Executive Summary
2025-26 Results and Analysis of Institutional Learning Outcome – Communication

ILO #1 – Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. (*Communication*)

Results of 2025-26 Assessment of Student Achievement of ILO#1 (Communication)

Institutional Learning Outcome #1: Communication	**Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. *(Communication)***						
Total Number of students enrolled in assessed courses: 432 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 396	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
Total Percentage of Students Scoring into Level	**54%**	**30%**	**12%**	**3%**	**1%**	**15%**	**84%**
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better	84%						

Comparison of 2015-16, 2020-21 and 2024-25 Results from Assessment of Student Achievement of Communication

Institutional Learning Outcome #1: Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. *(Communication)*						
Year of Assessment	**2015-16**	**2020-21**	**2015-16 to 2020-21 Comparative Difference**	**2025-26**	**2020-21 to 2025-26 Comparative Difference**	**2015-16 to 2025-26 Comparative Difference**
Total Number of Students who completed scored assignments for Written & Oral Communication	**269**	**601**	**332**	**396**	**-205**	**127**
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better	**71%**	**81%**	**10%**	**84%**	**3%**	**13%**

Student achievement in ILO #1 (Communication) has grown by 13% since the initial 2015–16 assessment cycle. The most notable gains across the three cycles align directly with specific five-year target areas, demonstrating the impact of coordinated faculty focus and instruction. Specifically, "Sources and Evidence" and "Organization" improved significantly between 2015–16 and 2020–21, while "Content Development" and "Control of Syntax and Mechanics" saw the largest increases from 2020–21 to 2025–26 (see page 11 for complete details).

Areas of Faculty Focus for ILOs as of Fall 2026

ILO	**Area of Focus**
1 – Communication	**“Sources and Evidence” and “Graphics”**
2 – Critical Thinking & Problem-Solving	**"Evidence" (Critical Thinking) and "Identify Strategies" (Problem Solving)**
3 – Quantitative Literacy	**“Assumptions”**
4 – Intercultural Knowledge & Competence	**"Openness" (Encouraging our students to "Initiate and develop interactions with culturally different others")**
5 – Community & Environmental Responsibility	**All dimensions**

ILO Assessment Scheduled For 2026-27

ILO #2 – Creatively solve problems by using relevant methods of research, personal reflection, reasoning, and evaluation of information. *(Critical thinking and Problem-Solving)*

2025-26 ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOMES

Analysis completed by:
The ILO Assessment Committee: Susan Lewis, Zip Krummel, Kristen Kane, John Evans, Kalie Brunton and Kristen Booth. Support provided by Sara Wade.

Date:
September 24, 2026

Section One: Academic Year:

2025-26

A. Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) Assessed:
#1 - Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. (*Communication*)

B. Competency level target (circled):
Beginning (1) Developing (2) (Accomplished (3)) Mastery (4)

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

A. Previous year(s) ILO was assessed:
2020-21

B. List recommendations from previous reviews.
Recommendation 1: This recommendation is from 2024-25 and pertains to ILO#3: The area of focus should continue on "Assumptions". Despite the committee's reservations about the contributing factors to the results, it's clear that this dimension continues to be an area that students struggle in.

Actions: Although faculty received reminders in the Part As and Part Bs of Course Outcomes Assessment (COA), only one instructor listed an activity to support students in achieving a higher level for "Assumptions". (Appendix 1).

While the Part Bs do not capture all of the ways that instructors support student achievement towards the ILOs during the 2025-26 academic year, it's concerning that there was so little engagement from faculty in answering the Part B question "Please describe any changes/additions to instruction, curriculum or assessment that you made to support students in better achieving the CGCC Institutional Learning Outcomes: ILO#3 - Quantitative Literacy - "Assumptions""

Results: To be determined during by the ILO Assessment Committee in fall of 2028, when the analysis of the 2027-28 assessment of ILO#3 is completed. **Faculty will continue to support students in the following areas:**

Table 1: Areas of Faculty Focus for ILOs as of Fall 2026

ILO	Area of Focus
1 – Communication	**“Sources and Evidence” and “Graphics”**
2 – Critical Thinking & Problem-Solving	**"Evidence" (Critical Thinking) and "Identify Strategies" (Problem Solving)**
3 – Quantitative Literacy	**“Assumptions”**
4 – Intercultural Knowledge & Competence	**"Openness" (Encouraging our students to "Initiate and develop interactions with culturally different others")**
5 – Community & Environmental Responsibility	**All dimensions**

Recommendation 2: This recommendation is continued from 2024-25: 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.

Actions: The AAC created a spreadsheet listing all credit courses from the 2024-25 catalog, including both general education and career and technical courses. This spreadsheet was updated to reflect changes to course offerings in the 2025-26 catalog. Using the Course Content Outcome Guides, each course was mapped to the appropriate ILOs. In total, courses that teach to each ILO are as follows:

ILO#1 “Communication” = 298

ILO#2 “Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving” = 404

ILO #3 “Quantitative Literacy” = 153

ILO #4 “Intercultural Knowledge & Competence” = 174

ILO #5 “Community and Environmental Responsibility” = 189

Beginning the summer of 2025, the AAC also updated the spreadsheet tracking those courses offered and canceled each term. Courses selected to assess for an ILO were also tracked, as well as which courses completed the ILO assessment.

Completing this project over the next few years will provide a better “big picture” of whether students have opportunities to receive sufficient instruction in all ILOs.

Results: The above list provides a total number of credit courses from the 2025-26 catalog that address each ILO: 70% of credit courses offered by CGCC address ILO #1 (Communication); 95% of credit courses address ILO #2 (Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving); 36% of courses address ILO #3 (Quantitative Literacy); 41% of courses address ILO #4 (Intercultural Knowledge & Competency); and 44% of courses address ILO#5 (Community and Environmental Responsibility). The table below shows how many courses were actually offered in 2025-26 that supported each ILO, and provides a more realistic picture of the opportunities that students have to engage with these essential skills, and to be assessed in their

achievement of each ILO. **This recommendation should be continued**. Providing accurate data will allow the ILO Assessment Committee to make more informed recommendations.

Table 2: 2025-26 Courses Supporting ILOs

ILO	Number of Courses Offered 2025-26	Courses Canceled 2025-26	Assessment Requested	Assessment Completed
ILO#1 "Communication"	327	38	54	30*
ILO#2 "Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving"	390	46	N/A **	N/A **
ILO #3 "Quantitative Literacy"	165	17	N/A **	N/A **
ILO #4 "Intercultural Knowledge & Competence"	137	17	N/A **	N/A **
ILO #5 "Community and Environmental Responsibility"	149	19	N/A **	N/A **

*Some instructors were offered 2 courses to choose from in the request, and chose one of two.
** Results will come available as each ILO is assessed in Cycle 3 (2025/26 – 2029/30).

2025-26 was a General Education program review year and the committee recommends that the General Education department begin to use this data to address this issue in their updates and next review.

This recommendation should continue for the cycle.

Recommendation 3: This is an ongoing recommendation and encompasses the combined faculty workshop recommendations 3, 4 and 5 from the analysis of the assessment strategies related to the 2019-20 assessment of ILO #3 Quantitative Literacy: 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.
Actions: The ILO Assessment Committee formed a subcommittee to develop a norming activity to be offered during the fall 2026 in-service. The hands-on norming activity was comprised of faculty scoring two "student" artifacts (created/revised by faculty) for critical thinking and two for problem-solving, followed by a table discussion of how scores were determined. Tables were then to report out scoring and discussion points to the larger group.

