

## 2022-23 ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOMES

### **Section One: Overview**

*This report touches on results of the current year assessment and comparative analysis to the year in which the ILO was last assessed. In addition, the report covers process and assessment methodology and efficiency. The comparative analysis, a key component of the report can be found in section 5B.*

#### **A. Academic Year:**

2022-23

#### **B. Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) Assessed:**

#4 Use an understanding of cultural differences to constructively address issues that arise in the workplace and community. (*Cultural Awareness*)

#### **C. Level at which the competency is assessed:**

The courses chosen were at the 200-level to reflect assessment of work students would be completing towards the end of their degree. In some cases, 100-level courses were also included in the assessment when considered appropriate by the instructor and the academic assessment coordinator (AAC).

As recommended by the ILO Assessment Committee when this ILO was last assessed in 2017-18, the expectation is that students should achieve the level of Accomplished (3) by the time that they graduate from CGCC with a 2-year degree. ([Report 2017-18 ILO#4 Cultural Awareness](#), Section B, Result of Recommendation 3)

### **Section Two: Recommendations, Action, and Analysis from Previous Assessment of ILO.**

#### **A. Previous year ILO was assessed**

2017-18

#### **B. List recommendations from previous reviews:**

2017-18 had one recommendation related to the assessment of the Cultural Awareness ILO:

*The ILO Assessment Committee proposes that actions be taken by all faculty in their classes, since accountability for student achievement of Core [Institutional] 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 [ILO] at a higher level when completing Part B. The AAC will track these interventions on a spreadsheet and CLO#4 [ILO#4] will be assessed again in 2022-23 to determine the impact of these interventions.*

**C. Summarize actions taken in response to recommendations:**

Results and an overview of the analysis were reported out to faculty during the fall 2017 in-service. Faculty worked together to provide a list of ideas and resources that could support student improvement in the recommended area of “Curiosity”. The list of [Ideas & Resources for Teaching to ILO #4 Cultural Awareness](#) was posted on the web. Faculty reported out on the implementation of support strategies that they added or practiced in their courses in the Part B of Course Outcomes Assessment (COA). The strategies were organized into a spreadsheet (see Appendix 1) Faculty were reminded of their commitment to focus on these areas during each in-service and as well when they completed their Part A of COA.

Faculty reported a total of 86 strategies to support students in the area of “curiosity”, implemented over the last 5 years when completing their Part B.

Comparison of the results between 2017-18 and 2022-23 show an increase of 19% of students scoring into Accomplished or better in the dimension of “Curiosity”. This dimension saw the greatest growth of all dimensions, indicating that faculty efforts over the last 5 years have been effective. **This recommendation is considered to be Met.**

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

1. In 2021, following the creation of a faculty professional development coordinator position, faculty began to take greater responsibility and leadership in faculty professional development opportunities, many of which were related to the ILOs. Specific to ILO #4, numerous professional development opportunities were offered:
  - Becoming an Anti-Racist Instructor (fall 2021)
  - Sense of Belonging: Gender Pronouns (winter 2022)
  - Being an Hispanic Serving Institution (HIS) (spring 2022)
  - Universal Design for Learning, Culturally Responsive Teaching, and Antiracism in teaching and learning. (fall 2022 inservice)
  - Contract Grading, a method of assessment based on student "work or labor" in support of equity and social justice. (fall 2022)
  - Inclusion, equity, belonging, justice, and culturally responsive teaching (spring 2023)
2. In accordance with the [2023-2025 Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement](#), Article 7, all faculty are “Responsible for..... assessment of student learning”, and adjunct faculty are no longer paid for up to 3 hours of ILO assessment work, as ILO assessment is part of their teaching responsibilities.

**Section Three: Overview of Process (es) used to Evaluate Competency:**

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

During the 2022-23 academic year, faculty assessed students in achievement of ILO #4 “*Use an understanding of cultural differences to constructively address issues that arise in the workplace and community. (Cultural Awareness)*” for the second time. Faculty initially assessed student achievement of this ILO in 2017-18. Instructors used the [Cultural Awareness Rubric](#) to score student work. This rubric was adapted by the ILO Assessment committee from the AAC&U’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.AAC&U.org/>). The rubric was the same rubric used to

assess students on the cultural awareness ILO in 2017-18, with the exception of one change (Recommendation 2; [Report 2017-18 ILO#4 Cultural Awareness](#)). A better explanation of the difference between “not demonstrated” and “not applicable” was included on the 2022-23 Cultural Awareness rubric. This change was made as a result of the ILO Assessment Committee’s concerns of inflated scoring and lack of norming during their 2018 meeting.

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 ILO Cultural Awareness. These upper-level courses were chosen with the understanding that students, in theory, would have had a few freshmen level courses that included cultural awareness as a course outcome, allowing CGCC to assess students who were closer to graduation and who had received more instruction and practice in building cultural awareness skills.

Each term, instructors who were teaching courses that address cultural awareness as a major or minor, as indicated in the CCOGs, were contacted to confirm that they had a suitable assignment to be scored using the adapted Cultural Awareness 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. (see Appendix 7)

In looking at the methodology, it is important to remember that assessment of Institutional Learning Outcomes is different than Course Outcomes Assessment or Instructor Evaluations: CGCC is compiling information on student achievement of ILOs in order to be analyzed by the Institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee and shared with CGCC faculty to determine where adjustments and improvements need to be made. Assessment of Institutional 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 cultural awareness, and as well, the institution’s ability to effect change and improvement through the implementation of focused teaching strategies.

