

# ANALYSIS OF CORE LEARNING OUTCOMES

## A. Overview

1. Academic Year:

2017-18

2. Core Learning Outcome (CLO) Assessed:

#4 - Appreciate cultural diversity and constructively address issues that arise out of cultural differences in the workplace and community. (*Cultural Awareness*)

3. Level at which the competency is assessed:

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

## B. Recommendations, Action, and Analysis from Previous Year

1. List recommendations from previous reviews
2. Summarize actions taken in response to recommendations.
3. Describe and analyze results from actions taken

**Recommendation 1.** The committee recommended that faculty at CGCC focus on 2 objectives for the next year and a half: “Student’s Position” (Critical Thinking) and “Evaluate Potential Solutions” (Problem Solving).

Actions: CLO assessment results and report were shared with faculty during fall in-service 2017. Faculty collaborated to create [Ideas & Resources for Teaching to the CLO: Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving](#). Faculty report out their interventions to support students in critical thinking and problem solving in Part B of their course outcomes assessment, with the Academic Assessment Coordinator (AAC) tracking the interventions in a spreadsheet.

Results: To be analyzed following the 2<sup>nd</sup> assessment of CLO 2.

**Recommendation 2.** To address the concerns of the limitations of the assessment methods, it was recommended that the terms “Beginning”, “Developing”, “Accomplished” and “Mastery” be removed from the adapted rubric. The rubric for the 2017-18 CLO Assessment of CLO #4 (Cultural Awareness), will have the levels numbered 1-4, so that faculty may be less influenced to inflate their scoring.

Actions: The descriptors for student achievement levels were removed from the [Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Rubric](#). Student achievement levels were numbered at 1 - 4, not demonstrated and not applicable.

Results: The committee questioned whether removing the descriptors had any impact on the accuracy of scoring student work. As noted below in Recommendation 3 the committee determined that level 3 (accomplished) was a reasonable target for CGCC students. Analyzing the results, the committee noted that a large percentage of students (36%) were scored into level 4 (mastery). The

committee deliberated over whether students were really achieving this level of knowledge, skills and attitudes for cultural awareness and questioned whether some instructors were still inflating scores for student work. Even though descriptors were removed, it would be obvious to instructors that level 4 was the highest level for students to achieve, and the committee suspected that a few faculty were still influenced by the desire for their students reach a high level of achievement for cultural awareness. The committee also contemplated that the inflation of scoring may be a result of the lack of norming and understanding of how to apply the rubric.

**Recommendation 3.** The committee will review and determine at what level CGCC expects student achievement of each Core Learning Outcome, noting that there may be a discrepancy between expected levels depending on the skills, knowledge and/or attitude that each CLO requires.

Actions: The committee reviewed the performance indicators for each level of achievement in the rubric, gauging which level was most appropriate for community college students.

Results: The committee determined that it is reasonable to expect CGCC students to achieve the level of “accomplished” (level 3) for CLO #4 “Appreciate cultural diversity and constructively address issues that arise out of cultural differences in the workplace and community”. The committee deemed that the level of knowledge, skills and attitudes expected for level 4, mastery, as described by the adapted LEAP rubric for cultural awareness, are outside of the realm of this community college’s expectations and responsibilities.

Please describe other actions taken that were not based on previous review recommendations. What assessment, evidence, or need prompted these actions?

No other actions were taken to change the process or the rubric of CLO assessment. It should be noted that several other limitations were indicated in the [Report 2016-17: CLO#2 Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving](#) :

1. The committee was concerned that many instructors scored student work as “not applicable” in the categories of “Influence of Context and Assumptions” and “Student's Position” (Critical Thinking) and “Implement Solutions” and “Evaluate Outcomes” (Problem Solving). A few instructors noted in the post-assessment survey that they were concerned that the rubric may not “fit” to their assignments ([see Appendices 7. Summary of Instructor Evaluations of CLO#2 Process](#)). The layout of the web form made it difficult to determine whether other instructors’ comments/analysis addressed why a student artifact might be considered “not applicable” in these categories. Without this information, the committee is forced to speculate when interpreting the results and what they mean to teaching and learning.

