

2023-24 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:

2023-24

B. Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) Assessed:

#5 - Recognize the consequences of human activity upon our social and natural world. (*Community and Environmental Responsibility*)

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.

As recommended by the ILO Assessment Committee when this ILO was last assessed in 2018-19, 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 2018-19 ILO#5 Community and Environmental Responsibility](#), Section B, Result of Recommendation 4)

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

A. Previous year ILO was assessed

2018-19

B. List recommendations from previous reviews. Summarize actions taken in response to recommendations:

Recommendation 1. 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 move towards increasing their understanding and achievement of their community and environmental responsibility on a more global level. All faculty are encouraged to participate in this goal, since accountability for student achievement of Institutional Learning Outcomes is the responsibility of the college as a whole. In particular, the AAC was encouraged by the committee to ensure that CTE faculty are engaged in and understand their value to the process. While it's widely understood that the General Education courses can be relied upon to teach to the ILOs, it cannot be ignored that students are often receiving instruction and demonstrating these skills in CTE classes as well.

The AAC will compile a list of these resources to support faculty instruction in this area and post to the Institutional Learning Outcomes website. Faculty will be reminded of their commitment to increase or integrate instruction for improving student understanding of global systems and how to apply knowledge to contemporary global contexts when they complete Part A of course outcomes assessment, and will then describe what they did to support students in achieving this ILO at a higher level when completing Part B. The AAC will track these interventions on a spreadsheet and ILO#5 will be assessed again in 2023-24 to determine the impact of these interventions.

Actions: Results and an overview of the analysis were reported out to faculty during the fall 2018 in-service. Faculty worked together to provide a list of ideas and resources that could support student improvement in the recommended areas of “Understanding Global Systems” and “Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Contexts”. The list of [Ideas & Resources for Teaching to ILO#5: Community and Environmental Responsibility](#) 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 4) 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 42 strategies to support students in the area of “Understanding Global Systems” and “Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Contexts”, implemented over the last 5 years when completing their Part B. The evidence of strategies and support came from a wide range of disciplines including all Gen Ed departments, CTE and ESOL.

Results: Comparison of the results between 2018-19 and 2023-24 show an increase of 20% of students scoring into Accomplished or better in the dimension of “Understanding Global Systems” and an increase of 15% in “Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Contexts. These two dimensions saw the greatest growth of all dimensions (additionally Global Self-Awareness also had a 15% growth), indicating that faculty efforts over the last 5 years have been effective. **This recommendation is considered to be Met**

Recommendation 2. To address the potential deficiency of degree-seeking students receiving instruction of this ILO, as a result of the lack of requirements for students to take courses that address community and environmental responsibility, the committee supports a recommendation that the college continue to move towards some form of Guided Pathways model that is more prescriptive in requiring coursework that ensures that all ILOs are addressed.

Actions: A Title III Academic Assessment Coordinator was hired in 2021 with the primary goal of mapping program courses to program and ILO outcomes. This mapping exercise supports this recommendation and moves programs closer to this goal. CTE programs, in particular, now have more coverage of ILOs, and work continues to identify where coverage can increase through inclusion and/or revision of course outcomes.

Currently, however, students are still lacking sufficient instruction in ILO#4 and ILO#5. While Gen Ed courses that address ILOs have been mapped, students are not required to take these identified courses. As a result, students can still graduate without taking courses related to ILO#4 and ILO#5.

The ILO Assessment Committee discussed that Guided Pathways may not be the means to address this recommendation. This recommendation requires work on the part of the General Education department and Instructional Council to resolve the issue that degree-seeking students can still graduate without taking courses that address ILO#4 and ILO#5.

Results: This recommendation has yet to be resolved and is considered ongoing, with the following amendment: The ILO Assessment Committee recommends that the General Education 2025-26 Program Review address degree-seeking students’ deficiency in ILO instruction. The General Education

department should then provide recommendations to Instructional Council to ensure CGCC degree-seeking students receive sufficient coverage to graduate with a proficiency in all ILOs.

Recommendation 3. The committee recommends that Instructional Council consider adopting a 6th ILO, splitting ILO#5 into two separate Institutional Learning Outcomes: Community Responsibility and Environmental Responsibility. The committee noted that the inclusion of environmental responsibility in the college's Institutional Learning Outcomes represents a value that is somewhat unique among colleges. As such, it would express a strong commitment to this value if it was in a separate Institutional Learning Outcome, better supporting CGCC's identity as a green institution. Focusing on environmental responsibility as a 6th Institutional Learning Outcome will also allow the college to focus more instruction on this ILO, thus having a greater impact on students.

Actions: The Curriculum and Academic Assessment Department and ILO Assessment Committee have discussed this recommendation and determined that social and environmental responsibility are not mutually exclusive concepts and that they may be addressed within the same ILO. It was noted that being environmentally responsible inherently can show social responsibility. In addition, it was recognized that 5 ILOs align better with CGCC's General Education Program Review and assessment schedule/cycle.

Results: This recommendation has been reconsidered and cancelled.