The subcommittee requested an hour during fall in-service, however due to a full schedule and time restraints, the request for this activity has been moved to spring in-service. As a result of this move, the committee determined that the norming activity should address the quantitative literacy and written communication, as those two ILOs will be assessed the following academic year of 2027-28. Kalie Brunton will provide 2 "student artifacts" demonstrating varying levels for quantitative literacy and John Evans will provide 2 "student artifacts" demonstrating varying levels for written communication.

Results: Results are to be determined in the 2027-28 Analysis. The hands-on norming activity has been developed and can be used during spring in-service.

The ILO Assessment Committee determined **that this recommendation should be continued.**

Recommendation 4: The rubric sub-committee should focus on the glossary when re-working the Quantitative Literacy rubric as part of the Rubric Redesign project. It's important that the criteria and descriptors accurately guide faculty in applying the rubric. The sub-committee should also consider re-ordering the dimensions to better align with the process of using data to make informed decision.

Actions: The rubric sub-committee completed the revision of the rubric used to score ILO#3. All aspects of this recommendations were addressed by the committee.

Results: All rubrics have been revised and approved by the Instructional Council. The revised rubrics have been posted to the web and faculty have been informed of the revised rubrics. **This project and recommendation are considered complete.**

Recommendation 5: Clarification of certain areas of the ILO assessment process is required**.** The AAC should ensure that all directions and emails clearly communicate that the goal is for all criteria to be covered, whether this objective requires one assignment or more than one assignment. Additionally, it should be stressed to faculty that the level of "Accomplished" meets the college's expectation, and that "Mastery" is not expected.

Actions: The AAC added to the email: "In order to meet the criteria for all dimensions in the rubric, some instructors may need to use more than one assignment." A link to Ideas & Resources for Teaching ILO #1 Communication was also included, as well as an offer to help create an appropriate assignment should the instructor need it.

Results: The Not Applicable (N/A) percentages continue to be high at 15% overall for Communication (up from 12.93% for ILO#3 2024-25). Looking at the areas where N/A was highest (222/320 N/A for the Graphics dimension in the Written Communication rubric), 70% of students were not required to provide graphics for the assignments used to assess this ILO.

The ILO Assessment Committee recognizes that a direct conversation with faculty would be more effective in meeting this recommendation. Given the time constraints of in-services, however, access to faculty during the only times that they gather together is limited.

This recommendation should be continued.

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

No other actions were taken.

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

A. Overview of methodology used for assessment:

During the 2025-26 academic year, faculty assessed students in the achievement of ILO#1 "*Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. (Communication)"* for the third time. Faculty initially assessed student achievement of this ILO in 2015-

16, then again in 2020-21. Instructors used the Written Communication Rubric and the Oral Communication Rubric to score student work. These rubrics were 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/). It should be noted that the rubrics used to score student work in 2025-26 had been revised from the previously used rubrics per recommendations by the ILO Assessment Committee. Changes were made to clarify definitions in the glossary, the criteria and descriptors, and an additional dimension of "Listening" was added to the Oral Communication rubric.

Course selection guidelines:

- Include courses that students are more likely to be taking closer to graduation ("sophomore" or 200 level courses). WR 121 and 122 courses were also selected based upon a recommendation of appropriateness for this purpose from the Writing faculty.
- Include General Education courses that address ILO#1 as a "major" or "minor" component
- Include Career and Technical Education courses that include an outcome that aligns with ILO#1
- Ensure that the selected courses have suitable assignments that can be scored using the modified and revised AAC&U rubric

Instructors were then responsible for scoring the student artifacts using the rubrics, and submitting the results to a web form. Instructors also had the option to include a rationale or analysis to help explain student scores. (Appendix 2)

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 proficiency 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 rubrics.

3) 2nd – 3rd week of term: the AAC contacted the instructors to confirm that they had an appropriate assignment that could be scored using the Written or Oral Communication rubrics. If it was determined an instructor did not have an appropriate assignment for this purpose, the AAC worked with the instructor to develop one.

4) 6th week of term: a check-in/reminder email that included the instructions and scoring rubrics was emailed to all participating instructors

6) 10th week of term: a final reminder email with 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 term in-service week 2026: The ILO Assessment Committee met to review and analyze the ILO assessment results. The committee:

- compared current assessment results with results from 2015-16 and 2020-21
- analyzed the effectiveness of faculty interventions over the past 10 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
- discussed ILO assessment related items: sufficiency of instruction pertaining to each ILO; ILO assessment requirements for BAS in Education; and the potential for a new technology ILO.

8) Once the results and analysis report are posted to the web, the AAC will send out an email informing faculty of the results, the focus of instruction and links to both the results and report.

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:

432 students were enrolled in 30 courses from 18 disciplines. A total of 396 student artifacts were scored using the Written/Oral Communication rubrics by the instructors of those courses. Broken down by rubric: the Written Communication rubric was used to score 320 student artifacts out of 351 students enrolled in those courses; the Oral Communication rubric was used to score 76 student artifacts out of the 81 students enrolled in those courses.

28 faculty were involved in the assessment of the ILO:

Fall Term: Elizabeth Anderson (ART 286), Ed Andree (BI 233), John Evans (STAT 234Z), Leigh Hancock (WR 121Z), Zip Krummel (PSY 215), Amirra Malak (ART 230), Emilie Miller (BI 234) and Mandy Webster (ED 216).

Winter Term: Franceina Brackenbury (CG 206), Velvet Cooley (ECE 238), Andrea LaMonaco (WR 122Z), Stephen Shwiff (BA 226), Carol Thorn (NRS 235 and NRS 238), Lori White/ Deanne Saldivar-Witter (NRS 223) and Abel Wolman (STAT 243Z).

Spring Term: Chris Dodson (MFG 290), Bernadine Herlihy (BA 205), Jessie Herrada-Nance (WR 121Z), Kristen Kane (PSY 215), Ray Kempf (PHL 202), Christine Martinez (SOC 206), Todd Meislahn (BA 206), tina ontiveros (WR 241/244), Thomas Roja (PS 201), Debra Shope (HEC 201), Diane Uto (COMM 218Z), David Wagenblast (EC 202Z) and Glenn Wood (CT 242).

The sampling size from the first assessment of ILO #1 in 2015-16 was slightly lower, with 325 students enrolled in 19 courses from 13 disciplines and a total of 269 student artifacts scored. 278 of those students were enrolled in courses that scored work using the Written Communication rubric, with 237 of those students completing the assignments. 38 students were enrolled in courses that scored using the Oral Communication rubric, with 32 students completing those assignments.

The 2020-21 assessment of ILO #1 had a much larger sampling size with 672 students enrolled in 39 courses from 17 disciplines. A total of 601 student artifacts were scored using either the Written or Oral Communication rubrics by the instructors of those courses. 581 of those students were enrolled in courses that scored work using the Written Communication rubric, with 526 of those students completing the assignments. 91 students were enrolled in courses that scored using the Oral Communication rubric, with 75 students completing those assignments.