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

- 1) One month prior to start of term: The AAC looked at the CCOGs of courses and selected those courses that had cultural awareness as a course outcome or indicated that ILO #4 was addressed as a major or minor. A list of suggested courses was sent by the curriculum and assessment administrative assistant (CAAA) to each department chair (DC) for consideration. DCs responded either confirming the selection or recommending revisions.
- 2) One to two weeks prior to start of term: Once a course was confirmed by the DC, instructors were contacted via email by the CAAA informing them that their course had been selected for assessment of the ILO#4. Information about the process of assessing ILOs was provided, as were directions and the rubrics.
- 3) 2nd – 3rd week of term: the AAC contacted the instructor to confirm that they had an appropriate assignment that could be scored with the Cultural Awareness rubric. If it was determined that instructors did not have an appropriate assignment for this purpose, the AAC either worked with the instructor to develop an appropriate assignment, or the course was removed from the list of courses used to assess ILO#4 for the term.

- 4) 6th week of term: a check-in/reminder email that included the instructions and scoring rubrics was emailed to all participating instructors
- 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. 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) 2.5 weeks before fall term 2023: the ILO Assessment Committee met to review and analyze results, including a comparative analysis of the results from the previous assessment of ILO#4 (2017-18). The committee made recommendations based on the results to improve student achievement of ILO#4, compared the assessment results between 2017-18 and 2022-23, analyzed the effectiveness of faculty interventions over the past 5 years, reviewed the ILO assessment process and made recommendations for improvement to the process.
- 8) Fall In-service: Results will be shared with faculty, as well as the committee's recommendations to help improve student achievement of cultural awareness.
- 9) Faculty will be reminded of their commitment to implement strategies to support students in achievement of ILO#1, #2, #3, #4 and #5 when they complete Part A of Course Outcomes Assessment.
- 10) Faculty will list the strategies they implemented to support student achievement of ILO#1, #2, #3, #4 and #5 when they complete Part B of Course Outcomes Assessment.

**C. Sampling information:**

236 students were enrolled in 12 courses from 7 disciplines. A total of 188 student artifacts were scored using the Cultural Awareness rubric by the instructors of those courses

The sampling size from the first assessment of ILO #4 in 2017-18 was more than 53% larger, with 429 students enrolled in 21 courses from 7 disciplines with a total of 355 student artifacts scored.

**Assessment Instrument(s):**

The Cultural Awareness rubric was adapted from LEAP Value Rubrics (<http://www.AAC&U.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.

Per Recommendation 2 from the [Report 2016-17 ILO#2 Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving](#), the ILO Assessment Committee replaced the names of each level from the rubrics anticipating that the adapted numbered student achievement levels would be less influential on instructor decisions, and encouraging instructors to instead, focus on the performance indicators for guidance.

### **3. Data Analysis Procedures.**

**Include a description of faculty involvement in the assessment and analysis process.**

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 ILO Assessment Committee. The ILO Assessment Committee compared and analyzed the results and reviewed the process. Notes were taken of the analysis during the meeting and captured in this analysis template

9 faculty from 7 disciplines were involved in the assessment of the ILO:

Fall Term: Diana Bailey (NRS 221), Kristen Kane (PSY 202A), Diane Uto (COMM 140)

Winter Term: Kristen Kane (PSY 201A, PSY 215), Zip Krummel (PSY 202A)

Spring Term: Diana Bailey/Lori White (NRS 224), Courtney Cunningham (ED 219), Kristen Kane (PSY 215), Tina Martinez (SOC 204), Debra Shope (HEC 201), Mandy Webster (WGS 202)

5 faculty and the director of curriculum and academic assessment (DCAA) were involved in the analysis process: Diana Bailey, Kristen Booth, Kalie Brunton, Kristen Kane, Zip Krummel, and Susan Lewis.

#### **Section Four: Results**

##### **A. Describe results of assessment work related to competency:**

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

##### Cultural Awareness Results:

A total of 236 students were enrolled in the courses that participated in the assessment of the ILO Cultural Awareness. Of those students, 188 students completed the assignments and were scored using the Cultural Awareness rubric. A total of 89% of students achieved a score of accomplished or better, with 8% of students scored into developing, 1% scored into beginning and >1% scored into not demonstrated. A total of 9% of students were scored into not applicable, meaning that the assignments used for the assessment could not be used to assess a dimension or did not require students to demonstrate certain knowledge, skills or attitudes related to the rubric.

In the individual category of "Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks", 95% of students scored as accomplished or better. 90% of students scored into accomplished or better in the categories of "Knowledge: Cultural Self-awareness"; and "Skills: Cultural Empathy". 87% of students scored into accomplished or better in the category of "Skills: Verbal and nonverbal communication", followed by 86% in the category of "Attitudes: Curiosity"; and 83% of students scored into accomplished or better in the category of "Attitudes: Openness".

**Table 1: Results of 2022-23 Assessment of Student Achievement of ILO #4 (Cultural Awareness)**

<b>Institutional Learning Outcome #4:</b>	<b>Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can: Use an understanding of cultural differences to constructively address issues that arise in the workplace and community. (Cultural Awareness)</b>						
Total Number of students enrolled in assessed courses: 236 Total # of students who completed scored assignment:188	Master y	Accomplish ed	Developi ng	Beginnin g	Not Demonstrat ed	Not Applicabl e	Total Percentage for Accomplish ed or better
<b>Cultural Awareness: Knowledge: Cultural Self-awareness: TOTALS</b>	127	43	13	5	0	0	90.43%
<b>Cultural Awareness: Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks: TOTALS</b>	102	57	4	4	0	21	95.21%
<b>Cultural Awareness: Skills: Cultural Empathy: TOTALS</b>	117	53	16	2	0	0	90.43%
<b>Cultural Awareness: Skills: Verbal and nonverbal communication: TOTALS</b>	93	66	21	2	0	6	87.36%
<b>Cultural Awareness: Attitudes: Curiosity: TOTALS</b>	91	53	14	4	5	21	86.23%
<b>Cultural Awareness: Attitudes: Openness: TOTALS</b>	78	31	21	1	0	57	83.21%
<b>Total Number of Students Scoring with Cultural Awareness Rubric</b>	608	303	89	18	5	105	89.05%
<b>Total Percentage of Students Scoring into Level with Cultural Awareness Rubric</b>	53.90 %	26.86%	7.89%	1.60%	0.44%	9.31%	
<b>Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better with Cultural Awareness</b>	89.05%						

## Section Five: Analysis of Results

Assessment at this level measures whether CGCC degree-seeking students can demonstrate the Institutional Learning Outcomes at a two-year lower-division competency level. 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.