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

1. 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 2023-24 academic year, faculty assessed students in the achievement of ILO#5 "*Recognize the consequences of human activity upon our social and natural world. (Community and Environmental Responsibility)*" for the second time. Faculty initially assessed student achievement of this ILO in 2018-19. Instructors used the [Community and Environmental Responsibility 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 community and environmental responsibility ILO in 2018-19

Course selection guidelines:

- Include courses that students are more likely to be taking closer to graduation ("sophomore" or 200 level courses)
- Include General Education courses that address ILO#5 as a "major" or "minor" component
- Include Career and Technical Education courses that include an outcome that mirrors ILO#5
- Ensure that the selected courses have suitable assignments that can be scored using the modified AAC&U 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 9)

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 global snap-shot of student ability and 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 met the ILO assessment course selection guidelines. A list of suggested courses was sent by the instructional services administrative assistant (ISAA) 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 ISAA informing them that their course had been selected for ILO assessment. Information about the process of assessing ILOs was provided, as were directions and the appropriate rubric.

3) 2nd – 3rd week of term: the AAC contacted the instructors to confirm that they had an appropriate assignment that could be scored with the Community and Environmental Responsibility rubric. If it was determined an instructor did not have an appropriate assignment for this purpose, the AAC worked with the instructor to develop an appropriate assignment.

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) Fall In-service: Results were shared with faculty.

8) Fall term in-service week 2024: The day following faculty in-service, the ILO Assessment Committee met to review and analyze the ILO assessment results. The committee:

- compared current assessment results with 2018-19 results
- analyzed the effectiveness of faculty interventions over the past 5 years
- reviewed previous recommendations and evaluated whether each recommendation had been completed or whether it was continued
- made new recommendations as needed
- reviewed the ILO assessment process and made recommendations for improvement

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:

372 students were enrolled in 26 courses from 15 disciplines. A total of 332 student artifacts were scored using the Community and Environmental Responsibility rubric by the instructors of those courses.

20 faculty from 15 disciplines were involved in the assessment of the ILO:

Summer Term: Tina Martinez (SOC 206)

Fall Term: Elizabeth Anderson (ART 286), Diana Bailey/Lori White (NRS 221), John Copp (HST 201), Courtney Cunningham (ED 216), Chris Dodson (MFG 220), Ray Kempf (PHL 202), Zip Krummel (PSY 215), Emilie Miller (BI 221), Mandy Webster (WGS 101), Susan Witt (ECE 222), Deanne Saldivar-Witter/Terri Tuthill (NRS 110), Glenn Wood (CT 233)

Winter Term: John Copp (HST 202), Kristen Kane (PSY 201A, PSY 215), Zip Krummel (PSY 216), Tina Ontiveros (WR 246), Luke Peterson (ART 211), Diane Uto (COMM 237), Glenn Wood (CT 243)

Spring Term: Chris Dodson (MFG 290), Ray Kempf (PHL 202), Emilie Miller (BI 234), Karen Stafford (ECE 200), Mandy Webster (ED 219)

The sampling size from the first assessment of ILO #5 in 2018-19 was relatively similar, with 365 students enrolled in 22 courses from 12 disciplines with a total of 333 student artifacts scored.

Assessment Instrument(s):

The Community and Environmental Responsibility 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 with numbers, 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.

2. Data Analysis Procedures.

Once instructors scored the student artifacts using the adapted LEAP Value Rubric, results were gathered by the AAC and presented to the ILO Assessment Committee.

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

Section Four: Results and Analysis

A. ILO#5 Assessment Results:

A total of 372 students were enrolled in the courses that participated in the assessment of the ILO of those students, 332 students completed the assignments and were scored using the rubric. A total of 77% of students achieved a score of accomplished or better, with 17% of students scored into developing, 4% scored into beginning and 1% scored into not demonstrated. A total of 6% 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 “Global Self-awareness,” 85% of students scored as accomplished or better. 79% of students scored into accomplished or better in the categories of “Perspective-taking” and “Attitudes: Personal and Social Responsibility”. 74% of students scored into accomplished or better in the category of “Understanding Global Systems” and 68% in the category of “Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Contexts.”

Table 1: Results of 2023-24 Assessment of Student Achievement of ILO#5 (Community and Environmental Responsibility)

Institutional Learning Outcome #5:	Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can: Recognize the consequences of human activity upon our social and natural world. (<i>Community and Environmental Responsibility</i>)						
Total Number of students enrolled in assessed courses: 372 Total # of students who completed scored assignment:332	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
Global Self-Awareness: TOTALS	174	95	37	7	4	15	84.86%
Perspective Taking: TOTALS	173	82	47	17	5	8	78.70%
Understanding Global Systems: TOTALS	129	98	64	10	5	26	74.18%
Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Contexts: TOTALS	126	94	83	17	4	8	67.90%
Attitudes: Personal and Social Responsibility: TOTALS	155	74	44	12	4	43	79.24%
Total Number of Students Scored	757	443	275	63	22	100	72.29%
Total Percentage of Students Scoring into Level	45.60%	26.69%	16.57%	3.80%	1.33%	6.02%	
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better	76.92%						

Section Five: Analysis of Results

A. Analysis, discussion and implications of current year results

The overall score of 77% does not meet the 80% target for the Strategic Priority of Advancing equitable student learning and educational outcomes, requiring that “Students will demonstrate proficiency in institutional learning outcomes”. With the exception of the dimension “Global Self-Awareness:”, the 80% target was not met in any of the dimensions of the rubric. The committee discussed a number of reasons for this ILO to have lower scores when compared to other ILOs. It may be that this ILO is more challenging for both faculty and students. This assumption is supported by the fact that the baseline from the assessment of ILO#5 in 2018-19 was lower than that of ILO #1, #2 and #4, meaning that more work was required to move more students towards accomplished or better in order to meet the 80% target.