Action: No action was taken to address this limitation. Web form options will be reviewed with the Information Technology department for 2018-19 CLO assessment.

2. Norming continues to be a limitation of this assessment work. A few instructor responses on the post-assessment survey addressed their confusion regarding the differences between the categories. Other instructors noted confusion about whether to score student work at the community college level or the university level .

Action: While norming activities did not take place, changes to the rubric were made to clarify performance indicators. Potential influential descriptors for the levels of achievement were removed as described in Actions to Recommendation 2.

## C. Overview of Process (es) used to Evaluate Competency:

### A. Overview of methodology used for assessment:

During the 2017-18 academic year, the fourth Core Learning Outcome (CLO) was assessed: “Appreciate cultural diversity and constructively address issues that arise out of cultural differences in the workplace and community. (*Cultural Awareness*)”. An interdisciplinary team, the Core Learning Outcome Assessment Committee, met at the beginning of the academic year to review the process from the previous year and make suggestions for improvement. The CLO Assessment team also adapted the [Intercultural Knowledge and Competence rubric](#) from AACU’s ([Association of American Colleges and Universities](#)) LEAP ([Liberal Education and America’s Promise](#)) Value ([Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education](#)) Rubrics (<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: Cultural Awareness. These upper level courses were chosen with the understanding that students, in theory, would have had a few freshman level courses that included cultural awareness as a course outcome, allowing CGCC to assess students who were closer to graduation and who had had more instruction and practice in building cultural awareness skills.

Each term, instructors who were teaching courses that had a cultural literacy designation or addressed cultural awareness in-depth or minimally, as indicated in the CCOGSs, were contacted to determine if they had a suitable assessment to be scored using the [Intercultural Knowledge and Competence](#) rubric. Instructors were then responsible for scoring the student artifacts using the rubric, and submitting the results to a web form. Instructors also had the option to include a rationale or analysis to help explain student scores.

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 Assessment Committee and shared with CGCC faculty 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 critical thinking and problem-solving.

### B. Summary of timeline and steps in assessment process:

1) Week prior to start of term: The Academic Assessment Coordinator (AAC) looked at the CCOGS of courses and selected those courses that either listed cultural awareness as a course outcome or indicated that CLO #4 was addressed in depth. A list of suggested courses was sent by the AAC to each Department Chair (DC) for consideration. DC’s responded either confirming the selection or recommending revisions.

2) 2<sup>nd</sup> - 3rd 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 fourth CLO.

Information about the process of assessing CLOs was provided, as were directions and links to the rubric.

3) 3rd - 4<sup>th</sup> week of term: the AAC contacted the instructor again to determine whether they had an appropriate assignment that could be scored with the [Intercultural Knowledge and Competence](#) 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. If it was determined that instructors did not have an appropriate assignment for this purpose, the course was removed from the list of courses used to assess CLO#4.

4) 6th 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 the [Intercultural Knowledge and Competence](#) 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 - 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 a spreadsheet.

6) Beginning of summer term: the AAC compiled the results for all terms.

7) Week before fall term 2018: The CLO Assessment Committee met to review and analyze results, provide recommendations based on the results to improve student achievement of CLO#4, review the CLO assessment process and make recommendations for improvement to the process.

8) Fall In-service: Results were shared with faculty, as well as the committee's recommendations to help improve student achievement of cultural awareness. Faculty used time during in-service to develop strategies for instruction, curriculum and/or assessment based on the committee's recommendations.

9) Faculty will be reminded of their commitment to implementing strategies to support students in achievement of CLO#1, #2 and #4 when they complete Part A of Course Outcomes Assessment.

10) Faculty will list the strategies they implemented to support student achievement of CLO#1, #2 and #4 when they complete Part B of Course Outcomes Assessment.

#### C. Sampling information:

429 students were enrolled in the 21 200-level courses from 7 disciplines. A total of 355 student artifacts were scored using the [Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Rubric](#) by the instructors of those courses.

