ANALYSIS OF CORE LEARNING OUTCOMES

A. Overview

1. Academic Year:

2019-20

The unusual circumstances of the 2019-20 academic year should be noted. During spring term CGCC campuses were closed to students and faculty as a result of the covid-19 coronavirus epidemic. All spring term courses were taught remotely. Spring term was reduced to 10 weeks to provide instructors an extra week prior to the start of term to prepare and adjust courses for remote learning.

2. Core Learning Outcome (CLO) Assessed:

#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).*

3. Level at which the competency is assessed:

The majority of courses chosen were at the 200-level to reflect assessment of work students would be completing towards the end of their degree. The exceptions were GS 106, 108 and 109 (the instructor polled her students and found that the majority of them were taking these courses during their second year); and MTH 111 and 112, as these are often the last math courses many students take at CGCC.

B. Recommendations, Action, and Analysis from Previous Year

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

Recommendation 1. The committee recommended that faculty 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 were 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.

It was recommended that the AAC compile a list of these resources to support faculty instruction in this area and post to the Institutional Core Learning Outcomes website. Faculty were to 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 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.

Actions: The Academic Assessment Coordinator (AAC) compiled a list of Strategies and Resources for Teaching to CLO#5: Community and Environmental Responsibility developed by faculty during fall in-service 2019. This list was developed with the intention of supporting faculty instruction in the area indicated by the results of the assessment of CLO#5, focusing on the categories where the fewest students scored into accomplished or better: "Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Contexts" and "Understanding Global Systems". The list was posted to the Institutional Core Learning Outcomes website, along with the lists of resources and strategies for CLO #1(*Communication*) , CLO#2 (*Critical Thinking/Problem-Solving*) and CLO#4 (*Cultural Awareness*). 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 then 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, CLO#4 in 2022-23 and CLO#5 in 2023-24 to determine the impact of these interventions.

Results: To be analyzed following the 2nd assessment of CLO#5 in 2023-24.

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.

Actions: Actions have yet to be taken in this area. The General Education department will be completing a program review in 2020-21 using 5 years' worth of CLO assessment data that could potentially lead to a Gen Ed redesign that would be similar in nature to a Guided Pathways model.

Results: To be determined in 2020-21

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.

Actions: This recommendation was made to the college's Instructional Council in the fall of 2019. No further actions have been taken towards this recommendation. There is the potential that this

recommendation may be implemented as a result of the General Education department examining the data from the CLO assessments as part of their program review.

Results: To be determined

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.

Actions: Actions towards this recommendation will be implemented during the second phase of CLO assessment. The first workshop is planned for fall in-service of 2020-21. Members of the CLO Assessment Committee will facilitate a workshop designed to help faculty develop assessments that can be used to assess CLO#1 and any course-level communication outcomes. The Written Communication Rubric and Oral Communication Rubric will be used as a guide to develop the assessments.

Future in-service workshops/presentations will focus on faculty and/or department collaborative exercises to create assignments that are more specific to the criteria of the rubrics for the CLO that will be assessed each year, replacing the exercise of collaborating to create Strategies and Resources for Teaching to CLOs.

Results: to be determined

4. 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 during 2019-20

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

1. Overview of methodology used for assessment:

During the 2019-20 academic year, the third Core Learning Outcome (CLO) was assessed: "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*)." 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 Quantitative Literacy 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 would be taking towards the end of their degree (sophomore or 200-level courses) were asked to assess student achievement of the Institutional Core Learning Outcome: Quantitative Literacy. These upper level courses were chosen with the understanding that students, in theory, would have had a few freshman level courses that included quantitative literacy as a course outcome, allowing CGCC to assess students who were closer to graduation and who had had more instruction and practice in building quantitative literacy skills. Three 100-level science courses were included after the instructor polled students to ensure the majority of them were taking these courses in their second year. Students from MTH 111 and 112 were also assessed, as these are often the last math courses that many students take prior to graduation.

Each term, instructors who were teaching courses that addressed quantitative literacy in-depth or minimally, as indicated in the CCOGSs, were contacted to determine if they had a suitable assessment to be scored using the adapted Quantitative Literacy rubric. Instructors were then responsible for scoring the student artifacts using the rubric, and submitting the results to a web form. Instructors also had the option to include a rationale or analysis to help explain student scores.

In looking at the methodology, it is important to remember that assessment of Institutional Core Learning Outcomes is different than Course Assessment or Instructor Evaluations: CGCC is compiling information on student achievement of CLOs in order to be analyzed by the Core Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee and shared with CGCC faculty to determine where adjustments and improvements need to be made. Assessment of Institutional Core Learning Outcomes is **not** about an individual instructor or an individual course: the purpose is to obtain a snap-shot on a more global perspective of student ability in formal college-level quantitative literacy.