Further, the committee questioned whether the college offers fewer classes that address this ILO. While there are a similar number of courses that include related outcomes or reported as addressing the ILO with a “major” or “minor” designation, it was recognized that many of these courses are often cancelled due to low enrollment or not scheduled at all. The AAC also noted that there are fewer strategies reported in Part B of Course Outcomes Assessment that support ILO#5, meaning that students may be receiving less instruction in this ILO. The committee was unable to provide a definitive reason for why fewer strategies were being submitted regarding ILO#5; however, they posited that contributing factors may include: overall difficulty of the ILO, fewer courses being offered that address the ILO, and the possibility that faculty, themselves, may lack a clear understanding of the ILO dimensions. It was evident to the committee upon reviewing the results that more work needs to be done to support students in achieving a higher level of proficiency for this ILO.

Despite not meeting the 80% target, the ILO Assessment Committee noted that 46% of students were scored into the level of “Mastery”, compared to only 27% scored into “Accomplished”, followed by 17% scored into “Developing” and 4% scored into “Beginning”. The committee expressed concern about the inordinate percentage of students who were scored into the level of “Mastery”, which requires “deep knowledge”, “sophisticated...solutions” and a global understanding of community and environmental responsibility. The committee discussed a number of possible explanations for this phenomenon:

- It’s possible that faculty may still struggle to understand the requirements for each level of the dimensions of the rubric.
- Faculty may feel pressure to show student improvement in achievement of this ILO and may be over-scoring students when applying the rubric to student work.
- The committee also noted the high percentage of students scored into “Not Applicable”, suggesting that faculty may be using some assignments that are not effective at assessing the requirements of the rubric.
- The committee deliberated over whether the rubric’s focus on a “global” understanding of community and environmental responsibility is beyond the scope CGCC’s fifth institutional learning outcome “Recognize the consequences of human activity upon our social and natural world.”

B. Comparative analysis of results from multiple years.

All dimensions saw an increase in the percentage of students who were scored into Accomplished or better when compared to the [2018-19 results](#) (also see Appendix 11). Overall, there was an 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 dimensions that faculty have been focusing on for the past 5 years: “Understanding Global Systems” saw an increase of 20% of students scored into Accomplished or better and “Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Contexts” saw an increase of 15% of students scoring into accomplished or better (as did “Global Self-awareness”). These dimensions had the greatest growth of all dimensions.

Table 2: Comparison of 2018-19 and 2023-24 Results from Assessment of Student Achievement of Community and Environmental Responsibility

Institutional Learning Outcome #5: Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can: Recognize the consequences of human activity upon our social and natural world. (<i>Community and Environmental Responsibility</i>)			
Year of Assessment	2018-19	2023-24	Comparative Difference
Total Number of Students who completed scored assignments	333	332	-1
Total Percentage of Students Scored as Accomplished or Better	64%	77%	13%
Community & Environmental Responsibility Rubric Dimensions			
	2018-19 Total Percentage for Accomplished or better	2022-23 Total Percentage for Accomplished or better	Comparative Difference
Global Self-Awareness: TOTALS	70%	85%	15%
Perspective Taking: TOTALS	73%	79%	6%
Understanding Global Systems: TOTALS	54%	74%	20%
Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Contexts: TOTALS	53%	68%	15%
Attitudes: Personal and Social Responsibility: TOTALS	67%	79%	12%

Part B of Course Outcomes Assessment asks faculty to list strategies that they incorporated into their instruction, supporting student achievement of the two highlighted dimensions. While this process does not gather all strategies, due to the limitation of assessing one course per instructor per year, the 42 strategies (see Appendix 4) reported indicate faculty efforts to promote student achievement in the two focus dimensions.

The ILO Assessment Committee noticed that the second dimension, “Perspective Taking” had the lowest gains. The committee wondered if the comparatively low gains in this dimension were a result of faculty not understanding “Perspective Taking”, students not demonstrating “Perspective Taking” at a higher degree or because this dimension started off at the highest baseline level.

The ILO Assessment Committee discussed a number of explanations for the overall improvement as well as the improvement in each dimension:

- An increased familiarity with the rubric (students and faculty)
- More familiarity with ILOs (students and faculty)
- Faculty improvement with assessment which may trickle down to student improvement

As discussed in Section 5A, Analysis of Results, it’s difficult to determine how real or true the numbers are and whether some improvement might be the result of a desire to “look good” and the unintentional, or even intentional, submission of biased scoring. The committee also struggled to determine whether the improvement is the result of improved faculty understanding of the rubric, ILOs and the assessment process, or whether the improvement reflects real enhancement of student achievement. It can be helpful to compare the results of this ILO assessment to the results of the program outcomes assessment of the General Education degrees compiled by the Title III Academic Assessment Coordinator. Three of the degrees (Associate of Science, Associate of Science – Business and Associate of General Studies) all share the same Environmental and Community Responsibility outcome, while the AAOT has a similar outcome (5A): “Apply analytical skills to social phenomena in order to understand human behavior.” Outcomes Assessment for the degrees have a different process, using end of course grades to determine student achievement of the outcomes. The difference in assessment practices may help support the results of student achievement for this ILO. Assessment of student achievement of the Community and Environmental Responsibility outcomes for the Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer, the Associate of Science, the Associate of Science-Business and the Associate of General Studies degrees all indicated that 86% of students achieved this outcome for a difference of 7% from the ILO results. (Appendices 12-15)

C. Recommendations and Action Items

1. What actions are recommended be taken as a result of the assessment?

Recommendation 1: The committee recommends faculty continue to support students towards improved proficiency of ILO#5. Instead of focusing on specific dimensions as identified by the results, the committee recommends supporting students towards CGCC’s ILO#5 in general, promoting a greater understanding of recognizing the consequences of human, including the students’, activity upon the social and natural world on a local, regional, national and potentially global level. The committee determined that focusing on specific dimensions does not make sense at this point due to the need for significant revisions required to the rubric.

Recommendation 2: The committee recommends that the AAC clarify the number of classes offered that address ILO#5, as compared to other ILOs, by tracking classes each year that address all ILOs. Doing so will better support any recommendations related to ensuring students receive sufficient instruction in all ILOs.

Recommendation 3: The committee recommends that faculty receive training in applying the rubrics to assignments and “norming”. This training could be in the form of a short activity completed during department meetings. For example, the departments could apply the rubric to different assignments,

followed by discussions related to the comparison of scores and appropriateness of the different assignments.

Recommendation 4: The committee recommends that the rubric web-form require a brief description of the assignments used for assessing the ILO, as well as a box for instructors to explain whether their assignments worked to assess the ILO and whether they feel the need for a revision to the assignments. The web form could also include an option for faculty to check if they would like some follow-up or support related to revising assignments. These changes will aid the committee in determining whether assignments are appropriate to address the scope of the rubric and whether more support/trainings/workshops are needed to create assignment that are better suited for assessment of the ILOs. Additionally, directions sent to faculty for ILO assessment should include a direct link to the webpage that lists teaching strategies for the specific 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 community and environmental responsibility 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.

See Recommendation 2 in Section 2.C, pg. 2.

Section Six: Evaluate the Assessment Strategy

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

The following recommendation is a combination of Recommendations 3, 4 and 5 from [the analysis of the assessment strategies related to the 2019-20 assessment of ILO #3 Quantitative Literacy](#), per recommendations from the analysis of assessment strategies related to the [2022-23 assessment of ILO#4 Cultural Awareness](#):

Recommendation 3-5. *The committee recommends that faculty continue to have opportunities for workshops that address ILOs. Workshops designed around the ILOs would support faculty in teaching to the ILOs with intentionality. Suggestions for workshops include norming activities that would increase the familiarity with the rubrics, as well as workshops that would support faculty in designing assignments that support teaching to and assessing the ILOs.*

Actions: Previous ILO analysis reports have listed workshops that focused on developing assignments that could be assessed using the rubrics for [ILO #1](#), [ILO#2](#) and [ILO#4](#). As described in section One/D of the [ILO#4 analysis report](#), a faculty professional development coordinator position was created in 2021, and faculty began to take greater responsibility and leadership in faculty professional development opportunities. As a result, combined with time constraints of in-services, the Curriculum and Academic Assessment Department (CAAD) has stepped back from offering these workshops.

Many of the workshops and trainings have related to ILO#1, #2 and #4. The focus of workshops for 2023-24 were related to accessibility and while accessibility can be considered part of the larger community system referenced in the rubric for ILO#5, the workshops did not address teaching to this ILO as it pertains to students.

Results: The academic assessment coordinator should continue to meet with the professional development coordinator to discuss workshops related to the ILOs. It should be recognized however, that faculty have other agendas for workshops and it may not always be possible to ask or require the professional development coordinator to provide workshops focused on addressing ILOs. The AAC will continue to update the Ideas and Resources documents related to teaching to each ILO so that faculty continue to have up-to-date resources to aid them in supporting student ILO achievement. CAAD will research other methods to send out assessment information or practice training opportunities, including:

- Hands-on activities for department meetings
- Video directions
- Exit surveys for graduating students that ask them to report on how they feel their college experience helped them attain each ILO
- Training videos

This recommendation should be continued.

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 created 3 sub-committees to work on the written communication (Kristen Booth, Kalie Brunton and Andrea LoMonaco), oral communication (Susan Lewis, Zip Krummel, Annette Byers and Courtney Cunningham) and critical thinking rubrics (Kristen Kane, Diana Bailey, Ed Andree and Leslie Berry) during the 2023-24 year. The sub-committees completed the work over two – 3 hour meetings and the DAAC and AAC presented the three re-worked rubrics to the Instructional Council in spring term.

Results: The re-worked [written communication](#), [oral communication](#) and [critical thinking](#) rubrics have been posted to the ILO website. The AAC sent an email to inform faculty of the updated 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.