### A. Analysis, discussion and implications of current year results

The ILO Assessment Committee was satisfied with the 2022-23 results. The overall score of 89.05% surpasses the Strategic Priority Measure for ILOs of 80%. Additionally more than 80% of students were scored into Accomplished or better for each dimension, meeting the goal to move more students into the upper skill levels. As in past ILO Assessment Committee meetings, the committee broached the subject of whether the numbers were real or whether the high percentage of achievement may be indicative of scoring inflation, a possibility that could happen when instructors score their own work. The committee noted that in comparing the results for the assessment ILO#4 with the results for the assessment of Cultural Awareness in the General Education program, which focuses on end of term grades to assess student achievement of outcomes, the percentages are similar. The results between the two assessment methods are almost identical with student achievement for the outcome related to cultural awareness for the General Education-related degrees ranging between 88%-92%. (see Appendix 10)

The critical connection between ILOs and General Education is apparent in the mission for the General Education program as outlined in the [2017-20 General Education Program Review](#) *“General Education (Gen Ed) refers to the foundation of skills, knowledge, habits of mind, and values that transcend the boundaries of specialization and provide all students with a common language and skills. Gen Ed is intended to develop students as well-rounded critical thinkers and communicators, rather than trained specialists; the goal is to transmit a common cultural heritage. At Columbia Gorge Community College, this educational foundation is defined by CGCC’s Institutional 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 Gen Ed program at CGCC is to provide our students with a common experience and set of skills that prepare them for success in their majors, as citizens of the US and the world and in their personal and professional lives after graduation..”* Of note is the emphasis on a “common experience and set of skills” for CGCC students. With the vast majority of students (89%) achieving accomplished or better when assessed for cultural awareness, as well as student achievement ranging between 83% and 95% in all categories of the rubric, it may be assumed that, at least in the area of cultural awareness, the General Education program is fulfilling its mission in providing a “common experience and set of skills” related to developing students who are culturally aware. The results, however, indicate that a small percentage of students, those scoring into “not demonstrated”, “beginning” and “developing”, may still be struggling with skills related to cultural awareness. Since the college cannot currently disaggregate ILO assessment data, it is difficult to identify which students may be struggling with these skills. Without this disaggregated data, while faculty may be able to focus their instruction in identified dimensions, they may not be able to provide the focused instruction that particular student populations require to be successful in achieving this learning outcome.

The General Education program’s emphasis on a “common experience” for CGCC students lends itself to another area of concern noted by the committee: the majority of student artifacts assessed came from nursing (22%) and psychology courses (45%). Because the range of disciplines assessing students this

past year were so narrow, it can be difficult to determine whether the weighted number of nursing and psychology students had an effect on the results. The committee wondered whether students who take these courses are more culturally aware? The committee also questioned whether these courses, as well as the other courses that assessed student artifacts: education, women and gender studies and sociology, are the only courses that students take where cultural awareness is taught. If this is the case, are there degree-seeking CGCC students graduating without meeting the Institutional Learning Outcome of Cultural Awareness?

The limited range of courses that participated in the assessment of ILO#4 also had a significant effect on overall numbers of student artifacts assessed. With only 188 student artifacts assessed, it may be difficult to generalize the results to all CGCC students. The committee was concerned that so few students were formally assessed for ILO#4 and questioned why the numbers were so low. As mentioned above, courses that align to ILO#4 are fewer than other courses that address other ILOs such as communication, critical thinking and problem-solving and quantitative literacy, however, there was also an overall lack of participation in ILO assessment during 2022-23 (see Appendix 14). The decrease in participation in formal ILO assessment is concerning beyond the difficulty in generalizing results to the CGCC student population. The committee wonders whether the college has lost the momentum for ILO assessment that first occurred when in-service devoted time to discussing results, implications and teaching strategies to address ILO dimensions and when adjunct faculty were paid for their assessment time.

The ILO Assessment Committee spent considerable time discussing the dimension “Attitudes: Openness” as this dimension had the lowest score. Of note was the large numbers of students who were scored into Not Applicable. Instructors’ comments and analysis related to this dimension (see Appendix 7) suggest that this is a difficult dimension to assess in an online class since it requires instructors to assess whether a student “*Initiates and develops interactions with culturally different others*” (AACU LEAP Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Rubric). Even when discussion forums require students to respond to other students, it’s almost impossible to determine by both instructor and student, whether they are initiating interactions with “culturally different others” without making assumptions about cultural identification based upon a student’s name, as this is often the only information available in the Moodle course management system about a student. The committee also noted that it may often be difficult to initiate interactions with culturally different others due to few racially/ethnically/ancestrally different cultures within the college community as is evident in [CGCC’s Student Characteristics/Percent of Undergraduates by Race/Ethnicity](#). This analysis by the committee leads to another implication, which is the assumption that many instructors and students make related to “culture” being primarily related to “race”, ethnicity, or ancestry. The committee noted that many often overlook other elements related to cultural variances such as socio-economic class, geographic location, religion, gender, sexual orientation, family and political attitudes to name a few. This realization led to a discussion among committee members related to how we educate students and train faculty/staff in regards to cultural diversity that broaches the topic beyond race/ethnicity/ancestry. The committee also discussed the college’s own openness to inquiry related to culture and diversity, and how we can better cultivate a safe space for people to be curious or ask questions, even if culturally charged. The committee also noted that the fourth dimension of “verbal and non-verbal communication” may also be implicated as it relates to “openness”, noting that a similar number of students scored into “Beginning” and “Developing” for this dimension as they did for “openness”. The



committee wondered how we can teach inquiry if we have trouble modeling tolerance for inquisitive people to ask questions.