Assessment Instrument(s):

The Written Communication and Oral Communication rubrics were 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.
Per Recommendation 3 from the Report 2020-21 ILO #1 Communication, the Written and Oral Communication Rubrics were revised by sub-committees of the ILO Assessment Committee to make them more student-friendly, easier to understand and apply, and clarified expectations for the different dimension levels. The rubrics were approved by the Instructional Council in 2025.

1. 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, John Evans, Kristen Kane, Zip Krummel, and Susan Lewis.

Section Four: Results and Analysis

A. ILO#1 Assessment Results:

Overall Communication Results:
A total of 432 students were enrolled in the courses that participated in the assessment of the ILO Communication. Of those students, 396 students completed the assignments and were scored using the Written or Oral Communication Rubric. A total of 84% of those students scored as accomplished or

better when the scores of the Written Communication and Oral Communication Rubrics were combined. 12% were scored into the Developing category and 3% were scored into Beginning.

Table 3: Results of 2025-26 Assessment of Student Achievement of ILO#1 (Communication)

Institutional Learning Outcome #1: Communication	**Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. *(Communication)***						
Total Number of students enrolled in assessed courses: 432 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 396	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
Total Percentage of Students Scoring into Level	**54%**	**30%**	**12%**	**3%**	**1%**	**15%**	**84%**
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better	84%						

Written Communication Results:

351 students were enrolled in the courses that participated in the assessment of the ILO Written Communication. Of those students, 320 students completed the written assignments and were scored using the Written Communication Rubric. A total 82.3% of students scored as Accomplished or better for the categories totaled, with a range between 76.5% and 86.3% within the categories. The category with the lowest score (the only dimension below 80%) was Sources and Evidence with a score of 76.5%. The remaining categories had over 80% of students scoring into accomplished or better.

Table 4: Results of 2025-26 Assessment of Student Achievement of ILO#1 (Written Communication)

Institutional Learning Outcome #1: Communication	**Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. *(Communication)***						
Total Number of students enrolled in assessed courses: 351 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 320	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
Audience, Context and Purpose	164	112	37	7	0	0	86.25%

Content Development	159	101	46	7	1	6	82.80%
Sources and Evidence	130	62	31	17	11	69	76.49%
Organization and Presentation	167	99	36	18	0	0	83.13%
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	141	114	49	5	1	10	82.26%
Graphics	67	12	11	1	7	222	80.61%
Total Number of Students Scored	828	500	210	55	20	307	82.33%
Total Percentage of Students Scoring into Level	51.33%	31.00%	13.02%	3.41%	1.24%	15.99%	
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better	82.33%						

Oral Communication Results:

81 students were enrolled in the courses that participated in the assessment of the ILO pertaining to Oral Communication. Of those students, 76 students completed the oral assignments and were scored using the Oral Communication rubric. A total of 88% of those students scored as accomplished or better in Oral Communication. 8.9% were scored into the Developing category and 3.1% were scored into Beginning.

More than 86.9% of students scored as Accomplished or better in all the categories, with the lowest percentage of students (86.9%) scoring accomplished or better in the dimensions of Organization/Language/Delivery Techniques.

Table 5: Results of 2025-26 Assessment of Student Achievement of ILO#1 (Oral Communication)

Institutional Learning Outcome #1: Communication	**Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. *(Communication)***						
Total Number of students enrolled in assessed courses: 81 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 76	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
Central Message	47	21	7	1	0	0	89.47%
Organization	49	17	8	2	0	0	86.84%
Language	48	18	8	2	0	0	86.84%
Delivery Techniques (oral/visual)	46	20	7	3	0	0	86.84%

Evidence Based Support	47	16	4	3	0	6	90.00%
Listening	49	18	6	3	0	0	88.16%
Total Number of Students Scored	286	110	40	14	0	6	88.00%
Total Percentage of Students Scoring into Level	63.56%	24.44%	8.89%	3.11%	0.00%	1.32%	
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better	88.00%						

Section Five: Analysis of Results

A. Analysis, discussion and implications of current year results

The overall score of 84% meets 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." All dimensions in the written communication and oral communication met the 80% benchmark, with the exception of the dimension of "Sources and Evidence" from the written communication rubric; this dimension had an overall score of 76.49%. The committee noted that it made sense that students struggled with this dimension, because it requires a higher level of critical thinking, requiring students to synthesize and integrate information from multiple sources into a cohesive text. Instructor comments for this dimension are particularly helpful in providing a bigger picture of the multiple challenges of this dimension for students (Appendix 2). In particular, it was noted that students struggled with:

- applying concepts (BA 206)
- citations (when to cite and correct formatting of citations) (HEC 201)
- providing supporting evidence from other sources and synthesizing others' work to substantiate assignment responses (HEC 201)
- using sources as evidence to support discussions (SOC 206)
- the integration and analysis of critical texts into the process essay (WR 241/244)

Of particular interest to the committee was the number of students scored into Not Applicable (N/A) in the category of "Graphics". Looking to instructor comments, it appears that the majority of instructors don't require graphics for their assignments. The committee deliberated over the importance of "Graphics" considering that so many instructors do not require graphics for the assignments used in their assessment, ultimately deciding that graphics are a useful skill for students to build in communicating information visually. The committee wondered whether instructors understood the many types of graphics that could be used in an assignment, from timelines to schematics to photos of electrical connections to graphs and tables.

As in other years, the committee also considered that faculty may still be assuming that only one assignment should be used for this assessment, thus applying a N/A for those criteria that aren't met by

that one assignment. Faculty on the committee who had participated in this assessment spoke to the rubric, in its entirety, as difficult to apply to one assignment.

The committee also discussed the on-going concern about the number of students scored into the level of "Mastery". Since the committee had decided in 2019-20 that "Accomplished" was a reasonable expectation for community college students, they were struck by the fact that over 50% of students were scored into the level of Mastery for both rubrics. The committee wondered whether faculty are inflating scores, driven by the numbers 4, 3, 2, 1, 0 on the top of the scoring rubric and their association with grades. Other considerations included an increase in student use of Artificial Intelligence, given that generative AI can help students refine grammar, structure arguments, and expand vocabulary, raising baseline performance in some of the communication dimensions.

Notable discussions regarding the results also pointed to the fact that the majority of instructors chose to apply the written communication rubric over the oral communication rubric, attributing this choice to the bulk of classes being online, which can make oral presentations particularly difficult. Regarding the oral communication rubric, the committee also noted the high scores (88% meeting "Accomplished or better") in the new dimension of "Listening"

B. Comparative analysis of results from multiple years.

Assessments using the written communication rubric show an increase in student success in all dimensions from the first cycle of assessment (2015-16), with the exception of "Graphics" which had a 17% decrease. Of note is a decrease of 3% in the category of "Sources and Evidence" from the second cycle of ILO assessment (2020-21).

Comparison of the results from the oral communication rubric show a decrease in student achievement from 2020-21, but an overall increase from the initial assessment in 2015-16, with the exception of the dimension of language.