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 quantitative literacy as a course outcome or indicated that CLO #3 was addressed in depth. A list of suggested courses was sent by the AAC to each Department Chair (DC) for consideration. DCs 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 third 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 Quantitative Literacy rubric. If it was determined that instructors did not have an appropriate assignment for this purpose, the course was removed from the list of courses used to assess CLO#3.

4) 6th week of term (fall/winter): 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 Quantitative Literacy rubric to be used to score each individual student's assignment, and instructions for submitting the scores on the web form. During spring term, an email that included the instructions and individual scoring rubric was emailed to all 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. 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 2020: The CLO Assessment Committee met to review and analyze results, provide recommendations based on the results to improve student achievement of CLO#3, 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 quantitative literacy. 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 implementing strategies to support students in achievement of CLO#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 CLO#1, #2, #3, #4 and #5 when they complete Part B of Course Outcomes Assessment.

3. Sampling information:

385 students were enrolled in the 23 courses from 6 disciplines. A total of 321 student artifacts were scored using the Quantitative Literacy rubric by the instructors of those courses.

Assessment Instrument(s):

The Quantitative Literacy 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 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 Quantitative Literacy rubric). Per Recommendation 2 from the 2017-18 CLO Analysis, the CLO Assessment Committee anticipated that the adapted student achievement categories would be less influential on instructor decisions, and instead instructors would focus on the performance indicators for guidance.

Data Analysis Procedures:

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

D. Results

1. Describe results of assessment work related to competency:

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

Results for Quantitative Literacy:

A total of 385 students were enrolled in the courses that participated in the assessment of the CLO Quantitative Literacy. Of those students, 321 completed the assignments and were scored using the Quantitative Literacy rubric. A total of 60.97% of those students scored into the levels of 3 and 4 (accomplished or better). 19.88% of students scored into the category of 2 (developing) and 12% of students scored into the category of 1 (beginning). 7.14% scored into "not demonstrated" and 1.85% were scored into the "not applicable" category.

Institutional Core Learning Outcome #3:	Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can: 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)							
Quantitative Literacy Total Number of students enrolled 385 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 321	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total numbers for Accomplished or better	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
CLO: Quantitative Literacy: Interpretation: TOTALS	124	113	51	27	6	0	237	73.83%
CLO: Quantitative Literacy: Representation: TOTALS	120	87	76	13	25	0	207	64.49%
CLO: Quantitative Literacy: Calculation: TOTALS	131	83	42	16	27	22	214	71.57%
CLO: Quantitative Literacy: Application/Analysis: TOTALS	83	88	94	43	13	0	171	53.27%
CLO: Quantitative Literacy: Assumptions: TOTALS	97	62	62	55	32	13	159	51.62%
CLO: Quantitative Literacy: Communication: TOTALS	105	60	51	73	32	0	165	51.40%
Total number of students scored into category using Quantitative Literacy Rubric	660	493	376	227	135	35	1153	60.97%
Total percentage of students scored into category using Quantitative Literacy Rubric	34.90%	26.07%	19.88%	12.00%	7.14%	1.85%		
Total Percentage of students who scored into Accomplished or Better with Quantitative Literacy Rubric* * Students who were scored into "Not/Applicable" are not included in total.	60.97%							

E. Analysis of Results

Assessment at this level measures whether CGCC degree-seeking students can demonstrate the Institutional Core Learning Outcomes at a two-year lower-division competency level. (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 (60.97%) of students who scored into accomplished or better for quantitative literacy 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: "Application and Analysis" (53.27%) and "Assumptions" (51.62%). Although the category of "Communication" also had a low percentage of students scoring into accomplished or better (51.40%), the committee reasoned that the ability to identify and explain "Assumptions" as well as conduct "Application and Analysis" needed to be improved prior to "Communication" in order that the student would have something to communicate. The committee also thought that the skill of communicating results could be addressed by the activities faculty are already integrating into their teaching to support CLO#1: Communication.

The committee discussed why students seemed to struggle in these last three categories, concluding that the ability to "apply", "analyze", evaluate "assumptions" and use quantitative information to support an argument, requires higher cognitive abilities. Students are required to go beyond computation and actually think critically about the data.