**B. Comparative analysis of results from multiple years.**

**Address effectiveness of actions taken from previous assessment of ILO**

All dimensions saw an increase in the percentage of students who were scored into Accomplished or better when compared to the [2017-18 results](#) (also see Appendix 13). Overall, there was a 13% increase for students who scored into Accomplished or better (Table 2).

Of note is the increase in the percentage of students scoring into Accomplished or better in the dimension that faculty have been focusing on for the past 5 years: “Attitudes: Curiosity” saw the greatest growth of all dimensions, with an increase of 19% of students who scored into Accomplished or better.

**Table 2: Comparison of 2017-18 and 2022-23 Results from Assessment of Student Achievement of Cultural Awareness**

Institutional Learning Outcome #4: Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can: Use an understanding of cultural differences to constructively address issues that arise in the workplace and community. (Cultural Awareness)			
Year of Assessment	2017-18	2022-23	Comparative Difference
Total Number of Students who completed scored assignments for Cultural Awareness	355	188	-167
Total Percentage of Students Scored as Accomplished or Better for Cultural Awareness:	76%	89%	13%
Cultural Awareness Rubric Dimensions			
	2017-18 Total Percentage for Accomplished or better	2022-23 Total Percentage for Accomplished or better	Comparative Difference
Cultural Awareness: Knowledge: Cultural Self-awareness: TOTALS	78%	90%	12%
Cultural Awareness: Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks: TOTALS	78%	95%	17%

<b>Cultural Awareness: Skills: Cultural Empathy: TOTALS</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>Cultural Awareness: Skills: Verbal and nonverbal communication: TOTALS</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>ILO: Cultural Awareness: Attitudes: Curiosity: TOTALS</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>ILO: Cultural Awareness: Attitudes: Openness: TOTALS</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better with Cultural Awareness</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>13%</b>

With such a significant increase in student achievement between 2017-18 and 2022-23, as briefly discussed in Section Five: Analysis of Results, the ILO Assessment Committee spent a significant amount of time discussing whether the results were real and valid. The committee noted a number of differences that could have affected the results between 2017-18 and 2022-23. Faculty now have more experience and are more prepared for ILO assessment. 2022-23 was the second time applying the ILO#4 rubric and instructors have had time to tailor projects to the rubric. Since 2017-18, instructors have had 5 more years of the ILO assessment process, applied various adapted AAC&U rubrics, aligned curriculum, activities and assignments for the ILOs identified in their Course Content Guides, and attended workshops related to designing activities and assignments specific to the various rubrics. As a result, many instructors may be more familiar with the rubrics and have projects customized to the rubrics. Further, some students may be somewhat familiar with the rubrics as well, since some instructors now share the rubrics with their students. Finally, smaller sampling numbers (see Appendix 16) may also have had an impact on results.

At the same time, the significance of the 5 years of combined efforts of faculty to integrate strategies into their classrooms to improve student achievement cannot be ignored. Instructors reported out on the various ways that they supported students in the areas not only identified in 2017-18 (Curiosity), but other areas from the rubrics as well. Faculty reported a [total of 86 strategies](#) integrated into their classrooms, as captured by COA assessment (COA does not capture all strategies in all classrooms – <https://www.cgcc.edu/course-outcomes-assessment> for more detailed information on the COA process). Over the last 5 years, a total of 1,502 students (may be duplicated) received some kind of focused instruction in cultural awareness.

In reviewing the actions that faculty have implemented into their teaching and classrooms in the last 5 years, it should be noted that the actions were not just occurring in the classes where the ILO assessment was taking place, but also in the classes that lead up to the 200-level courses, such as ESOL and Pre-College (see Appendix 14). It was obvious to the ILO Assessment Committee that the actions taken have been pervasive and college-wide, and thought to give validity to the assessment results. Both the increase in students' achievement of the areas of focus, and the overall increase in percentage of students scoring into accomplished or better for ILO #4, support the effectiveness of the actions faculty have taken in their classrooms. Therefore, faculty should be congratulated for their efforts and for the effectiveness of their assessment inspired teaching strategies resulting in the improvement of student understanding of ILO #4.

An additional benefit noted is that faculty have not only accomplished their goal of increasing the percentage of students who achieve the Institutional Learning Outcome of Cultural Awareness, but that they have worked together to build a growing "culture of assessment" at CGCC. Over the past two years, CGCC faculty have been taking greater ownership of the assessment conversation in general. They are requesting and leading workshops of their own choosing as part of the faculty organized and led professional development series. ILO assessment topics are a regular addition to these workshops, showing a growth in faculty willingness to discuss ILO assessment and recognize its purpose in supporting positive teaching practices and improvement in student learning. Eight years ago, when CGCC first began assessing Institutional Learning Outcomes, this type of engagement did not happen.

At the same time, it should not be ignored that comparing faculty participation in 2017-18 to 2022-23, there was an almost 50% decrease in courses participating in the ILO assessment process, as well as close to a 50% decrease in the number of student artifacts assessed. This would represent a potential contradiction in the assertion of a growing "culture of assessment." While some of the decrease may be attributed to lower enrollments, it is also imperative to recognize that there was also a decrease in faculty willingness to conduct ILO assessment in 2022-23. At the same time that faculty were engaging in greater discussion around assessment and student learning of ILOs, many were also boycotting the assessment process. Decline in faculty participation has been growing over the past few years and is often attributed to workload; however, further research is needed prior to making any conclusions.