Table 6: Comparison of 2015-16, 2020-21 and 2024-25 Results from Assessment of Student Achievement of Communication

Institutional Learning Outcome #1: Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. *(Communication)*						
Year of Assessment	**2015-16**	**2020-21**	**2015-16 to 2020-21 Comparative Difference**	**2025-26**	**2020-21 to 2025-26 Comparative Difference**	**2015-16 to 2025-26 Comparative Difference**
Total Number of Students who completed scored assignments for Written & Oral Communication	**269**	**601**	**332**	**396**	**-205**	**127**
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better	**71%**	**81%**	**10%**	**84%**	**3%**	**13%**

Table 6 (continued): Comparison of 2015-16, 2020-21 and 2024-25 Results from Assessment of Student Achievement of Communication

Written Communication Rubric Dimensions						
	2015-16 % for Accomplished or better	2020-21 % for Accomplished or better	2015-16 to 2020-21 Comparative Difference	2025-26 % for Accomplished or better	2020-2021 to 2025-26 Comparative Difference	2015-16 to 2025-26 Comparative Difference
Audience, Context and Purpose:	76.8%	82.3%	6%	86.3%	4%	10%
Content Development:	73.0%	**78.1%**	**5%**	**82.8%**	**5%**	10%
Sources and Evidence:	**68.4%**	80.0%	12%	76.5%	-3%	**8%**
Organization and Presentation:	**66.7%**	78.7%	12%	83.1%	4%	**16%**
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	72.6%	**78.9%**	**6%**	**82.3%**	**3%**	10%
Graphics (Visual Aids):	97.90%	82.4%	-16%	80.6%	-2%	-17%
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better with Written Communication Rubric	63%	79.9%	17%	82.3%	2%	19%
Oral Communication Rubric Dimensions						
	2015-16 % for Accomplished or better	2020-21 % for Accomplished or better	2015-16 to 2020-21 Comparative Difference	2025-26 % for Accomplished or better	2020-2021 to 2025-26 Comparative Difference	2015-16 to 2025-26 Comparative Difference
Central Message:	84%	92.0%	8%	89.5%	-3%	6%
Organization:	84%	93.3%	9%	86.8%	-7%	3%
Language:	94%	96.0%	2%	86.8%	-9%	-7%
Delivery Techniques (oral/visual):	**59%**	92.0%	33%	86.8%	-5%	**28%**
Evidence Based Support	75%	93.3%	18%	90.0%	-3%	15%
Listening (new dimension 2025):				88.2%	N/A	N/A
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better with Oral Communication Rubric	79%	93.3%	14%	88.0%	-5%	9%

Boxes highlighted in green are the areas of focus for faculty instruction.

Comparing the results of the written communication rubric, as with all other years, the committee considered the various contributing factors for the growth in student achievement: faculty comfort with applying the rubrics and the assessment process, improved instruction and/or different students in the sampling. It's interesting to note that some of the most significant increases in student achievement are in the areas of focus for the 5 years following the assessment of ILO#1: – "Sources and Evidence" and "Organization" (2015-16 to 2020-21) and "Content Development" and "Control of Syntax and Mechanics" (2020-21 to 2025-26) which would support the significance of a combined effort of faculty focus and instruction.

The committee discussed whether we should continue to use WR 121 and WR 122 in the assessment of communication, as recommended by the writing department chair in 2016. Of concern is the appropriateness of using these gateway courses that introduce the concepts of communication to evaluate student achievement. There was concern that using WR 121 and WR 122 may skew the results more than if General Education courses, which have WR 121 or higher as prerequisites, were used.

Comparing the results of the oral communication rubric, the committee discussed how these changes made sense in the context of seeing such significant growth between the first and second cycles, then a leveling out in the third cycle once students achieve the 80% target for the Strategic Priority of *Advancing equitable student learning and educational outcomes*. The committee anticipates that once that 80% target is reached for a dimension, going forward we'll continue to see slight increases and decreases with each cycle.

C. Recommendations and Action Items

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

Recommendation 1: The committee recommends that faculty focus instruction in the dimensions of "Sources and Evidence" and "Graphics". Pertaining to "Graphics", the committee concluded that if this dimension is on the rubric, it is a skill that is important for CGCC students to attain, and faculty are encouraged to try to find a way to make more use of graphics so that we can avoid such high numbers in the level of N/A.

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 (2021-26) did not include any recommendations that had relevancy to ILOs. In feedback provided to the General Education Program Review committee, however, it was highlighted that the ILO Assessment Committee has expressed an ongoing concern for roughly 10 years related to the college's inability to ensure that students receive instruction in all five ILOs. As described in Recommendation 2 (Section 2.C, pg. 2), the committee feels comfortable in saying that students are exposed to instruction in ILOs 1, 2 and 3, since all courses with Gen Ed designations must address ILOs #1 and #2 as a major component of the course and all degrees have a math requirement; therefore, addressing ILO #3. But, ILOs #4 and #5 are not explicitly required for all degrees. Of concern is that we make the promise that students earning a degree at CGCC will leave with a community college understanding of the five ILOs, but the General Education program has yet to ensure that this promise is kept in regards to ILOs #4 and #5. Therefore, it is recommended that the General Education program add a recommendation to the program review addressing this concern.

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 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 a sub-committee (Kristen Kane, Annette Byers, Susan Lewis and Kalie Brunton) to work on the quantitative literacy rubric during the 2025-26 year. The sub-committees completed the work over two meetings, totaling 6 hours of committee work.

The revised quantitative literacy rubric, as well as the community and environmental responsibility rubric which was revised in 2024-25, were reviewed by the ILO Assessment Committee and approved by Instructional Council.

Results: The re-worked quantitative literacy, and community and environmental responsibility rubrics have been posted to the ILO website. The AAC sent an email to inform faculty of the updated rubrics.

This recommendation is considered complete.

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

Recommendation 1: The committee recommends that WR 121 & WR 122 not be used in the assessment of communication, since they are foundational courses for the other General Education courses, and are less likely to provide an accurate assessment of students' capabilities at the finish of their academic studies at CGCC.

Section Seven: Appendices

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

1. Report on Evidence of Focused Instruction to Improve Student Achievement of ILO#3 2025-26
2. Instructor Comments/Analysis from the 2024-25 Assessment of ILO#3
3. 2015-16 Results for the Assessment of ILO#1 – Communication
4. 2020-21 Results for the Assessment of ILO#1 – Communication

Appendix 1: Report on Evidence of Focused Instruction to Improve Student Achievement of ILO#3 2025-26

Term	Course Prefix & #	Course Title	Number Enrolled/ Scheduled for Assessment	Support for institutional effort to support students in improving achievement for ILO#5
F25	PSY 201Z	Introduction to Psychology I	22	The deep dive into Andrew Wakefield's MMRI/Autism research provides more opportunities for students to begin to think about "Assumptions" when reading research journal articles.