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

Addendum to Recommendation 3: The ILO #5 Community and Environmental Responsibility Rubric requires significant change. The ILO Assessment Committee recommends that the ILO#5 Rubric Sub-committee address the following during the revision process:

- Alignment between the requirements/dimensions of the rubric and the requirements of CGCC's Community and Environmental Responsibility ILO
- Clarify the definition of "global."
- Determine whether the concept of "global" is necessary to the level of "Accomplished" considering that the majority of CGCC 100 and 200 level courses that address ILO#5 may not address the effects of human social and environmental activity on a global level.
- Consider that the "global" scale be left as a requirement for "Mastery" and that the level of "Accomplished" is revised to be local, regional and/or national. The revisions to the rubric should ensure that "Accomplished" does not project beyond the intention of the college's ILO.

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: See actions for Recommendation 2 in Section 2.C, pg.2

Results: See Recommendation 2 in Section 2.C, pg. 2.

Addendum to Recommendation 4: This recommendation does not belong under assessment recommendations, and more appropriately fits under recommendations related to student achievement of the ILO. For future reference this recommendation will be combined with recommendation #2 in Section 2C, page 2.

The following recommendation is from the analysis of the assessment strategies related to [the 2018-19 assessment of ILO #5 Community and Environmental Responsibility](#):

Recommendation 4: To address the concerns of the lack of familiarity that faculty may have with the criteria of the rubric and a lack of norming, it is recommended that in the following cycle of ILO assessment, faculty focus on working together in their departments to create assignments that are more specific to the criteria of the rubric. These assignments could be adopted by department faculty to

assess student learning of the ILO in their classes, adapted to specific course content or used as examples for faculty to develop their own assignments.

Actions: CAAD and faculty have been working to create assignments that align with each ILO. These assignments, as well as ideas, teaching strategies and other assignments reported out by faculty in their Part Bs have been added to the [Ideas & Resources for Teaching for each ILO](#) . These updated documents have been posted and faculty have been notified of their locations.

Results: Faculty now have access to a multitude of ideas, resources and assignments specific to their discipline that can be used for supporting and assessing students for each ILO. If faculty do not have an assignment when asked to assess ILOs, the AAC continues to work with faculty to identify or create one.

This recommendation is considered mostly met. “Norming” will be addressed by Recommendation 3 from the 2023-24 assessment of ILO#5.

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#5 which may have contributed to a difference in how they scored student work

Section Seven: Appendices

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

1. [Report 2018-19 ILO#5 Community and Environmental Responsibility](#)
2. [Ideas & Resources for Teaching to ILO#5 Community and Environmental Responsibility](#)
3. [CGCC Course Outcomes Assessment \(COA\)](#)
4. [Report on Evidence of Focused Instruction to Improve Student Achievement of ILO#5 2018-24](#)
5. [2023-2025 Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement](#)
6. [CGCC Community and Environmental Responsibility Scoring Rubric](#)
7. [AAC&U LEAP VALUE Rubrics](#)
8. [AAC&U LEAP VALUE Rubric: Global Learning](#)
9. Instructor Comments/Analysis from the 2023-24 Assessment of ILO#5
10. [Results for Assessment of ILO#5 Community and Environmental Responsibility 2018-19](#)
11. 2018-19 Results for the Assessment of ILO#5
12. [Results of AAOT Outcomes Assessment](#)
13. [Results of AS Outcomes Assessment](#)
14. [Results of AGS Outcomes Assessment](#)
15. [Results of ASOT-BUS Outcomes Assessment](#)
16. 5 Year Average of Student Achievement of the Community and Environmental Responsibility by General Education degree
17. [2017-20 General Education Program Review](#)
18. [2016 General Education Program Review](#)
19. [ILO Rubrics and Reports](#)

20. [Outcome Assessment Schedule](#)
21. [Written Communication Re-designed Rubric](#)
22. [Oral Communication Re-designed Rubric](#)
23. [Critical Thinking Re-designed Rubric](#)

Appendix 9: Instructor Comments/Analysis from the 2023-24 Assessment of ILO#5

Dimension: Global Self-Awareness

- ART 286 (F23) - All 13 students were able to make their own natural organic paints and present the process to the class and discuss in groups how paints organically made compared and contrasted to chemically, industrial made paints can affect the community as well as the environment globally. Students used cave paintings as examples of pigments made with natural sources as well and compared and contrasted those pigments with what we are using in tubes in class manufactured by M.Graham Company in West Linn Oregon.
- CT 233 (F23) - Students were learning the implications of waste in the building trades, and how to implement green building practices (and why).
- ECE 222 (F23) - Students were asked to complete an action plan in which they consolidated and operationalized information learned in class for a struggling student and implement it.
- ED 216 (F23) - All three of the students evaluated our education system in comparison with another culture's. While two students demonstrated a solid understanding of their place within these structures, one's understanding was more surface. Community and environmental responsible on a local, much less a global scale, is quite complex. I would have been surprised if any student met this criteria with a 4.
- NRS 221 (F23) - Most students address the mental health disease related to the United States but doesn't look at the bigger picture in how it affects the world globally.
- PHL 202 (F23) - Students seemed to generally have a significant grasp of the interactivity in human ethical and social systems as evidenced through the core the ideas of Social Contract
- PSY 215 (F23) - Global self-awareness is new and untested for younger students. Lack of experience on a more global scale limits this awareness.
- WGS 101 (F23) - Students were required to complete a final research essay that summarizes and analyzes an issue of their choice related to the content/topics addressed in class. Then, students were required to evaluate solutions, including the impact on different people and institutions globally as well as locally. We study "socially-lived theorizing" so they must articulate their place (and responsibility) within the context of these issues.
- ART 211 (W24) - Students reported stronger marks in this section. More course assignments also aligned with this one
- PSY 201A (W24) - 8 students completed the assignment but did not follow the directions. The topic they wrote their reflection paper on was not applicable to the rubric requirements.
- PSY 216 (W24) - Actually, I was pleased with the more global perspective many students took in their observations
- PSY 215 (W24) - This was a main theme throughout the course.
- WR 246 (W24) - Each student contributed to the development of the journal mission statement and ethical framework for publication decisions. In addition to mission