#### Assessment Instrument(s):

[Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Rubric](#) was 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 performance indicators and a renaming of the student achievement categories from Capstone (4); Milestones (3 and 2); and Benchmark (1) ([LEAP VALUE Rubrics](#)) to 4; 3; 2; 1; Not Demonstrated; and Not Applicable ([CGCC Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Rubric](#)). Per Recommendation 2 from the 2017-18 CLO Analysis, the CLO Assessment Committee anticipated that the adapted student achievement categories would be less influential on instructor decisions, and instead instructors would focus on the performance indicators for guidance.

#### Data Analysis Procedures:

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

## D. Results

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

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

#### Results for Cultural Awareness:

A total of 429 students were enrolled in the courses that participated in the assessment of the CLO Cultural Awareness. Of those students, 355 completed the assignments and were scored using [Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Rubric](#). A total of 75.71% of those students scored into the levels of 3 and 4 (accomplished or better). 19.09% of students scored into the category of 2 (developing) and 4.33% of students scored into the category of 1 (beginning). Less than 1% scored into "not demonstrated" and 8.45% were scored into the "not applicable" category.

Institutional Core Learning Outcome #4: Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can: Appreciate cultural diversity and constructively address issues that arise out of cultural differences in the workplace and community. (Cultural Awareness)								
Cultural Awareness	4	3	2	1	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total numbers for Accomplished* or better	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
Total Number of students enrolled 429 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 355								
CLO: Cultural Awareness: Knowledge: Cultural Self-awareness: TOTALS	138	121	53	19	1	23	259	78.01%
CLO: Cultural Awareness: Knowledge of cultural worldview	118	142	58	16	1	20	260	77.61%
CLO: Cultural Awareness: Skills: Cultural Empathy: TOTALS	121	140	62	12	0	20	261	77.91%
CLO: Cultural Awareness: Skills: Verbal and nonverbal communication: TOTALS	106	135	59	7	4	45	241	77.49%
CLO: Cultural Awareness: Attitudes: Curiosity: TOTALS	105	119	89	14	7	20	224	67.07%
CLO: Cultural Awareness: Attitudes: Openness: TOTALS	124	118	54	17	4	38	242	76.34%
Total Number of Students Scoring with	712	775	375	85	17	166	1487	75.71%
Total Percentage of Students Scoring with Cultural Awareness Rubric	36.25%	39.46%	19.09%	4.33%	0.87%	8.45%	*3=Accomplished 4=Mastery	
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better with Cultural Awareness Rubric**	75.71%							
** Students who were scored into "Not/Applicable" are not included in total.								

## 2. Limitations

What were the limitations of the assessment?

- As noted in the analysis of CLO#1 in 2015-16 and CLO#2 in 2016-17, it cannot be ignored that faculty scoring of their own student artifacts leads to a certain amount of subjectivity in determining results. When looking at the results of CLO#4, the committee acknowledged that results may be somewhat distorted as a result of faculty assuming that their work is being scrutinized or evaluated and consequently inflating the scores that they give students. Although the following language is included in an explanation of CLO assessment (both on the website and in faculty emails): *“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”*, instructors may not read the entirety of their emails or may continue to believe that their student scores could impact their teaching assignments. Further the committee felt it was reasonable to assume that the numbering system of 1, 2, 3 and 4 may influence faculty as much as categories named “Beginning”, “Developing”, “Accomplished” and “Mastery”.

- 2) Norming continues to be a limitation of this assessment work. The committee considered that the inflated scores (36% of students scored into level 4/mastery) may in part be a result of faculty not understanding how to apply the rubric to student work.

In summary, it should be noted that the process of CLO assessment and the adapted AACU rubrics are still fairly new to faculty. Although 2017-18 was the third time a CLO has been assessed at CGCC, faculty and the CLO Assessment Committee know that there is still work to be done to improve the process to provide more accurate results and analysis. As more faculty participate in the process, awareness of Core Learning Outcomes and the process of assessment continues to improve.