Appendix 2: Instructor Comments/Analysis from the 2025-26 Assessment of ILO#1

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION RUBRIC:

Dimension: Audience, Context and Purpose

- ART 230 (F25): The majority of students (4/6) were able to thoroughly understand context, audience, and purpose in the writing task which was a written commentary/artist statement about their final still life project. The writing was to include materials, processes, and ideas as well as a final reflection with an intended audience of the general viewer outside of the class who may know nothing about art, art making, and the artist's intentions. The two students with adequate consideration sometimes used language that bordered on a bit too casual for an artist statement or did not fully respond to the prompt but rather skimmed the surface. In the future, I plan to present more examples of writing to clarify language use.
- ART 286 (F25): 2 students demonstrated very good use of written art critique skills in a 6 assignment portfolio or work. 2 students demonstrated average use of written art critique skills in a 6 assignment portfolio of work. Students who attended class on a regular basis and contributed to practice oral art critiques did much better in the written assignments.
- ED 216 (F25): All students demonstrated a clear grasp of the context, audience, and purpose by consistently grounding their analysis in ideas from our class text, THE TEACHER WARS, and applying them purposefully throughout their final work. Their responses fully addressed the assignment expectations, showing depth of understanding and intentional connection across all parts of the task.
- PSY 215 (F25): I expected (hoped) more students would take an optional direction other than a research-based paper, but only one student chose to be different; they produced a children's book. I was surprised to hear how many students wanted to do a paper, like it was a rite of passage.
- WR 121 (F25): This is an outcome that students usually find easier to grasp.
- BA 226 (W26): Most students demonstrated a clear understanding of the legal scenario and wrote with appropriate focus on the assigned task. Responses generally addressed the audience and purpose of the assignment by explaining legal reasoning related to business law concepts.
- WR 122 (W26): All students performed well on this metric. (additional analysis from separate email: I just completed my assessment of WR 122z. I'm not sure if this is relevant, but these results are fairly high; however, it is 100% this group of students. I had the same batch of students for WR121 and WR122 as these were the Early College folks. They are an impressive bunch that not only came into the courses with a solid foundation but continued to rise to the task. Both terms, their writing skills were on point.)
- NRS 235 (W26): Students were given several assignments (as well as exams) during the term that featured clinical scenarios in which they had to explain disease processes to various people (children, adults, elderly) in language they would be able to understand. Basically taking very complex medical language and determining the best way to share that information in non-technical/medical language. Students were also given very technical information in a flowchart modality related to a disease process and had to re-write the information into a 'patient friendly' flowchart that could be utilized in patient teaching.
- BA 206 (SP26): Four students scored a 3 here, with one each at 2 and 1. Student #2 stood out for the wrong reasons: multiple responses answer a different question than asked or went generic instead of engaging the actual prompt. The stronger students all responded well to the prompts, but nobody fully met every component, which is why there are no 4s.
- CT 242 (SP26): Wasn’t as bad as I expected

- EC 202 (SP26): I felt that a statistically significant (75% with a score of 3) number of students showed good consideration of context, etc., and a clear focus on the assignment.
- HEC 201 (SP26): Students were solid in this area. They demonstrated that they understood the context of the assignment and they were able to compose their written paper with consistent structure throughout each paragraph and culminated their ideas in a conclusion paragraph. Each paragraph consisted of a summary of the applicable content in their own words, backed up by an example to demonstrate comprehension.
- MTH 213 (SP26): Students needed to write clear instructions on how to make a snowflake and use the assigned math terms in the written description. Two students completed a detailed description and used more than the required vocabulary concepts and terms. Four students covered the content adequately.
- PHL 202 (SP26): Over half of my students demonstrated a high understanding of context, audience and purpose in writing a college level paper. Roughly a third of my students demonstrated a reasonable and generally acceptable understanding of those elements. The remaining 10% of students demonstrated some understanding of context, audience and purpose in writing a college level paper - less than I would've liked, but developing. All students demonstrated at least some understanding of the issues.
- PS 201 (SP26): One of the student's work had a Moodle Copyleaks AI score of 75%, indicating a minimal demonstration of meeting the formal minimum criteria in addressing the audience, context, and purpose for writing.
- WR 241/244 (SP26): For this ILO, I used the final revision portfolio assignment. The portfolio includes a rough draft of a short story written this term, a process essay (critical explanation of revision process with textual influences), and a revised version of the story. The rough draft was presented in class for a critical workshop. Students gather feedback from their audience (peers and instructor) and must discern which feedback is useful for their revision process. Over the course of term, students are assigned weekly reading of two types; fiction and critical texts. Students must revise their short story using feedback, influences from critical texts, influence from fiction texts, and development of at least 3 elements of fiction. The process essay must integrate these elements to explain influences and choices in the revised version. Ten (10) students finished the class and submitted a portfolio. For this concept, I scored based on the process essay and the revised story in the portfolio, specifically the discussion and integration of feedback from peers and instructor: 1. A score of 4 means that the student analyzed and integrated feedback from at least 3 audience members. (2) 2. A score of 3 means that the student analyzed and integrated feedback from at least 1 audience member. (5) 3. A score of 2 means the student analyzed and integrated feedback from at least 1 audience member. (3)

Dimension: Content Development

- ART 230 (F25): The majority of students (5/6) showed deep understanding of subject ie. their own ideas and process for creating work. It was clear from reading that students were able to articulate why they chose the objects they drew and explain how the drawing was made. In addition, these students also able to reflect and make conclusions about their growth and project into the future how they could create new work with skills gained. One student accurately explored ideas but did not make the ideas feel compelling. Again, I may work to provide multiple examples with a range of levels of quality of content development in the future.
- ART 286 (F25): 2 students demonstrated very good use of written art critique skills in a 6 assignment portfolio or work. 2 students demonstrated average use of written art critique skills in a 6 assignment portfolio of work. Students who participated and practiced art critiques of

famous artists work throughout the term did much better when it came to self critiquing skills. Comparing and contrasting famous artists work with their own art was much easier when students attended class on a regular and participated more often.

- ED 216 (F25): All students incorporated relevant and compelling ideas that reflected a strong command of the required objectives/knowledge/concepts and reinforced the purpose of their analysis. Their work showed depth, clarity, and intentional selection of content, resulting in cohesive and well-developed final submissions. They were all excellent!
- PSY 215 (F25): About what I would expect. The one student whom I rated as a "4" already has a BS degree.
- WR 121 (F25): This assignment is the culmination of 11 weeks work on a specific place in the Gorge, where students have been developing context and content the whole term. This shows in fairly high mastery of this criteria.
- BA 226 (W26): Students generally used appropriate legal concepts and examples to develop their responses. Most submissions showed a solid understanding of the topic, though some students could further strengthen their explanations and depth of analysis.
- WR 122 (W26): Through scaffolded research assignments, students were able to learn about their subject on a deep level which provided a foundation for nicely developed content.
- NRS 235 (W26): Students were given several assignments (as well as exams) during the term that featured clinical scenarios in which they had to explain disease processes to various people (children, adults, elderly) in language they would be able to understand. Basically taking very complex medical language and determining the best way to share that information in non-technical/medical language. Students were also given very technical information in a flowchart modality related to a disease process and had to re-write the information into a 'patient friendly' flowchart that could be utilized in patient teaching.
- BA 206 (SP26): Identical results to Audience, Context, and Purpose, which makes sense, I guess, as students who understood what was being asked tended to develop their ideas better. My common observation across the group was a habit of introducing a concept but just continuing on before really digging into it. Even the stronger students didn't fully develop their content.
- CT 242 (SP26): Wasn't as bad as I expected
- EC 202 (SP26): About 60% of the students (scores of 4 and 3) used relative content to at least accurately explore ideas within the assignment to help shape their work.
- HEC 201 (SP26): Again, students were solid in this area. They demonstrated that they understood the theory that they were asked to summarize in their own words, and also provided either real-world examples, or examples from the text, or a combination of both. Each student approached their paragraph structure somewhat differently from their peers' paragraph responses; however, within their own paper, they demonstrated a cohesive pattern within their paragraphs.
- MTH 213 (SP26): The written part of the assignment was not an essay or research paper.
- PHL 202 (SP26): I looked at explanation of how a student's personal moral theory worked using explanation and/or examples in their paper. Most students were "on track" in their examples/explanations but of those roughly half fell short of successfully using explanations or examples in a way that significantly helped to clarify their position. In other words - for half my students they included the required explanation and/or examples but the inclusion didn't actually help to clarify their thinking very much.
- PS 201 (SP26): One of the student's work had a Moodle Copyleaks AI score of 75%, indicating a minimal criteria in addressing content development.