### **C. Recommendations and Action Items**

**Assessment of Institutional 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.**

#### **1. What actions will be taken as a result of the assessment?**

**Recommendation 1:** The committee recommends that faculty focus their teaching efforts on moving more students into Accomplished for the dimension of "openness". The committee recognizes that faculty may need more training in this area in order to model what "openness to inquiry" means, and thus includes in this recommendation the need to create a culture of openness at the college that allows inquisitive people to ask questions. This may mean further training, professional development and most likely the support of the Director of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion to encourage conversations to be open and safe for people to ask questions and have discussions about culturally charged topics. The

committee also noted that the fourth dimension, “verbal and non-verbal communication” may also be implicated as an area of focus as it relates to “openness”.

**Recommendation 2:** The committee recommends that the college and faculty recognize an expanded definition of, or meaning of, culture beyond race and ethnicity, encompassing other elements related to cultural variances such as socio-economic class, geographic location, religion, gender, sexual orientation, family and political attitudes, etc.

**Recommendation 3:** The committee recommends addressing the problem of assessing “openness” in the online classroom. This may mean building tools to support measuring this dimension online and/or re-working the definition of “openness” on the rubric.

**Recommendation 4:** The committee recommends increasing faculty involvement in the assessment of ILOs. A plan is in place to attend the October 2023 Instructional Council meeting to discuss the decrease in ILO assessment participation and the concurrent decrease in completion of COAs (Course Outcome Assessments). The committee recommends that a clear check-list of faculty responsibilities be created. The committee also recommends ensuring deans and department chairs are included in all ILO emails with faculty, and that department chairs and/or deans follow-up with their faculty to ensure that ILO assessment results are completed. Changes in the onboarding process for new faculty should also include meetings with the Curriculum and Academic Assessment Department to support faculty in creating appropriate assignments for ILO assessment and to ensure new faculty understand their assessment responsibilities. Information from the academic assessment coordinator should also focus on why ILO Assessment matters, with follow-up emails when instructors decline requests for ILO assessment shifting to asking “what resources the instructor may need that would allow them to complete the assessment”.

**Recommendation 5:** The committee recommends an initiative to formalize a conversation between faculty in General Education & CTE to share responsibility and techniques in teaching ILOs. While ILOs have been considered the responsibility of General Education, limitations in number of General Education courses required by CTE degrees may add to the possibility that students could graduate without instruction in ILOs #4 and #5. This recommendation may become a part of the recommendation requesting that the General Education department resolve the issue that students could potentially graduate with a CGCC degree without taking classes that address either ILO.

**2. 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 most current [General Education Program Review \(2017-2020\)](#) did not include any recommendations that had relevancy to ILOs. The [2016 General Education Program Review](#)'s 2nd recommendation, however, 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 Institutional 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 awareness 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.

## **Section Six: Evaluate the Assessment Strategy**

### **A. List assessment strategy recommendations from previous reviews, summarize actions taken in response to recommendations**

The following recommendations are from [the analysis of the assessment strategies related to the 2019-20 assessment of ILO #3 Quantitative Literacy](#):

**Recommendation 3.** *The committee recommends that faculty embrace a more intentional approach to teaching the concepts addressed by the rubrics. This intentionality would include using the words and terminology from the rubrics with our students, as well as educating them about how the content of General Education courses are tied to their attainment of ILOs. One suggestion would be to include the assignments supporting student achievement of ILOs in the syllabi, as an addition to the requirement that all Gen Ed syllabi include the ILO major and minor designations. Workshops are planned to be offered during fall 2020 in-service to support faculty towards this goal.*

**Actions:** While some faculty have stated that they have begun to include assignments supporting student achievement of ILOs in their syllabi, formal tracking has not taken place to determine how many faculty have implemented this recommendation.

Workshops that focused on developing assignments that could be assessed using the ILO #1 rubric (fall in-service 2020) and the ILO#2 rubric (fall 2021) in-service have been provided to faculty. Fall 2020’s workshop was titled “Creating Assignments and Activities to Support Student Achievement of CLO#1: Communication”, and was led by Gretchen Gebhardt, Kristen Kane and Susan Lewis. Fall 2021’s workshop was titled “Building Assignments and Assessments to Measure Critical Thinking/Problem-Solving Outcomes” and led by Jim Pytel, Diane Uto, Kristen Kane and Susan Lewis. Both workshops were attended by a number of faculty. The faculty professional development coordinator position created in 2021 allowed faculty to begin to take greater responsibility and leadership in faculty professional development opportunities, many of which were related to the ILOs. Per Section One/D, there were 6 professional development opportunities related to ILO#4. As a result, combined with time constraints of in-services, the Curriculum and Academic Assessment Department (CAAD) has stepped back from offering these workshops.

**Results:** The results of this recommendation are difficult to track, as the AAC does not have access nor the time to review all faculty syllabi. Syllabi that follow the newest syllabus template should have the ILOs that the course addresses listed, as required by the template *“Gen Ed faculty should insert only the major/minor designated institutional learning outcome(s) for your course from <https://www.cgcc.edu/ccogs>. All other faculty should enter any/all ILOs that map to their specific course outcomes and are addressed intentionally as part of the course content”*. **The recommendation related to the syllabus template should be shelved for the time-being.** The syllabus template currently does not require instructors to make connections between ILOs and assignments, however it may be an item to revisit with Instructional Council in the future. **The portion of the recommendation related to workshops and intentionality of teaching the ILOs should be continued.** The academic assessment

coordinator will meet with the professional development coordinator to discuss workshops related to ILO#5 for 2023-24. The 2023-24 report out on this recommendation should include professional development workshops related to ILO#5.