statement drafting assignment, each student submitted reflective writing on this process, including personal values and how those values impacted their contributions to the mission statement and their individual approach to editing and publication decisions, and analysis of the power of local publications to connect with broader world movements.

- ECE 200 (SP24) - Course activities promoted self-reflection and awareness of the impact of individual and group actions.
- ED 219 (SP24) - Many of the readings focused on inclusion in educational settings and, specifically, in discovering and analyzing their own, and their students', identities. Of the students who completed the final assignment, there was a high level of proficiency in their ability to understand and evaluate the impact of identity within understanding experiences within the educational system.
- MFG 290 (SP24) - Through the related assignment, students were asked to identify and explain aspects specifically related to the manufacturing process that influence the world we live in today. From the materials sourced, to manufacturing scale, students provided their perspectives of the interconnections between these aspects of their project. Greater than 50% of the students who completed the assignment were able to identify both direct and indirect interconnections of their position in the global system. Remaining student submissions were more based on direct path concepts with a singular scope.
- PHL 202 (SP24) - Based on forum responses regarding Cultural Relativism.

Dimension: Perspective Taking

- CT 233 (F23) - Students were able to evaluate various solutions, compare factors in choices of materials and weigh which ones to choose for the greater good.
- ECE 222 (F23) - "It is imperative that we provide opportunities for students and families we work with to self-acknowledge. Because trauma exposure interrupts young people's ability to define their self-worth, develop healthy self-esteem, and identify their own needs, their ability to self-acknowledge is likewise compromised...We can teach our youngsters this skill by identifying their strengths, their goals, and the work they need to do to meet those goals." What activities or strategies can you incorporate into your classroom that provides opportunities for the children in your care to celebrate and acknowledge themselves and others? Students were asked to consider the above quote and create classroom activities to address a diverse classroom.
- ED 216 (F23) - All three students were able to synthesize other perspectives, in this case within education systems, especially within human systems.
- NRS 221 (F23) - 24% of the students are able to evaluate and apply diverse perspectives to the mental health disease while 24% of the students synthesized other perspectives needing more depth/research. 2% identifies and explains multiple perspectives of the mental health disease.
- PHL 202 (F23) - 2 students did not complete the last test (having dropped out at the end.) Generally - the students who completed the last test showed a significant awareness of diverse and conflicting positions on issues and the relative characteristics of each..
- PSY 215 (F23) - I found most of the student perspectives were better when assessed at the end of the term compared to the first two weeks of the term.

- WGS 101 (F23) - This class is ALL about applying a variety of perspectives as we examine problems in society through a gender lens, but specifically an intersectional lens.
- ART 211 (W24) - Also a section where students reported strongly. Several significant course assignments aligned here
- COMM 237 (W24) - Demonstration of global self-awareness not required for assignment.
- PSY 201A (W24) - 8 students completed the assignment but did not follow the directions. The topic they wrote their reflection paper on was not applicable to the rubric requirements.
- PSY 216 (W24) - I was disappointed how many paid little attention to the synthesis of cultural perspectives despite the leading questions provided
- PSY 215 (W24) - This was a main theme throughout the course.
- WR 246 (W24) - Curated art, prose, and poetry in order to diversify perspectives platformed by journal as much as possible. Once submissions were received, voted on, and evaluated, the team made the decision to solicit additional works to broaden the diversity of voices represented in the journal. This resulted in at least two more prose pieces, one more poem, and six more art works.
- ECE 200 (SP24) - Advocacy in Action project required consideration of the knowledge and perspectives of others to create an informative and persuasive article, letter, handout, or slide presentation.
- ED 219 (SP24) - Many dove into the ethical implications of civil rights in education. Some focused on cultural differences of students and how this impacts education.
- MFG 290 (SP24) - Through peer review and concept analysis. Students engaged in multi layered discussions of the related assignment. From which they provided informed recommendations as to alternative methods as well as cause and effect analysis to further explain their position. Many students went one step further to trial multiple methods to display their findings with data gathered during labs.
- PHL 202 (SP24) - Based on Forum responses about Natural Law Theory - results were disappointingly low and I have a clear suspicion that a significant number of students did not do the required ancillary reading. Since the advent of AI increasingly many students seem to be trying to skirt (or skim) the reading in favor of online help - In the case of this chapter where I was asking specifically about the content of the reading this was not a helpful approach :(