- WR 241/244 (SP26): For this concept, I scored based on the process essay, specifically the integration of critical texts, fiction texts, and the elements of fiction into their revision process: 1. A score of 4 means that the student integrated at least 3 critical texts, 3 fiction texts, and 3 elements of fiction in their process essay. (10)

Dimension: Sources and Evidence

- ART 230 (F25): Students were analyzing their own work, process, and growth so this category was not included in the writing.
- ED 216 (F25): All students effectively incorporated the text as a credible and relevant source while skillfully integrating knowledge gained throughout the term to deepen their analysis. Their work showed thoughtful use of course learning to support and develop ideas appropriate to the assignment. I was continuously impressed by this group of future educators!
- PSY 215 (F25): I was pleased with the breadth and appropriateness of the sources used this time.
- STAT 243Z (F25): This project requires students to formulate an acceptable method of collecting data, then performing calculations on the data to draw conclusions. Citing sources is not necessary; evidence is, but the calculations involved are design to weigh the strength of the evidence shown in the data.
- WR 121 (F25): This is definitely the hardest of evaluated skills overall. However, a couple of terms back, I started introducing research in the 5th week, rather than the 7th, and it has made a big difference.
- BA 226 (W26): Students were responding to a legal case problem based on the provided scenario and course concepts. The assignment did not require outside research or citation of sources, so the Sources and Evidence category was not applicable
- ECE 238 (W26): Students successful in this criteria cited learning materials for the topic.
- NRS 235 (W26): For every assignment done in this class, students were required to support their statements/answers with reliable, relevant data from sources no older than 3 years.
- WR 122 (W26): This is a concept I've been working on heavily with students across this term and last (I had the same cohort for both terms--WR121 and WR122). They spend about two weeks compiling and evaluating their sources before they write the paper which provides a solid base for developing their ideas and supporting them with credible, relevant sources.
- BA 206 (SP26): I found the rubric especially helpful for this one as the scores were clearly split across three levels. There was some consistency in that the students could tell a good personal story but struggled to use the actual course concepts I was teaching in their analysis. There was a big gap between just naming a concept and actually applying it.
- CT 242 (SP26): Wasn't as bad as I expected
- EC 202 (SP26): I felt that 65% of the students (scores of 4 and 3) used credible and consistent sources to support their ideas to convey their message in the assignment.
- HEC 201 (SP26): This proved to be a weaker demonstrated area for this assignment. Many students either failed to cite relevant work, or mentioned contents from our textbook, but then failed to properly cite the work. I would like to say that this was due to the fact that this paper prompted them to address the assignment prompts in their own words, but I know from experience that in general, the ECE students that I work with are not strong in citing their work, and they are also not strong in pulling in supporting evidence from other sources and synthesizing other work into their written papers to substantiate their assignment responses. Also, in general, ECE students are not knowledgeable in APA style, which is the style that is typically suggested that they use to write their papers in and most do not take advantage of the

APA writing lab that Zip offers. I do know that not all of the ECE students are actually working on earning a degree. Some of them are only working on earning the ECE certificates, so their writing skills may not always be on par with formal college level writing.

- MTH 213 (SP26): Sources were Youtube videos for snowflake samples. However, some students already knew how to make a snowflake so did not use any sources. The students did use the class textbook for the correct math concepts and definitions.
- PHL 202 (SP26): This assignment was not a research paper and I discouraged the use of outside sources other than our assigned text. The paper was intended as a personal reflection of content covered in class.
- PS 201 (SP26): One of the student's work had a Moodle Copyleaks AI score of 75%, suggesting a minimal effort to use sources to support ideas in the assignment.
- SOC 206 (SP26): While students were told that they needed to uses sources to back up what they said in their discussions, a number of students did not do so.
- WR 241/244 (SP26): For this concept, I scored based on the integration and analysis of critical texts into the process essay: 1. A score of 4 means that the student integrated at least 3 critical texts in their process essay. (10)

Dimension: Organization and Presentation

- ART 230 (F25): 2 students reached the highest level for this category in terms of stylistic choices. There were stylistic issues for the remaining 4 in that there were several terms that were overly casual for an artist statement. All students skillfully organized their writing into three paragraphs guiding the viewer through their ideas, materials use, process, and reflection.
- ART 286 (F25): 2 students demonstrated very good use of oral and written art critique skills in a 6 assignment portfolio or work. 2 students demonstrated average use of oral and written art critique skills in a 6 assignment portfolio of work. Students who attended class on a regular basis and contributed to practice oral art critiques did much better in the written assignments. Students who attended class on a regular had practice before and after each art assignment to present to the class and reorganize their written art critique assignments for submissions.
- ED 216 (F25): Almost all students displayed strong and consistent attention (of a level 4) to organization and stylistic choices, presenting their ideas clearly and purposefully throughout the assignment. Their final work reflected thoughtful structure and polished presentation appropriate for the expectations of the course. For the students who had 3's, I would like to incorporate more instruction about how to effectively format the ""presentation"" of final research papers.
- PSY 215 (F25): This deals with formatting, and too many students used subheadings (a no-no), &/or tried to make the paper "pretty."
- WR 121 (F25): We did a lot of extra work on organization this term, and it paid off, although I was not especially happy with student work on Formal Outlines. In fact, thre students wound up taking an Incomplete so that they could redo their final essay due to poor organization. So in some sense, this numbers are skewed high
- BA 226 (W26): Most submissions were logically organized and followed a clear structure for presenting legal analysis. Students generally used appropriate formatting and clear paragraph organization in their responses.
- ECE 238 (W26): All students presented their discussion in a way that was easy to follow and understand.
- NRS 235 (W26): Students were able to follow the guidelines and produce products that represented attention to detail in their written communication. Rubrics utilized for the

assignments provided points for this so that students understood what was expected of them from the beginning. Feedback had been given in fall term to those students who struggled with this and showed vast improvement during winter term

