

ANALYSIS OF CORE LEARNING OUTCOMES

A. Overview

1. Academic Year:
2018-19

2. Core Learning Outcome (CLO) Assessed:

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

3. Level at which the competency is assessed:

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

B. Recommendations, Action, and Analysis from Previous Year

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

Recommendation 1. The Core Learning Outcome (CLO) committee recommended 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.

Actions: The Academic Assessment Coordinator (AAC) compiled a list of [Ideas and Resources for Teaching to CLO#4](#): Cultural Awareness developed by faculty during fall in-service 2018. This list was developed with the intention of supporting faculty instruction in the area indicated by the results of the assessment of CLO#4, focusing on cultural curiosity. The list was posted to the [Institutional Core Learning Outcomes website](#), along with the lists of resources and strategies for [CLO #1 \(Communication\)](#) and [CLO#2 \(Critical Thinking/Problem-Solving\)](#). Faculty have been reminded of their commitment to increase or integrate instruction for the areas identified for each of the CLOs when they completed Part A of course outcomes assessment. Faculty reported out on what they did to support students in achieving each CLO at a higher level when completing Part B. The AAC has tracked these interventions, on a spreadsheet. CLO #1 will be assessed again in 2020-21, CLO #2 in 2021-22 and CLO#4 in 2022-23 to determine the impact of these interventions.

Results: To be analyzed following the 2nd assessment of CLO#4

Recommendation 2. To address the concerns of inflated scoring and lack of norming, it was recommended that a better explanation of the difference between “not demonstrated” and “not applicable” be included on the rubric. It was also recommended that the AAC work with IT to include a box for faculty comments on the web form, so that scoring may be further explained.

Actions: The following explanations were included on the rubric:

- “not demonstrated”: Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (level one) level performance.

- “not applicable”: Evaluators are encouraged to assign “not applicable” if student work was not required to address a category

A box for faculty comments was also included on the web form with instructions to include an explanation for any criterion that was scored as “Not Applicable”.

Results: The table below shows the changes in the percentage of students scored into the categories of “not demonstrated” and “not applicable” over the past 4 years.

Table 1. Percentage of Students Scored into “Not Demonstrated” and “Not Applicable”

| | 2015-16 CLO#1 | 2016-17 CLO#2 | 2017-18 CLO#4 | 2018-19 CLO#5 |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| % of students scored into “not demonstrated” | 1 | 2 | 0.87 | 4.71 |
| % of students scored into “not applicable” | 12 | 4 | 8.45 | 7.25 |

The CLO Assessment Committee assumed that the higher percentage of students scored into the “not demonstrated” category may be indicative of faculty having a better understanding of the difference between “not demonstrated” and “not applicable”.

The following explanations demonstrate the effectiveness of using the web form to track instructor rationales for scoring Not Applicable. Instructor clarifications helped the committee determine whether a score truly should be in the “not demonstrated” category (meaning that student work did not meet benchmark performance level) or whether the course or assignment used for scoring did not address the criteria:

- *Assignment did not require an examination of effects at a global level*
- *This one was a real stretch, however, as we don't really cover "global systems" in American Literature...nor is it an action-oriented class*
- *This course does not require any implementation of action*
- *This was a tough one, I did not ask students to address their own responsibilities in relation to Volcanic Hazards and Mitigation, although a few addressed in a basic way*
- *Assignment required a historical and contemporary overview, did not require intervention or specific action on a global level*
- *Ethical consequences of different market structures were not required in this assignment*

To other factors that may have affected student scores:

- *Abnormal amounts of snow days this term that might have impacted the quality of work the students submitted at the end of the term. Many were stressed and overwhelmed with other courses cramming in material in the last few weeks.*

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

Actions: To be implemented 2020-21

Results: Although this recommendation will not be implemented until 2020-21, the committee continues to feel strongly that faculty require training to become more familiar with the criteria of each

rubric. Plans are progressing to provide faculty opportunities to develop specific assignments that can be scored using the criteria of each rubric during the next cycle of CLO assessment. This exercise should help faculty with norming of their scoring of student artifacts.

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

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

Results: The committee determined that it is reasonable to expect CGCC students to achieve the level of “accomplished” (level 3) for CLO #5 “Recognize the consequences of human activity upon our social and natural world. The committee considered that the level of knowledge, skills and attitudes expected for level 4, mastery, as described by the adapted LEAP rubric for community and environmental responsibility, are outside of the realm of this community college’s expectations and responsibilities.