Dimension: Understanding Global Systems

- CT 233 (F23) - Construction world & fabricating world as the organization and how to get more yield from the materials to clean up our carbon footprint.
- ECE 222 (F23) - Students were asked to evaluate how institutions can minimize vicarious trauma and put systems in place to support the well being of the staff and students.
- ED 216 (F23) - Again, two students went above examining and were able to analyze and present solutions to common and complex systems within educational systems both locally and globally.
- NRS 221 (F23) - 24% of the students are able to utilize deep knowledge related to the mental health disease while 24% of the students analyze major elements needing some more depth/research. 2% examines the mental health disease also needing more depth/research.

- PHL 202 (F23) - Knowledge of the historic role of social structures, historic inequities and appropriate responses (as related to Feminist Ethics of Care position) were generally pretty solid.
- PSY 215 (F23) - Difficult to measure especially in such a personal-oriented course.
- WGS 101 (F23) - We do a lot of problem solving in the class through a root cause analysis model. First, identify the problem, analyze its roots, and examine solutions already used AND come up with their own solutions. They did this in their final research essay.
- ART 211 (W24) - This section was not assessed to the extent outlined in this rubric. Still most students performed reasonably well in this regard
- COMM 237 (W24) - Demonstration of understanding global systems not required for this assignment.
- PSY 201A (W24) - 8 students completed the assignment but did not follow the directions. The topic they wrote their reflection paper on was not applicable to the rubric requirements.
- PSY 216 (W24) - A very real weak point in this Social Psych course, would need a longer term to cover it
- WR 246 (W24) - The team had the opportunity to solve a complex problem related to free speech and self expression when a poem confronting the situation in Palestine received enough points in blind judging to be published. Each student researched and read before deciding how to move forward with publication. We invited a guest speaker, Lisa AbuAssaly George, to class to help students better understand the current situation in Palestine. After research and consideration, each student voted on publication.
- ECE 200 (SP24) - Students are service oriented and inclined to advocate for equitable opportunities and supports. Ratings indicate these skills at the individual and local level- advocating for children, families and ECE staff members.
- ED 219 (SP24) - Although many evaluated systems in this final research paper, I would not say they were global systems necessarily since they were focusing on education in the U.S.
- MFG 290 (SP24) - From this assignment, students identified, in practical contexts, the interconnection of manufacturing technologies and practices upon natural and human systems. Taking a holistic approach to their manufactured product and identifying specific natural environmental impacts, as well as metallurgical changes to the design process that change the impacts. They were also able to express the effects of changing practices on economic and political environments.
- PHL 202 (SP24) - Form a forum post about Feminist Ethics of care - which is particularly interesting because it revolves around a strong feminist critique of contemporary Ethics that in many ways runs counter to contemporary popular feminism.

Dimension: Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Contexts

- ART 286 (F23) - Students researched chemical compositions of paint as well as manufacturing to identify negative impacts and compared and contrasted them to the natural organic small batch paints they made. We had group and class discussions based upon their findings to identify harmful applications as well as manufacturing and disposal.

- CT 233 (F23) - Students are demonstrating forethought about making decisions in building that will impact the other industry partners
- ECE 222 (F23) - Students were asked to Complete their final assignments incorporating what they learned to evaluate ways to help students and themselves before, during and after action. They could chose a variety of ways to show their learning.
- ED 216 (F23) - While one students was able to plan and evaluate more complex solutions to challenges within the educational realm, the other two had more elementary solutions. Again, it is quite difficult to craft sophisticated solutions to global issues, but all students were able to tackle it to some degree with one doing quite an astute job.
- NRS 221 (F23) - 24% of the students are able to apply knowledge and skills related to the mental health disease while 24% of the students are able to plan and evaluate more complex solutions. 2% are able to formulate practical elementary solutions related to the mental health disease.
- PHL 202 (F23) - Generally students independently developed clear and practical solutions to broad and complex problems.
- PSY 215 (F23) - I see growth in this area just starting; need these students for a couple more terms to register higher.
- WGS 101 (F23) - This is a hard one! The nature of this discipline IS interdisciplinary, and the way we approach each topic is through a variety of perspectives, but it is also challenging to do. With the final essay, all 8 students who submitted (there is one incomplete at this time), demonstrated their ability to evaluate challenging problems and their solutions but not at the highest level as described by the rubric.
- ART 211 (W24) - Perhaps this section was the least (directly) assessed according to rubric. Still most students performed demonstrated a moderate proficiency.
- PSY 201A (W24) - 8 students completed the assignment but did not follow the directions. The topic they wrote their reflection paper on was not applicable to the rubric requirements.
- PSY 216 (W24) - The lower scores in this category can be attributed, in part, to the nature of the assignment used.
- WR 246 (W24) - Team was faced with a difficult editorial decision regarding a potential triggering fiction story. Team worked with the author to evaluate and analyze options for moving forward with publication. The team took care to approach editorial in a way that honors the author's voice and intention, while also taking into consideration the possible impacts of the finished work.
- ECE 200 (SP24) - Systems work and problem solving in the course are focused on the field of ECE. Consideration of interrelatedness with other disciplines is limited.
- ED 219 (SP24) - I am not sure the assignment totally moved them towards demonstrating this outcome, but I do think many of them identified solutions, even if they were sharing solutions that came from the readings to solve some of the issues of equity within educational systems.
- MFG 290 (SP24) - From our work in labs with multiple mediums. Students were able to recognize, and develop processes that directly correlated in reductions of environmental waste, energy consumption, and increased economic growth and provide data from labs that expressed these correlations.
- PHL 202 (SP24) - Personal Ethical Theory Paper - which synthesized course content and personal application.