- WR 122 (W26): Early submissions of tentative thesis statements and supporting points as well as peer review provided the space for these students to excel in this area.
- BA 206 (SP26): Nearly identical to the first two categories, above. The four 3s all produced readable, logical responses. The student who received a 1 had responses that lacked structure and ended rather abruptly. Nobody showed the kind of consistent, polished organization across all submissions needed for a 4.
- CT 242 (SP26): Wasn't as bad as I expected
- EC 202 (SP26): My expectations were a little higher for presentation and order than a score of 2. Almost split even with a little higher (55%) in scores 4 and 3, relative to scores 2 and 1.
- HEC 201 (SP26): For the most part, this area was strong for the assignment that I reviewed. Since this assignment prompted them to explain Bronfenbrenner's theory in their own words and then provide real world examples of each of the systems within the theory, students used their own voice in their writing response. Most students incorporated a strong introduction, along with individual paragraphs for describing each of the systems within the theory and then closed with a solid conclusion paragraph. Some, on the other hand, had run-on sentences and added far too much personal information in their real-world examples. A couple of the submissions contained disjointed and rambling thoughts, particularly when the students were describing their real-world experiences to support their examples.
- MTH 213 (SP26): Two students demonstrated the steps to how they make the snowflake. This class is via Zoom. Two students also made a video of themselves making the snowflake and submitted the video. The purpose of the assignment was to give clear directions to grade school students on how math terms are used while making a snowflake. Symmetry, line segments, angle measurements, types of triangles, plane figures, and rays were most of the concepts that needed to be covered while demonstrating the snowflake. The same students that had clearly written the directions for their snowflake, were the same two students that skillfully presented their project to the group.
- PHL 202 (SP26): My instructions as to the paper's scope, structure, tone and required components were clear and nearly all students were able to use the specific required components (which also served as the basis for grading) to provide clear structure and set an appropriate tone for their paper. The two students who seemed to struggle still contained the required components but seemed not to recognize appropriately what those components were - glossing over them and generally naming the components without really satisfying their requirements.
- PS 201 (SP26): One of the student's work had a Moodle Copyleaks AI score of 75%, indicating a minimal criteria in organization and presentation.
- WR 241/244 (SP26): For this concept, I scored based on the overall organization of the portfolio, as well as the process essay specifically: 1. A score of 4 means the student organized their portfolio according to the sample template, and the process essay is organized with discernible attention to detail. (7) 2. A score of 3 means the student organized their portfolio clearly, even if not exactly like the sample template, and the process essay is organized with consistency. (3)

<u>Dimension: Control of Syntax and Mechanics</u>

- ART 230 (F25): 1 student skillfully communicated meaning with clarity and fluency nearly error free. They integrated the academic drawing language in a way that was accurate and accessible

to the viewer/reader. 4 students needed significant help with editing as there were several grammar/convention/spelling issues. In the future, I will imbed peer review into class time to catch more of the errors sooner. Since the artist statements were to be displayed with art. I had students correct the work before display after carefully reviewing why aspects weren't following conventions.

- ART 286 (F25): 2 students demonstrated very good use of written art critique skills in a 6 assignment portfolio or work. 2 students demonstrated average use of written art critique skills in a 6 assignment portfolio of work. Students who attended class on a regular basis and contributed to practice oral art critiques did much better in the written assignments. Students who practiced using art term vocabulary in oral art critique skills while using a critique format provided to them did very well.
- PSY 215 (F25): A better than usual job in this category - I was pleased.
- WR 121 (F25): This has become a very difficult assessment point due to generative AI. In order to get students to write in their natural voice (as opposed to some academic perfect voice they think I want), I've had to stress voice over perfect mechanics. This seems like a good trade. Students gain critical thinking skills by doing their own work, not by producing a grammatically perfect essay.
- BA 226 (W26): Writing was generally clear and understandable, with only minor grammar or punctuation errors. Most students communicated their ideas effectively using appropriate language.
- NRS 235 (W26): A few students continue to struggle with this a bit but I believe it is due to being non native English speaking rather than their ability to grasp the concept. Once feedback was provided, improvement was immediate so that by the end of the term it was no longer an issue for the majority of the class.
- WR 122 (W26): This group of students overall has a strong command of language.
- BA 206 (SP26): "This category was especially difficult to score due to a disconnect between the rubric and the guidance presented by Tina Ontiveros during the in-service last September. My notes indicated that she said students should not be penalized for using their language of origin — that there is no ""right way to speak"" and students should be graded on what they are trying to communicate, not how they communicate it. As I understood it, grammar, spelling, syntax, and paragraph structure were essentially off the table as evaluative criteria. This is pretty much antithetical to the rubric. While I could see her point and attempted to apply that philosophy this year, I think it is a significant mistake, at least in a business context. Employee candidates are judged from the moment their resume is first read. If they do not communicate in standard professional English, they are less likely to get the job and, if they do, less likely to advance. In my view, preparing students for that reality is part of what a business course should do. I chose to score according to the rubric. This was the only category where a student produced genuinely clean, precise writing throughout and earned a 4. Two students scored 2, but for different reasons: one showed error patterns consistent with non-native English use, which felt more like a language-of-origin situation Tina may have had in mind, while the other had basic issues with sentence structure and grammatical control that affected clarity regardless of origin. The other students scored 3s as their writing was clear and mostly error-free even if not polished enough for a 4.
- CT 242 (SP26): Wasn’t as bad as I expected
- EC 202 (SP26): Most of the students had a good handle with language and syntax order (85% with 4 and 3 scores).

- HEC 201 (SP26): This area was strongly demonstrated. Students did a solid job in the language that they used to develop their written responses and most used appropriate academic vocabulary to define the systems within the theory. They also interjected less formal language when they were providing their real-world examples. I would like it noted that out of the 15 students that completed this assignment, five of them are DLL students, and two of those five are very limited in their English and those two students worked closely each week with Karie Mize to work on their English proficiency and writing skills. I would also like to add that I do know that students are using AI tools such as Grammarly to help polish their writing and some of the DLL students use AI tools such as Google translate, so in this day and age of AI tools, analyzing and rating writing proficiencies has an added layer of challenge around knowing what the students' actual skillset is, versus how much of their writing reflects AI polishing.
- MTH 213 (SP26): Students did outstanding work with their control of syntax and mechanics.
- PHL 202 (SP26): In the era of AI, autocorrect and spell check I have found that student writing has continued to get better, more clear and more error free. Spelling errors were notably non-existent among these papers - punctuation errors were likewise absent. There were some form and formatting idiosyncrasies (notably a lack of understanding of spacing and paragraphing procedures for double-spaced academic writing) - but that is not what is being asked about here. The one student that had some struggles wrote what was otherwise a solid paper (in terms of content and ideas) but sentence structure and word choice hurt clarity.
- PS 201 (SP26): One of the student's work had a Moodle Copyleaks AI score of 75%, indicating a minimal control of syntax and mechanics.