Recommendation 5. To address the potential deficiency of degree-seeking students receiving instruction of this CLO, as a result of limited courses and the lack of requirements for students to take courses that address cultural literacy, the committee supported a recommendation that the college move towards some form of Guided Pathways.

Actions: Several of the CLO committee members participated in the Strategic Planning winter/spring term meetings to establish new strategic goals for CGCC for 2019-2024. A strategic goal to develop an institutional guided pathways model was established

Results: Some of the CLO Committee members participated on the Strategic Planning Team that addressed Goal #3: Establish an Institutional Guided Pathways Model. Four goals were established for 2019-20: 1) Establish a Guided Pathways Team; 2) Develop a four year plan for development and implementation; 3) Identify the data points and institutional benchmarks for tracking Guided Pathways implementation and success; 4) Populate meta-majors: programs and curriculum

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

During 2018-19, the majority of CGCC courses were taken through Curriculum Committee to update which ones address the new CLO#3: Extract, interpret, evaluate, communicate, and apply quantitative information and methods to solve problems, evaluate claims, and support decisions in their academic, professional and private lives. (Quantitative Literacy).

Course alignment to CLOs were also updated to identify which courses address the CLOs as a Major designation: *1. the outcome is addressed recurrently in the curriculum, regularly enough to establish a thorough understanding. 2. Students can demonstrate and are assessed on a thorough understanding of the outcome. The course includes at least one assignment that can be assessed by applying the appropriate [CLO rubric](#).*

and/or as a Minor Designation: *1. The outcome is addressed adequately in the curriculum, establishing fundamental understanding. 2. Students can demonstrate and are assessed on a fundamental understanding of the outcome. The course includes at least one assignment that can be assessed by applying the appropriate [CLO rubric](#).*

Instructors are also required to indicate CLO alignment on their syllabi in an effort to make students aware of which courses provide instruction for which CLOs.

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

1. Overview of methodology used for assessment:

During the 2018-19 academic year, the fifth Core Learning Outcome (CLO) was assessed: “Recognize the consequences of human activity upon our social and natural world. (*Community and Environmental Responsibility*).” An interdisciplinary team, the Core Learning Outcome Assessment Committee, met at the beginning of the academic year to review the process from the previous year and make suggestions for improvement. The CLO Assessment team also adapted the [Global Learning Value rubric](#) from AACU’s ([Association of American Colleges and Universities](#)) LEAP ([Liberal Education and America’s Promise](#)) Value ([Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education](#)) Rubrics (<http://www.aacu.org/>)

Instructors who taught courses that students could potentially be taking towards the end of their degree (sophomore or 200-level courses) were asked to assess student achievement of the Institutional Core Learning Outcome #5: Community and Environmental Responsibility. These upper level courses were chosen with the understanding that students, in theory, would have had a few freshman level courses that may include community and/or environmental responsibility as a course outcome, allowing CGCC to assess students who were closer to graduation and who had had more instruction and practice in building community/environmental responsibility skills.

Each term, instructors who were teaching courses with a major or minor designation for addressing community and/or environmental responsibility, as indicated in the CCOGs, were contacted to determine if they had a suitable assignment to be scored using the adapted [Community and Environmental](#) rubric. Instructors were then responsible for scoring the student artifacts using the rubric, and submitting the results to a web form. Instructors also had the option to include a rationale or analysis to help explain student scores, in particular any student work scored as “Not Applicable”.

2. Summary of timeline and steps in assessment process:

1) Week prior to start of term: The academic assessment coordinator (AAC) looked at the CCOGs of courses and selected those courses that either listed community and/or environmental responsibility as a course outcome or had a major or minor designation for addressing CLO #5. A list of suggested courses was sent by the AAC to each Department Chair (DC) for consideration. DC’s responded either confirming the selection or recommending revisions.

2) 2nd - 3rd week of term: Once a course was confirmed by the DC, instructors were contacted via email by the AAC informing them that their course had been selected for assessment of the fifth CLO. Information about the process of assessing CLOs was provided, as were directions and links to the rubric.

3) 3rd - 4th week of term: the AAC contacted the instructor again to determine whether they had an appropriate assignment that could be scored with the [Community and Environmental](#) rubric.* If it was determined that instructors did not have an appropriate assignment for this purpose, they either volunteered to create or adapt an existing assignment or the course was removed from the list of courses used to assess CLO#5.

* The faculty training supporting the development of the assignment(s) to be assessed using the CLO rubrics, as required for a major/minor designation, is scheduled to begin in the 2019 fall pre-service.

- 4) 6th week of term: packets were created by the AAC and curriculum and assessment administrative assistant (CAAA) and distributed to the instructors. Within the packets were paper copies of the [Community and Environmental](#) rubric to be used to score each individual student's assignment, and instructions for submitting the scores on the web form.
- 5) End of term - week after end of term: Instructors scored student assignments using the rubric and input the totals for each category of the rubric in the web form. Adjunct faculty submitted time cards for up to 3 hours to be paid at the Special Project Rate. The AAC compiled the results at the end of each term into a spreadsheet.
- 6) Beginning of summer term: the AAC compiled the results for all terms.
- 7) 2 weeks before fall term 2019: The CLO Assessment Committee met to review and analyze results, provide recommendations based on the results to improve student achievement of CLO#5, review the CLO assessment process and make recommendations for improvement to the process.
- 8) Fall In-service: Results will be shared with faculty, as well as the committee's recommendations to help improve student achievement of community and environmental responsibility. Faculty will use time during in-service to develop strategies for instruction, curriculum and/or assessment based on the committee's recommendations.
- 9) Faculty will be reminded of their commitment to implement strategies to support students in achievement of CLO#1, #2, #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 CLO#1, #2, #4 and #5 when they complete Part B of Course Outcomes Assessment.

3. Sampling information:

365 students were enrolled in the 22 200-level courses from 12 disciplines. A total of 333 student artifacts were scored using the [Community and Environmental Responsibility rubric](#) by the instructors of those courses.

4. Assessment Instrument(s):

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

The CLO Assessment Committee's adaptations to the LEAP Rubrics included changes to some of the performance indicators and a renaming of the student achievement categories from Capstone (4); Milestones (3 and 2); and Benchmark (1) ([LEAP VALUE Rubrics](#)) to 4; 3; 2; 1; Not Demonstrated; and Not Applicable ([CGCC Community and Environmental Responsibility rubric](#)). Per Recommendation 2 from the 2017-18 CLO Analysis, the CLO Assessment Committee anticipated that the adapted student achievement categories would be less influential on instructor decisions, and instead instructors would focus on the performance indicators for guidance.

5. Data Analysis Procedures:

Once instructors scored the student artifacts using the adapted LEAP Value Rubric for Community and Environmental Responsibility, results were gathered by the AAC and presented to the CLO Assessment

Committee. The CLO Assessment Committee analyzed both the results and the process. The analysis was recorded during the meeting and captured in this analysis template.

D. Results

1. Describe results of assessment work related to competency:

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

A total of 365 students were enrolled in the courses that participated in the assessment of the CLO Community and Environmental Responsibility. Of those students, 333 completed the assignments and were scored using the [Community and Environmental Responsibility rubric](#). A total of 63.74% of those students scored into the levels of 3 and 4 (accomplished or better). 24.17% of students scored into the category of 2 (developing) and 7.38% of students scored into the category of 1 (beginning). 4.71% scored into “not demonstrated” and 7.25% were scored into the “not applicable” category.

Table 2. [Results for Community and Environmental Responsibility](#)

| Institutional Core 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) | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|--------------|------------|-----------|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| 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 numbers for Accomplished or better | Total Percentage for Accomplished or better |
| CLO: Community and Environmental Responsibility: Global Self-Awareness: TOTALS | 109 | 117 | 67 | 25 | 4 | 11 | 226 | 70.19% |
| CLO: Community and Environmental Responsibility: Perspective Taking: TOTALS | 96 | 129 | 63 | 14 | 7 | 24 | 225 | 72.82% |
| CLO: Community and Environmental Responsibility: Understanding Global Systems : TOTALS | 85 | 87 | 93 | 43 | 8 | 17 | 172 | 54.43% |
| CLO: Community and Environmental Responsibility: Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Contexts: TOTALS | 89 | 66 | 68 | 20 | 48 | 42 | 155 | 53.26% |
| CLO: Community and Environmental Responsibility: Attitudes: Personal and Social Responsibility: TOTALS | 105 | 119 | 89 | 14 | 7 | 20 | 224 | 67.07% |
| Total Number of Students Scoring with Community and Environmental Responsibility Rubric | 484 | 518 | 380 | 116 | 74 | 114 | 1002 | 63.74% |
| Total Percentage of Students Scoring with Community and Environmental Responsibility Rubric | 30.79% | 32.95% | 24.17% | 7.38% | 4.71% | 7.25% | | |
| Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better with Community and Environmental Responsibility Rubric* * Students who were scored into "Not/Applicable" are not included in total. | 63.74% | | | | | | | |

2. Limitations

What were the limitations of the assessment?