**Recommendation 4.** *To address the concerns of the lack of familiarity that faculty may have with the criteria of the rubric, future in-services will include workshops designed around creating assignments specific to the criteria of the rubric. These workshops will not only help faculty become more familiar with the criteria, but also ensure that courses are supporting student achievement in the appropriate ILOs as indicated in the CCOGs. It is recommended that the Instructional Council member of the committee remind the General Education department chairs about the major/minor designation of ILOs so that the department chairs can continue to educate faculty in their departments.*

**Actions:** See response to Recommendation 3/Actions above related to workshops and the faculty professional development coordinator

**Results:** The workshops and professional development activities had fair attendance, and the increase in student achievement for ILOs #1, #2 and ILO#4 may be, in part, the result of faculty having better activities, assignments and opportunities for discussion, to support and assess student learning of. The committee decided that **this recommendation should continue** for the next 2 years so that faculty experience the same opportunity for all ILOs and their rubrics. It should be noted that despite many professional development activities related to ILOs being now offered throughout the year, the committee has expressed some concern that in-service no longer provides an opportunity for all faculty to work together on ILO-related activities. **This recommendation may be combined with Recommendation 3 to create one recommendation that addresses faculty training to increase familiarity with, and intentionality in teaching to the criteria of the rubrics.**

**Recommendation 5.** *In order to further support faculty in the above recommendation, the committee proposes that the college consider expanding the ILO workshops, to be offered each term. Doing so would require more faculty to be trained on applying the rubrics, something that could occur during the summer through the AAC&U VALUE Institute Calibration Trainings. Faculty would be trained on norming, as well as compensated (the rate in 2018 was \$750) for their time in scoring student artifacts. These faculty could then lend their expertise to providing workshops for CGCC faculty each term.*

**Actions:** See response to Recommendation 3 above related to workshops and the faculty professional development coordinator. Norming training has not occurred. As stated in the [2021-22 Analysis Report for ILO #2 Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving](#), the ILO Committee considered one of the possible explanations for improvement in student achievement could be related to faculty familiarity with the rubrics after 6 [now 8] years of following the ILO assessment process. Although familiarity is not the same as norming, it may have an effect on how the criteria are applied to student artifacts. As previously discussed, however, the CAAD has decided to step back from providing workshops and trainings, leaving faculty professional development to the coordinator.

**Results:** The workshops and faculty Coffee Hour had a number of faculty in attendance. Familiarity with the expectations of the rubric, and using assignments created specifically for use with the rubrics may have helped to contribute to an increase in student achievement for ILO#1, 2 and 4. **This recommendation related to norming activities should be included in the combined recommendation noted above under Recommendation 4.**

The following recommendations are from the [analysis of the assessment strategies related to the 2020-21 assessment of ILO #1 Communication](#):

**Recommendation 3:** *The change from Core Learning Outcomes to Institutional Learning Outcomes reinforces the concept that these outcomes span what all degree-seeking students should attain by the time they graduate. The use of the rubrics to score student work helps lead to consistency. For the student, the rubrics offer an explanation of the standard that CGCC expects students to attain before they leave the college with their 2-year degree. The ILO Assessment Committee, however, expressed concern that students may struggle with understanding the expectations required to meet “Accomplished” or better. The committee recommends that the rubrics be re-worked over the next two years to make them more-student friendly, and that they should be shared more widely with students.*

**Actions:** The committee began to re-work the Critical Thinking, Problem-Solving and Cultural Awareness rubrics during their fall 2022 ILO Committee meeting, however the process proved to be daunting for the time allotted during the annual ILO Committee meeting. The recommendation was tabled until the 2023 meeting, when the committee decided to create 3 sub-committees, one each to work on the writing communication, oral communication and critical thinking rubrics. The sub-committees will recruit other faculty for two 3-hour work sessions. The committee will reconvene via zoom in spring term to present the revised, student-friendly rubrics. The problem-solving, cultural awareness and community and environmental responsibility rubrics will be worked in the same manner in 2024-25, followed by the final revamping of the quantitative literacy rubric in 2025-26. It is recommended that the sub-committee that reworks the rubric for ILO#4 also include the Director of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.

**Results:** According to Recommendation 3 from [the 2021-22 assessment of ILO #2 Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving](#):

**Recommendation 3:** *The committee determined that work on Recommendation 3 from 2020-21, related to re-working the rubrics to make them more student-friendly continue. The committee cautioned, however, that during the second round of ILO assessment, these improvements should not change the criteria for the dimensions, as it is essential that the students are scored on the same dimensions/criteria as were used in the baseline results. Prior to the third round of assessment, the committee may want to review the rubrics to ensure that rubrics address expectations from our own outcomes.*

**This recommendation will be continued through 2025-26 until all rubrics are revised to be more student-friendly.**

**Recommendation 4.** The committee will continue to review and determine at what level CGCC expects student achievement of each Institutional 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 continues to analyze the expected level of student achievement of the ILO assessed each year.

**Results:** As a result of the increase in student achievement of ILO#2 in 2021-22, the committee recommended that CGCC students should be expected to demonstrate achievement of ILO#2 at the

level of accomplished or better. All 5 ILOs now have the same expectation for CGCC students graduating with a degree. **This recommendation is considered met.**

The following recommendation is from the analysis of the assessment strategies related to [the 2021-22 assessment of ILO #2 Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving](#):

**Recommendation 4:** The committee continues the recommendation that the General Education department resolve the issue that students could potentially graduate with a CGCC degree without taking courses that address ILOs #4 (Cultural Awareness) and #5 (Community and Environmental Awareness). While all degrees incorporate courses that address Communication (ILO#1), Critical Thinking/Problem-Solving (ILO#2) and Quantitative Literacy (ILO#3), there is not yet a requirement that students complete classes addressing Cultural Awareness or Community and Environmental Awareness.