## E. 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.

The committee deliberated over the results and what they meant in terms of both student achievement and faculty instruction of cultural awareness. The committee concluded that cultural awareness was a more difficult CLO to teach to and measure because it was more subjective than the first two CLOs assessed, Communication and Critical Thinking. The first two categories of the rubric for CLO#4 assessed student knowledge, and it made sense that these two categories would have higher numbers, since it may be easier to encourage students to contemplate their cultural self-awareness and teach them about different cultural worldviews. The other categories, empathy, communication, curiosity and openness are not as concrete and often require students to adjust belief systems or attitudes. The committee also recognized that while a student may score high in these areas for a particular assignment because they are being graded on these skills and attitudes, students may yet not incorporate cultural empathy, inter-cultural communication, curiosity and openness as consistent behavioral ways of thinking.

Because the AACU rubrics are used not only to assess student achievement of the CLO's, but also to inform CGCC where faculty can work together to focus instruction, the committee decided it would be of benefit to use the outcome to remind faculty what we should be teaching in the classroom.

Since the percentage of students scoring at the level of accomplished or better in the categories of "cultural self-awareness", "knowledge of cultural worldview", "cultural empathy", "verbal and nonverbal communication" and "openness" were all within the 76%-77% range, the committee agreed that faculty should focus on "Curiosity" since this category had the lowest score of students achieving "Accomplished" or better at 67%.

The implications of this focus, as recommended by the committee, is to 1) move more students from the beginning and developing levels for cultural curiosity to the level of accomplished. This means that students would move from demonstrating either minimal interest in learning more about other cultures

(beginning) or asking simple or surface questions about other cultures (developing) to asking deeper questions about other cultures and seeking out answers to these questions (accomplished). As stated previously, the committee felt that mastery (or asking complex questions about other cultures, seeking out and articulating answers to these questions that reflect multiple cultural perspectives) may be reaching beyond our expectation for the majority of CGCC degree-seeking graduate. This focus will also create a common goal for instruction that all faculty can contribute to. In doing so, we hope to move students towards “the curiosity to learn respectfully about the cultural diversity of other people and on an individual level to traverse cultural boundaries to bridge differences and collaboratively reach common goals”, as described in cultural diversity category of the AACU’s Global Learning VALUE Rubric.

With regards to the General Education program, the committee was concerned that with the exception of AAOT graduates, many of our degree-seeking students may never take a course that addresses or instructs in cultural awareness. Since the number of courses that address this CLO are limited, and students (with the exception of AAOT students) are not required to take a General Education course with a cultural literacy designation, CGCC could potentially have many graduates who never receive instruction in this CLO.

## 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?

**Recommendation 1.** The CLO Assessment Committee proposes that actions be taken by all faculty in their classes, since accountability for student achievement of Core Learning Outcomes is the responsibility of the college as a whole. As stated above, while many of CGCC’s courses do not have a cultural literacy designation nor a course outcome that addresses cultural awareness, CGCC faculty and the institution could do much to foster curiosity about other cultures. The committee recommends that faculty continue the process that they started during spring in-service 2016, and work together to develop strategies that they can integrate into their instruction and assessment that help students to move towards asking deeper questions about other cultures and seeking out answers to these questions. The AAC will compile a list of resources to support faculty instruction in this area and post to the Institutional Core Learning Outcomes website. Faculty will be reminded of their commitment to increase or integrate instruction for cultural curiosity when they complete Part A of course outcomes assessment, and will then describe what they did to support students in achieving this CLO at a higher level when completing Part B. The AAC will track these interventions on a spreadsheet and CLO#4 will be assessed again in 2022-23 to determine the impact of these interventions.

**Recommendation 2.** To address the concerns of inflated scoring and lack of norming, it is recommended that a better explanation of the difference between “not demonstrated” and “not



applicable” be included on the rubric. The AAC will also work with IT to include a box for faculty comments on the webform, so that scoring may be further explained.

**Recommendation 3.** Once assessment of all 5 CLO’s has been completed, the faculty in-service exercise of creating strategies for instruction should be replaced with exercises in norming.

**Recommendation 4.** The committee will continue to review and determine at what level CGCC expects student achievement of each Core Learning Outcome, noting that there may be a discrepancy between expected levels depending on the skills, knowledge and/or attitude that each CLO requires.