In terms of the connection between the achievement of CLO#3 and the General Education program, the committee wondered what these results might mean for teaching math at CGCC. The foundational skills related to quantitative literacy are often first learned in math courses, and then carried over into other courses (General Education courses require, at the very minimum, completion of MTH 20 for this very reason). Similarly, many CGCC programs do not require students to complete math classes beyond Introductory Algebra (MTH 65), and it's possible that students are not getting enough practice in these higher level quantitative literacy skills related to critical thinking. One math faculty who scored student work commented that in terms of students struggling with application and analysis, it seemed that students "haven't been taught to think along those lines". Another math faculty noted when scoring student work for "assumptions" that analyzing their assumptions was not part of the assignment: "*This assignment did not expect students to look at assumptions. But trust me, this means something very specific to mathematicians. The math might be right, but that doesn't mean you get a good answer. Everything depends on the assumptions made. It is the assumptions, after all, that lead us to pick one mathematical model over another."* After making changes to teaching and assessments for courses taught the following term, this same faculty member stated that time was spent "*trying to get them to realize that the assumptions we make lead to the type of equation we are going to use (constant growth,*

constant percent growth, and so on...). But projects beyond those weren't really showing that. And I saw the same thing again. It wouldn't surprise me if that's an issue across the board for this particular outcome. And I know I will have to emphasize it in all my classes and not just math 111." This faculty's realization mirrors the committee's that more focus needs to be placed on analysis, application and evaluation of assumptions. The committee also concluded that the critical thinking skills of application, analysis and evaluating assumptions are not just attributed to quantitative literacy and math. The concepts of application, analysis and evaluating assumptions are applicable across all disciplines and all faculty could contribute towards instruction in these areas.

The committee further determined that upon completion of a two year degree, it's reasonable to expect CGCC students to achieve the level of "accomplished" in all areas identified by the rubric. While the committee recognizes that the last three categories are difficult and require more critical thinking, the committee feels that community colleges have a greater responsibility for these foundational skills so that students can successfully transfer to a 4-year school and/or demonstrate competency in the workforce.

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 the scope of supporting student attainment of these skills be broadened to include other disciplines as well. The committee recommends that faculty continue the process that they started during spring in-service 2016, and work together to develop strategies that they can integrate into their instruction and assessment that help students to move towards the level of accomplishment or better in application/analysis and the ability to make and evaluate assumptions. The AAC will compile a list of resources to support faculty instruction in these areas and post this list to the Institutional Core Learning Outcomes website. Faculty will be reminded of their commitment to increase or integrate instruction for application/analysis and assumptions 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#3 will be assessed again in 2024-25 to determine the impact of these interventions.

   Recommendation 2. The committee recommends that the college have a conversation about how to incorporate the analytical skills taught in the math department into lower level math courses.

   Recommendation 3. The committee recommends that faculty embrace a more intentional approach to teaching the concepts addressed by the rubrics. This intentionality would include using the words and terminology from the rubrics with our students, as well as educating them about how the content of General Education courses are tied to their attainment of CLOs. One suggestion would be to include the assignments supporting student achievement of CLOs in the syllabi, as an

addition to the requirement that all Gen Ed syllabi include the CLO major and minor designations. Workshops are planned to be offered during fall 2020 in-service to support faculty towards this goal.

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

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

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 quantitative literacy implicitly supports the General Education program's Recommendation 2 by making changes to course curriculum and delivery to better prepare students for the roles of citizens of the US and the world.

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 inability to distinguish those students who are in their last term from those who may be new to college level coursework

An extensive discussion occurred during the annual meeting regarding how to improve the assessment method. Suggestions included using capstones and e-portfolios, methods already adopted by programs such as Early Childhood Education, Entrepreneurship/Business Management, and the Elementary Educator Transfer Pathway. For 2020-21, the committee agreed that CGCC should continue to have faculty score their own student work until 1) the General Education Program Review has been completed and 2) the use of capstones and e-portfolios have been assessed. The committee acknowledges, however, that the process can be improved in 2020-21 by aiding faculty in creating appropriate assignments that can be scored by the rubrics and better educating faculty regarding the descriptors.

H. Faculty Involvement

Describe faculty involvement in the assessment and analysis process.

8 faculty from 6 disciplines were involved in the assessment of the CLO:

Fall Term: Gretchen Gebhardt (GS 106), Emilie Miller (BI 211 and BI 234), Pam Morse (MTH 111), Abel Wolman (MTH 243).

Winter Term: John Evans (MTH 243 and MTH 252), Gretchen Gebhardt (GS 109), Emilie Miller (BI 211 and BI 212), Todd Meislahn (BA 211), Pam Morse (MTH 111), