presentations to the class. They are given instruction for presentation styles(ethos/pathos/and logos). They also receive training via a pre-report practise session in small groups. In this way-timing and delivery can be rehearsed. The student also receives academic feedback from their fellow students. I also give verbal feedback to the individual student regarding their oral and presentation skills.</p>	<p>Students receive training regarding power points/films/overheads/research. Images are reviewed and mini-oral reports take place in small groups. The students also have access to reports on CD'S from past student presentations.</p>	<p>Research training is provided by the library staff and students are able to attend weekly library research meetings in the library and the classroom. As the instructor I provide research updates and clarifications on a one on one basis.</p>

Assessment completed by: Kristen Kane with the help of the CLO Assessment Committee (Susan Lewis, Zip Krummel, Diana Lee Greene)

Date: 10.8.16

Analysis to be submitted by the Academic Assessment Coordinator ([kkane@cgcc.edu](mailto:kkane@cgcc.edu)) by October 15 the following academic year being assessed.