<u>Dimension: Graphics</u>

- ART 230 (F25) Writing was about art so no additional graphics were needed.
- ART 286 (F25): 2 students demonstrated very good use of written art critique skills in a 6 assignment portfolio or work. 2 students demonstrated average use of written art critique skills in a 6 assignment portfolio of work. Students who attended class on a regular basis and contributed to practice art term definitions and oral art critiques did much better in clearly and effectively communicating to the class.
- PSY 215 (F25): Only the student who developed the children's book is scored here.
- STAT 243Z (F25): Over all the projects last fall were quite a bit better than in most terms, though they still could have done a better job incorporating graphs into their finished project - especially since the very first thing we do on the very first day of class is learn how to display data.
- WR 121 (F25): No graphics
- BA 226 (W26): Graphics were not required for this assignment. The work focused on written legal analysis and explanation of course concepts.
- NRS 235 (W26): Students are very adept at using Canva and other sources to add graphics to their presentations to enhance the information.
- WR 122 (W26): In their final research paper, graphics are optional. One student did choose to include them, and did so in an effective manner that worked in support of the point being made.
- BA 206 (SP26): There were no graphics opportunities or requirements for the submissions.
- CT 242 (SP26): Wasn’t as bad as I expected
- EC 202 (SP26): Interpretations of a graph or table were not required in this assignment.
- HEC 201 (SP26): This element is not applicable to this assignment.
- MTH 213 (SP26): Because the end product was a snowflake, the graphics were clear. We were able to discuss the various patterns that students created. As a class we were able to give

feedback about the process of making the snowflake. All students agreed that using the math terms made this assignment more interesting and challenging. They also discussed how to encourage students to notice the math when making a snowflake.
- PHL 202 (SP26): Graphics were not a required component of this assignment and I have difficulty seeing how they could have been meaningfully included in a paper explaining one's Personal Ethical Theory

ORAL COMMUNICATION RUBRIC:

Dimension: Central Message
- CG 209(W26): I put students under N/A who did not complete the task. (3 students removed from N/A by KK)
- NRS 238 (W26): Students completed many assignments during this course that meet the requirements for this review but I will focus on the 'med map' assignment. Students were to utilize information from a patient they took care of in clinical and complete an in-depth evaluation of the medications that the patient was prescribed. The project required creativity, analysis/evaluation, communication, and research.
- COMM 218Z (SP26): All eight students clearly stated their goals in their final project.
- MTH 213 (SP26): The message of the assignment was to clearly explain how to make a snowflake.

Dimension: Organization
- CG 209(W26): I put students under N/A who did not complete the task. (3 students removed from N/A by KK)
- NRS 238 (W26): Students followed the assignment guidelines as well as the rubric to complete the assignment. This provided structure to ensure there was organization, strucutre and cohesion of the information
- COMM 218Z (SP26): All eight students presented plans that were clearly organized and easy to follow; a template had been provided for their final plan.
- MTH 213 (SP26): Three students skillfully organized their work.

Dimension: Language
- CG 209(W26): I put students under N/A who did not complete the task. (3 students removed from N/A by KK)
- NRS 238 (W26): Students were asked to provide education to patients based on the information they learned about the medications. Students utilized a variety of methods to do this section of the assignment that were engaging and informative.
- COMM 218Z (SP26): All eight students used language that was clear and effective, with little "filler" in their written plans, making it easy to understand the content.

Dimension: Delivery Techniques (oral/visual)
- CG 209(W26): I put students under N/A who did not complete the task. (3 students removed from N/A by KK)
- NRS 238 (W26): Most students were engaging during the presentation of their information. One student tended to be very tentative and did not display the same zeal as others in the cohort
- COMM 218Z (SP26): All eight students presented their plans to the whole class; delivery was organized with minimal use of notes. They each maintained eye contact and responded to questions with a good level of detail and explanation as to their findings.

- MTH 213 (SP26): One student was unable to present at the time of the rest of the class. For that reason, they were a bit rushed and not prepared to present when asked.

Dimension: Evidence Based Support

- CG 209(W26): I put students under N/A who did not complete the task. (3 students removed from N/A by KK)
- NRS 238 (W26): Assignment requirements included providing information from evidence-based, reliable sources that were no older than 3 years to support the information they were sharing.
- COMM 218Z (SP26): All eight students cited the sources used in support of each step in their plans and how they intended to apply their findings, which were derived from both qualitative and quantitative data collected over a four-week period.

Dimension: Listening

- CG 209(W26): I put students under N/A who did not complete the task. (3 students removed from N/A by KK)
- NRS 238 (W26): Class is very interactive with small group work and then presenting information to class. All students are aware that it is an expectation to participate in class...
- COMM 218Z (SP26): All eight students demonstrated an understanding of the various concepts learned about from readings and discussions in forums and supporting materials, effectively applying those concepts to their final plan.
- MTH 213 (SP26): All student participated, gave feedback, and made comments about making their own snowflake. They also observed other students in the class give their snowflake demonstration. As agreed by the class, using all of the math terms was a bit of a challenge for the project.

Appendix 4: 2015-16 Results for the Assessment of ILO#1 – Communication

Institutional Learning Outcome #1: Communication	**Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. *(Communication)***						
Total Number of students enrolled in assessed courses: 325 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 269	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
Total Percentage of Students Scoring into Level	36%	35%	14%	2%	1%	12%	71%
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better	71%						
Written Communication Rubric Scores							
Total Number of students enrolled in assessed courses: 278 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 237	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
Audience, Context and Purpose	76	106	52	3	0	0	76.8%
Content Development	53	120	60	4	0	0	73.0%
Sources and Evidence	**64**	**98**	**51**	**5**	**3**	**16**	**68.4%**
Organization and Presentation	**52**	**106**	**55**	**9**	**0**	**15**	**66.7%**
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	47	125	61	4	0	0	72.6%
Graphics	23	23	5	1	0	190	97.9%
Total Percentage of Students Scoring into Level	22%	41%	20%	2%	0%	16%	
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better	63%						

Appendix 4 (continued): 2015-16 Results for the Assessment of ILO#1 – Communication

Oral Communication Rubric Scores							
Total Number of students enrolled in assessed courses: 38 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 32	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
General Purpose	16	11	3	2	0	0	84 %
Organization	18	9	3	2	0	0	84%
Language	15	15	2	0	0	0	94%
Delivery Techniques (oral/visual)	**13**	**6**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**12**	**59%**
Evidence Based Support	17	7	4	0	4	0	75%
Total Percentage of Students Scoring into Level	49%	30%	8%	3%	3%	8%	
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better	79%						

Appendix 5: 2020-21 Results for the Assessment of ILO#1 – Communication

Institutional Learning Outcome #1: Communication	**Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. *(Communication)***						
Total Number of students enrolled in assessed courses: 672 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 601	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
Total Percentage of Students Scoring into Level	49.8%	31.6%	13.5%	4.1%	1.0%	8.2%	81.4%
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better	81.4%						
Written Communication Rubric Scores							
Total Number of students enrolled in assessed courses: 581 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 526	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
Audience, Context and Purpose	264	169	68	20	5	0	82.3%
Content Development	**251**	**156**	**81**	**27**	**6**	**5**	**78.1%**
Sources and Evidence	249	154	72	23	6	22	80.0%
Organization and Presentation	267	147	79	30	3	0	78.7%
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	**220**	**195**	**78**	**26**	**7**	**0**	**78.9%**
Graphics	118	116	40	6	4	242	82.4%
Total Percentage of Students Scoring into Level	47.4%	32.5%	14.5%	4.6%	1.1%	9.3%	
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better	**79.9%**						

Appendix 5 (continued): 2020-21 Results for the Assessment of ILO#1 – Communication

Oral Communication Rubric Scores							
Total Number of students enrolled in assessed courses: 91 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 75	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
General Purpose	51	18	6	0	0	0	92.0%
Organization	54	16	5	0	0	0	93.3%
Language	47	25	2	1	0	0	96.0%
Delivery Techniques (oral/visual)	50	19	6	0	0	0	92.0%
Evidence Based Support	55	15	5	0	0	0	93.3%
Total Percentage of Students Scoring into Level	68.5%	24.8%	6.4%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better	**93.3%**						