**Recommendation 5.** To address the potential deficiency of degree-seeking students receiving instruction of this CLO, as a result of limited courses and the lack of requirements for students to take courses that address cultural literacy, the committee supports a recommendation that the college move towards some form of Guided Pathways. The committee assumes that there is the possibility for similar limitations from the 2018-19 assessment of CLO#5 (Community and Environmental Responsibility) as a result of students not being required to complete coursework that addresses this CLO.

- ii. li) 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.

The 2016 General Education Program Review’s 2nd recommendation was to “ Revamp the program to align it more fully with its mission, especially its goals of providing a common experience and preparing students for the roles as citizens of the US and the world.” As described in the General Education Program’s Mission, CGCC’s common educational experience “is defined by CGCC’s Core Learning Outcomes and is developed primarily through a set of general education course requirements that all students take, regardless of their major. Ultimately, the mission of the General Education program at CGCC is to provide our students with a common experience and set of skills that prepare students for success in their majors, as citizens of the US and the world and in their personal and professional lives after graduation.” The action of CGCC faculty intentionally providing resources and extra support for students to improve achievement in cultural literacy implicitly supports the General Education program’s Recommendation 2 by making changes to course curriculum and delivery to better prepare students for the roles of citizens of the US and the world.

### 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 and 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. As noted in the limitations (Section D2) the committee is concerned, however, about the accuracy and subjectivity of faculty scoring their own student artifacts. The committee agrees that CGCC will continue to have faculty score their own student artifacts while a baseline for each CLO is established, however it is recognized that the

process, can be improved by educating faculty regarding the descriptors, reminding faculty that student achievement of a CLO is **not** about an individual instructor or an individual course and thus encouraging faculty to accurately score student work.

#### 4. Faculty involvement

Describe faculty involvement in the assessment and analysis process.

10 faculty from 7 disciplines were involved in the assessment of the CLO (compared to 25 faculty in the previous year):

Fall Term: Dan Hall (SOC 204 and SOC 205), Kristen Kane (PSY 201A), Zip Krummel (PSY 201A and PSY 215), and Stephen Shwiff (HST 201)

Winter Term: John Copp (PS 202), Tess Fegel (PSY 215), Leigh Hancock (ENG 253), Kristen Kane (PSY 202A), Zip Krummel (PSY 201A), Stephen Shwiff (HST 202), Kristy Towell (ENG 250), Diane Uto (COMM 237) and Mandy Webster (WS 201)

Spring Term: John Copp (PS 203), Dan Hall (SOC 213), Leigh Hancock (ENG 214), Kristen Kane (PSY 215), Zip Krummel (PSY 201A and PSY 202A), Stephen Shwiff (HST 203), and Mandy Webster (WS 202)

4 faculty and the Director of Curriculum and Assessment were involved in analysis process: Katy Jablonski, Kristen Kane, Zip Krummel, Susan Lewis and Dan Ropek.

#### 5. Additional comments

1. In May 2018, CGCC's Instructional Council revised CLO #4 from "Appreciate cultural diversity and constructively address issues that arise out of cultural differences in the workplace and community. (*Cultural Awareness*)" to "Use an understanding of cultural differences to constructively address issues that arise in the workplace and community. (*Cultural Awareness*)" to address concerns that "appreciate" was not measurable.
2. 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. Extract, interpret, evaluate, communicate, and apply quantitative information and methods to solve problems, evaluate claims, and support decisions in their academic, professional and private lives. (*Quantitative Literacy*)
  4. Use an understanding of cultural differences to constructively address issues that arise 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 faculty during the fall 2018 in-service. 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.

### iii. Appendices

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

1. [AACU LEAP VALUE Rubrics](#)
2. [AACU LEAP VALUE Rubric: Intercultural Knowledge and Competence](#)
3. [Institutional Core Learning Outcome Assessment Schedule](#)

Assessment completed by: Kristen Kane with the help of the CLO Assessment Committee (Susan Lewis, Zip Krummel, Dan, Ropek and Katy Jablonski)

Date: 9.18.18

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.