**Actions:** No actions were taken on this recommendation.

**Results:** The ILO Committee continues to make this recommendation each year. The 2017-21 General Education Program Review did not address this recommendation and the issue has yet to be resolved. **The recommendation should be continued.**

**B. Were the assessment methods accurate indicators of student achievement of the Institutional learning outcome? Why or why not? Recommendations for changes.**

Given that the assessment methods and LEAP rubrics developed by the AAC&U, 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 committee did discuss some concerns about the limitations of the assessment methods:

- Faculty may be more comfortable with the rubric in the second assessment of ILO#4 which may have contributed to a difference in how they scored student work
- Faculty are most likely not scoring the same students from 2017-18, so the increase in student achievement is seen using two different sampling sets. The committee agreed, however, that the changes and strategies implemented by faculty as the result of the previous assessment in 2017-18 (see Appendix 12) were improvements that supported all subsequent students. Any students taking the courses after the 2017-18 set of students would have benefitted from the new approaches and efforts of faculty interventions.
- Over the last 8 years of ILO assessment, the committee has been aware that faculty scoring of their own student artifacts leads to a certain amount of subjectivity in determining the results. In past meetings, the committee has agreed that CGCC should continue to have faculty score their own student work until either the General Education Program is able to address this issue in their program review, the use of capstone and e-portfolios has been assessed ([Section G, 2019-20 Report of ILO #3 Quantitative Literacy](#)), or there is budget for outside scoring of CGCC student work.



## Section Seven: Appendices

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

1. [Report 2017-18 ILO#4 Cultural Awareness](#)
2. [Ideas & Resources for Teaching to ILO#4: Cultural Awareness](#)
3. [2023-2025 Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement](#)
4. [CGCC Cultural Awareness Scoring Rubric](#)
5. [AAC&U LEAP VALUE Rubrics](#)
6. [AAC&U LEAP VALUE Rubric: Intercultural Knowledge and Competence](#)
7. Instructor Comments/Analysis from the 2022-23 Assessment of ILO#4
8. [ILO Rubrics and Reports](#)
9. [2017-20 General Education Program Review](#)
10. 5 Year Average of Student Achievement of the Cultural Awareness by General Education degree
11. [CGCC's Student Characteristics/Percent of Undergraduates by Race/Ethnicity](#)
12. [Results for Assessment of ILO #4 Cultural Awareness 2017-18](#)
13. 2017-18 Results for the Assessment of ILO#4
14. [Report on Evidence of Focused Instruction to Improve Student Achievement of ILO#4 2018-23](#)
15. [CGCC Course Outcomes Assessment \(COA\)](#)
16. Comparison of Participation between 2017-18 and 2022-23 ILO#4 Assessment
17. [2016 General Education Program Review](#)
18. [Outcome Assessment Schedule](#)

## Appendix 7: Instructor Comments/Analysis from the 2022-23 Assessment of ILO#4

### Dimension: Knowledge: Cultural self-awareness

- PSY 201A (W23) - This is a major focus throughout the course.
- PSY 202A (W23) - Those that demonstrated a broader cultural perspective of both self and others did a better job than previous times - I was delighted to see their growth. I was disappointed in the number who completely missed cultural issues, despite pointedly asking them about what they see in regards to cultural influence and perspectives. For this class at this time it was like a widening difference between those to "get it" and those that don't.
- ED 219 (Sp23) - For this particular assignment students had to articulate three factors that most contributed to their cultural identities. Among the factors were socioeconomic status, race, religion, gender, traditions, etc. Students had to reflect on how these factors have contributed to their life experience, including shaping any biases. For the most part, students provided deep introspective reflection. It should be noted that the six students that scored the highest are all from non-white backgrounds. They or their parents are immigrants so they have first hand knowledge and experience with another culture and are able to compare that with the cultural norms of mainstream, white America.
- HEC 201 (Sp23) - I had a very diverse group of students in this course. Several relocated to the Dalles area from other countries such as Mexico, Kenya (seeking asylum) and the

South Pacific. Several students are bilingual with English as a second language, and I had a wide diversity of age ranges in this particular course, including a few older students returning to college after being out of school for decades. In addition, a couple of my students in this class have diagnosed disabilities and/or mental health conditions that require medical supports and treatment. I think this is important information as their backgrounds serve to influence their world views and can also serve to reinforce or breakdown all types of systemic stereotypes and biases, whether conscious or unconscious. The majority of the 9 participatory students fell into several target categories, as opposed to dominant culture/agent categories. As a collective group, they were very open to leaning into deep discussions in the forums about how society serves to shape our values (both positive and negative) and how our culture is influenced by popular media. An interesting fact about this group (the active 9 students) is that each one of them also participated in my spring ECE 124 Anti-bias Practices and they all felt that the HEC 201 course and the ECE 124 course seemed to be highly correlated regarding the content and almost like an extension of each other. In hindsight, I wish I had completed the rubric scoring on this group early on in the quarter and rated them in these categories within the first few weeks, and then did a re-rating at the end of the quarter to see how much growth had occurred for each student. I also think it would be interesting to see how they each would rate themselves. I know that at the beginning of the quarter, many of them rated themselves as allies or advocates regarding social justice work, and then later in the quarter many of them changed their status to beginner based on their newer understanding of what anti-bias and social justice actually consists of and also based on a greater awareness of their own unconscious biases. It is much deeper than many of them realized at first, so that is an example of becoming more aware of their own perspectives and also becoming more curious regarding how to foster growth and change.

- NRS224 (Sp23) - Weekly reflections, Capstone Article Summary, Capstone Project, and Preceptorship
- WGS 202 - I was blown away by the students' reflections on this assignment. For this assignment, students have to use all of the theoretical perspectives to view their service experience in the community. In doing so, they have to articulate cultural realities, and they must reflect on how their own biases impact the way they see the organization or service experience.

Dimension: Knowledge: Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks

- PSY 201A (W23) - This is a major focus throughout the course.
- PSY 202A (W23) - Similar to above. However, we have quite a large number of students with limited exposure to other (more than 2) cultures, so this is somewhat a subjective scoring.
- NRS224 (Sp23) - Weekly reflections, Capstone Article Summary, Capstone Project, and Preceptorship
- WGS 202 (Sp23) - In this context, we define culture as feminist or queer theoretical perspectives. Students must view their service learning experience, and their reflection on the experience, through these cultural experiences. Although "economy" does not apply, students addressed history, values, and politics through their reflections.