Dimension: Personal and Social Responsibility

- ART 286 (F23) - All Students wrote a compare and contrast essay to demonstrate personal and social responsibilities of using the pigments that they made as compared to the M. Graham manufactured paints.
- ECE 222 (F23) - Students were asked to evaluate their own strengths and weaknesses and put a plan in place to support their own resiliency.
- ED 216 (F23) - All three students demonstrated informed and responsible action in their ideas to address ethical, social, and/or environmental challenges on a global scale. I think that comparing our education system other cultures broadens their perspectives and allows them to see that there isn't only one way. They are better able to identify ways in which our systems could change and also what we are doing that's working. Their ability to self reflect about their role in all of it was quite impressive.
- NRS 221 (F23) - 24% of the students are able to take informed and responsible action related to the mental health disease while 24% of the students are able to analyze the ethical, social, and/or environmental consequences. 2% are able to explain the ethical, social, and/or environmental consequences related to the mental health disease.
- PHL 202 (F23) - This criteria was not directly assessed - in general, yes but in specific directed towards global systems/structures, no.
- PSY 215 (F23) - Probably the strongest area in this rubric for this course as taught by me.
- WGS 101 (F23) - They can all EXPLAIN the consequences, as shown through our practice of the roots cause analysis, and they were getting to the analysis part. Honestly, I believe they ALL have a solid sense of their personal and civic responsibility, but I am not sure the assignment showed that specifically.
- ART 211 (W24) - Students reported strongest in this section. Most course assignments aligned with this rubric
- PSY 201A (W24) - 8 students completed the assignment but did not follow the directions. The topic they wrote their reflection paper on was not applicable to the rubric requirements.
- PSY 216 (W24) - Again, this course didn't really look at a global perspective this ILO asked for.
- PSY 215 (W24) - Demonstration of personal and social responsibility not required for this assignment.
- WR 246 (W24) - In drafting the mission statement and approaching editorial, students interrogated the power inherent in the publication decisions they made. Each student contributed reflective writing on the ethical and social impacts of their publishing and editorial choices.
- ECE 200 (SP24) - Seven students in this course have worked in the field of early childhood education for a number of years. They recognize their responsibilities to children, families, colleagues, community and society. Values and ethics were discussed and applied in course activities.
- ED 219 (SP24) - This outcome was met by all students! They all demonstrated that they were INFORMED and could APPLY and take action as pre-service teachers to have an impact when attempting to solve some of the issues when it comes to equity in education (whether it is funding, teacher quality and preparation, bias, etc.)
- MFG 290 (SP24) - All students who participated in the assignment provided unique perspectives that express high levels of competence, ethical and moral reasoning as well

as action. From perspectives of employee vs employer and small craft manufacturing to global corporate manufacturing contexts. Students were able to provide perspectives and through peer review, accept criticisms to their project planning and manufacturing outlines.

- PHL 202 (SP24) - Combined consideration of forum posts about respect for persons (dealing with the death penalty) and Social Contract theory (dealing with the role of law in society)

Appendix 11: 2018-19 Results for the Assessment of ILO#5 – Community and Environmental Responsibility

Institutional Learning Outcome #5:	Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can: Recognize the consequences of human activity upon our social and natural world. (Community and Environmental Responsibility)						
Total Number of students enrolled 365 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 333	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
Global Self-Awareness: TOTALS	109	96	67	25	4	11	70.19%
Perspective Taking: TOTALS	96	129	63	14	7	24	72.82%
Understanding Global Systems: TOTALS	85	87	98	43	8	17	54.43%
Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Contexts: TOTALS	89	66	68	20	48	42	53.26%
Attitudes: Personal and Social Responsibility: TOTALS	105	119	89	14	7	20	67.07%
Total Number of Students Scored	484	518	380	116	74	114	63.74%
Total Percentage of Students Scored into level	30.79%	32.95%	24.17%	7.38%	4.71%	7.25%	
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better* <small>* Students who were scored into "Not/Applicable" are not included in total</small>	63.74%						

Appendix 16: 5 Year Average of Student Achievement of the Community & Environmental Responsibility Outcomes by General Education degree

Degree/Certificate/Program	5 Year Average of Students who Achieve Outcomes 2019-2024
Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer	
AAOT Outcome 5A	90%
Associate of Science Oregon Transfer - Business	
ASOT - BUS Outcome 5	89%
Associate of Science	
AS Outcome 5	89%
Associate of General Studies	
AGS Outcome 5	89%

Analysis completed by:

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

Date: 10.9.24

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