- 1) As noted in the analysis of CLO#1, 2 and 4 in previous years, it cannot be ignored that faculty scoring of their own student artifacts leads to a certain amount of subjectivity in determining results. Although the committee has considered alternative methods for scoring student work, such as paying to have artifacts scored using the AACU's Multi-State Collaborative, the committee decided that the college should complete this first cycle of assessment using the current process to create a baseline of student achievement for each CLO using consistent methodology.
- 2) Norming continues to be a limitation of this assessment work. The committee recognizes that the rubrics and the process are still new to instructors, and as a result faculty may not be familiar with or have an accurate understanding of the criteria for each category of the rubric yet. During the 2019 meeting, the CLO Assessment discussed plans for the next cycle of CLO assessment (2020-2025) to include time during faculty in-service to create assignments specific to the rubrics which may help increase familiarity and norming.
- 3) This particular CLO and the rubric address two different themes: Community Responsibility and Environmental Responsibility. The committee recognized that many courses that align with this CLO most likely only teach to either community responsibility or environmental responsibility, and that as a result student artifacts scored with this rubric may not address one of the themes. The committee considered that this division of themes may be partly responsible for the high percentage (7.25%) of students scored into "not applicable".
- 4) Currently the college does not have a means to identify which students in the 200-level General Education courses used for CLO assessment are close to graduation. While the committee recognizes that student achievement of Institutional Core Learning Outcomes would best be assessed after a student has had sufficient instruction in multiple courses, there is no means to ensure that the assessment is taking place during a student's final term.

E. Analysis of Results

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

1. Discussion and Implications

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

While the total percentage (63.74%) of students who scored into accomplished or better for community and environmental responsibility provides a number to determine if CGCC is meeting its mission for Core Themes, this overall percentage does not provide enough meaning to be used by the committee in their analysis of student achievement of this CLO. In order to make a more informed analysis, the committee looked to student achievement scores for each specific category of the rubric. Since the AACU rubrics are used not only to assess student achievement of the CLO's, but also to inform CGCC where faculty can work together to focus instruction, as in previous years, the committee decided to focus on the categories where the fewest students scored into accomplished or better: "Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Contexts" (53.26%) and "Understanding Global Systems" (54.43%). The committee found it interesting to note that

these two categories both address community and environmental responsibility on a more global scale, while the other categories that had significantly higher percentages of students scoring into accomplished or better addressed community and environmental responsibility on a more personal level (“Global Self-Awareness 70.19%; “Perspective Taking” *72.82%; “Personal and Social Responsibility 67.07%).

The committee contemplated why students’ had difficulty understanding the impact of community and environmental responsibility on a more global scale, yet had a much greater understanding of community and environmental responsibility on a more personal level. Some faculty committee members stated that they were not surprised at the difference of student understanding between the global level and the personal level since often when global issues are discussed in class students seem shocked and unformed. It was hypothesized that perhaps students are currently tuning out of political and global issues and focusing more on personal awareness and relationships.

Rationales from the web form required when students were scored into “not applicable” also indicate that faculty may not be teaching or assessing the concept of community/environmental responsibility at the global level. The committee recommends that faculty focus their instruction in a concerted effort to move more students from the beginning and developing levels for “Understanding Global Systems” and “Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Contexts” to the level of accomplished. This means that students would not only understand their own personal responsibility in the challenges to communities and the environment, but would also develop a deeper understanding of community and environmental responsibility on a more global level.

In terms of the connection between the achievement of CLO#5 and the General Education program, the committee was concerned that many of our degree-seeking students may never take a course that addresses or instructs in community and environmental responsibility. Since students are not required to take a General Education course that addresses community and environmental responsibility, CGCC could potentially have many graduates who never receive instruction in this CLO.

The committee also expressed concern that this CLO addressed two different aspects: community responsibility and environmental responsibility. As a result it may be difficult for faculty to teach to or ensure student accomplishment of this CLO.

F. Recommendations and Action Items

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

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

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

*Perspective Taking is defined on the rubric as “the ability to engage and learn from perspectives and experiences different from one’s own and to understand how one’s place in the world both informs and limits one’s knowledge.”

encouraged to participate in this goal, since accountability for student achievement of Core 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 CLOs, 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 Core 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 CLO at a higher level when completing Part B. The AAC will track these interventions on a spreadsheet and CLO#5 will be assessed again in 2023-24 to determine the impact of these interventions.

Recommendation 2. To address the potential deficiency of degree-seeking students receiving instruction of this CLO, 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 CLOs are addressed.