#### Dimension: Skills: Cultural Empathy

- PSY 201A (W23) - This is a major focus throughout the course.
- PSY 202A (W23) - I see this as the strongest point of the rubric to-date. I am pleased by the empathy and desire to understand between students of a different basic culture.
- NRS224 (Sp23) - Weekly reflections, Capstone Article Summary, Capstone Project, and Preceptorship
- WGS 202 (Sp23) - All six responses reflected a sophisticated ability to interpret their experiences within the society (culture) in order to expand their worldview. Although "economy" does not apply, students addressed history, values, and politics through their reflections.

#### Dimension: Skills: Verbal and nonverbal communication

- PSY 201A (W23) - Assessment based on written communication; this is an online class.
- PSY 202A (W23) - I cannot state the depth or breadth of their cultural literacy in communication, but I can state I see this group as an improvement over previous groups. In part, this might be because I had more non-traditional students in this class, many that work in areas of mixed races.
- PSY 215 (W23) - Assessment based on written communication; this is an online class.
- NRS224 (Sp23) - Weekly reflections, Capstone Article Summary, Capstone Project, and Preceptorship
- WGS 202 (Sp23) - Not necessary for this assignment.

#### Dimension: Attitudes: Curiosity

- PSY 202A (W23) - I am disappointed by my one holdout (scored the 1); that person states they don't care about learning anything beyond what is in front of them at that time; no negativity, just very narrowed focus.
- NRS224 (Sp23) - Group A Case Study students had Asian Pregnant Diabetic Capstone Project and didn't address any cultural needs, etc.
- WGS 202 (Sp23) - I would say that all of the assignments reflected this: students' abilities to question societal norms in light of their understanding of theoretical perspectives on contemporary social issues.

#### Dimension: Attitudes: Openness

- PSY 201A (W23) - This is difficult to assess in an online course.
- PSY 202A (W23) - By the third week this class seemed to be very open intaking with each other, and became more open as the term progressed.
- PSY 215 (W23) - Difficult to assess in an online class.
- ED 219 (Sp23) - This assignment didn't offer the chance to directly interact with people from different cultures, but it did provide the opportunity for students to express an interest in doing that. All students expressed a genuine interest in learning about and interacting with people from diverse backgrounds. As future educators, they recognize that this will help them better understand their students and support those students in their educational journeys.
- NRS224 (Sp23) - Weekly reflections, Capstone Article Summary, Capstone Project, and Preceptorship
- WGS 202 (Sp23) - Not applicable to this assignment.

**Appendix 10: 5 Year Average of Student Achievement of the Cultural Awareness Outcomes by General Education degree**

Degree/Certificate/Program	5 Year Average of Students who Achieve Outcomes 2018-2023
<b>Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer</b>	
AAOT Outcome 2A	90%
AAOT Outcome 5B	92%
AAOT Outcome 6B	88%
<b>Associate of Science Oregon Transfer - Business</b>	
ASOT - BUS Outcome 4	90%
<b>Associate of Science</b>	
AS Outcome 4	90%
<b>Associate of General Studies</b>	
AGS Outcome 4	90%

Appendix 13: 2017-18 Results for the Assessment of ILO #4 - Cultural Awareness

<b>Institutional Learning Outcome #4:</b>	<b>Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can: Use an understanding of cultural differences to constructively address issues that arise in the workplace and community. (Cultural Awareness)</b>						
Total Number of students enrolled in assessed courses: 429 Total # of students who completed scored assignment:355	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
<b>Cultural Awareness: Knowledge: Cultural Self-awareness: TOTALS</b>	138	121	53	19	1	23	78.01%
<b>Cultural Awareness: Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks: TOTALS</b>	118	142	58	16	1	20	77.61%
<b>Cultural Awareness: Skills: Cultural Empathy: TOTALS</b>	121	140	62	12	0	20	77.91%
<b>Cultural Awareness: Skills: Verbal and nonverbal communication: TOTALS</b>	106	135	59	7	4	45	77.49%
<b>Cultural Awareness: Attitudes: Curiosity: TOTALS</b>	105	119	89	14	7	20	67.07%
<b>Cultural Awareness: Attitudes: Openness: TOTALS</b>	124	118	54	17	4	38	76.34%
<b>Total Number of Students Scoring with Cultural Awareness Rubric</b>	712	775	375	85	17	166	75.71%
<b>Total Percentage of Students Scoring into level with Cultural Awareness Rubric</b>	36.25%	39.46%	19.09%	4.33%	0.87%	8.45%	
<b>Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better with Cultural Awareness</b>	75.71%						

**Appendix 16: Comparison of Participation between 2017-18 and 2022-23 ILO#4 Assessment**

	2017-18	2022-23
Classes Scheduled for Assessment	34	42
Classes Completing Assessment	23	12
Total Classes Not Completing Assessments	11	30
➤ Classes Cancelled	2	7
➤ Classes Not Completing Assessments (did not have assignment)	3	5
➤ Classes Not Completing Assessment (no response from instructor)	3	6
➤ Classes Not Completing Assessment (did not submit results)	0	3
➤ Classes instructor declined or asked to put it off another term	3	9
Number of Students Enrolled in Classes Scheduled for Assessment	528	433
Number of Students Enrolled in Classes that Completed Assessment	429	236
Number of Students Who Did Not Complete Assignments	74	48
Number of Students Not Assessed in Classes Scheduled for Assessment	99	197

**Analysis completed by:**

The ILO Assessment Committee: Susan Lewis, Zip Krummel, Kristen Kane, Kristen Booth, Kalie Brunton and Diana Bailey. Support provided by Sara Wade.

**Date: 09.14.2023**

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.