Recommendation 3. The committee recommends that Instructional Council consider adopting a 6th CLO, splitting CLO#5 into two separate Core Learning Outcomes: Community Responsibility and Environmental Responsibility. The committee noted that the inclusion of environmental responsibility in the college's Core 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 Core Learning Outcome, better supporting CGCC's identity as a green institution. Focusing on environmental responsibility as a 6th Core Learning Outcome will also allow the college to focus more instruction on this CLO, thus having a greater impact on students.

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 CLO 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 CLO in their classes, adapted to specific course content or used as examples for faculty to develop their own assignments.

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

The 2016 General Education Program Review's 2nd recommendation was to "Revamp the program to align it more fully with its mission, especially its goals of providing a common experience and preparing students for the roles as citizens of the US and the world." As described in the General Education Program's Mission, CGCC's common educational experience "is defined by CGCC's Core Learning Outcomes and is developed primarily through a set of general education course requirements that all students take, regardless of their major. Ultimately, the mission of the General Education program at CGCC is to provide our students with a

common experience and set of skills that prepare students for success in their majors, as citizens of the US and the world and in their personal and professional lives after graduation.” The action of CGCC faculty intentionally providing resources and extra support for students to improve achievement in a global understanding of 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.

G. Evaluate the Assessment Strategy

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

Given that the assessment methods and LEAP rubrics developed by the AACU, have been tested and widely adopted by post-secondary institutions across the US, it is probably safe to say that the assessment methods were accurate indicators of student achievement. As noted in the limitations the committee does have some concerns:

- The subjectivity of faculty scoring their own student artifacts.
- The lack of norming when using the rubric to score student artifacts
- The difficulty of using one rubric to assess the two separate themes of community responsibility and environmental responsibility
- The inability to distinguish those students who are in their last term from those who may be new to college level coursework

The committee agrees that CGCC should continue to have faculty score their own student artifacts establishing a baseline for each CLO. The committee acknowledges, however, that the process can be improved by aiding faculty in creating appropriate assignments that can be scored by the rubrics and educating faculty regarding the descriptors.

H. Faculty Involvement

Describe faculty involvement in the assessment and analysis process.

13 faculty from 12 disciplines were involved in the assessment of the CLO (compared to 10 faculty in the previous year):

Fall Term: John Copp (HST 201), Gretchen Gebhardt (G208), Leigh Hancock (ENG 222), Ronda Hull (HEC 201), Zip Krummel (PSY 215), Emilie Miller (BI 211), and Lorie Saito (NUR 210).

Winter Term: Gretchen Gebhardt (G 202), Leigh Hancock (ENG 253), Ronda Hull (HE 262), Raymond Kempf (PHL 201), Zip Krummel (PSY 239), Christopher Lindsay (BA 285), Emilie Miller (BI 211), Diane Uto (COMM 237), David Wagenblast (EC 201), and Mandy Webster (WS 201)

Spring Term: Leigh Hancock (ENG 254), Kristen Kane (PSY 215), Emilie Miller (BI 234), David Wagenblast (EC 202), and Mandy Webster (WS202).

4 faculty and the director of curriculum, assessment, strategic planning and accreditation were involved in analysis process: Gretchen Gebhardt, Katy Jablonski, Kristen Kane, Zip Krummel, and Susan Lewis.

I. Additional Comments

1. While assessment of the CLOs is in part, to comply with the requirements for NWCCU and accreditation, it's important to state that CGCC's commitment to the assessment of CLOs is the result of our promise to students that: Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can:
 1. Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. *(Communication)*
 2. Creatively solve problems by using relevant methods of research, personal reflection, reasoning, and evaluation of information. *(Critical thinking and Problem-Solving)*
 3. Extract, interpret, evaluate, communicate, and apply quantitative information and methods to solve problems, evaluate claims, and support decisions in their academic, professional and private lives. *(Quantitative Literacy)*
 4. Use an understanding of cultural differences to constructively address issues that arise in the workplace and community. *(Cultural Awareness)*
 5. Recognize the consequences of human activity upon our social and natural world. *(Community and Environmental Responsibility)*

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

Results, analysis and committee recommendations will be shared with faculty during the fall 2019 in-service. The results and analysis documents will also be shared with faculty through a faculty-wide email and be posted on the Academic Assessment/Institutional Core Learning Outcomes webpage in an effort towards transparency for our students and community.

J. Appendices

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

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

Report on the analysis of CLO#5 completed by: Kristen Kane with the help of the CLO Assessment Committee (Susan Lewis, Zip Krummel, Gretchen Gebhardt and Katy Jablonski)

Date: 9.10.19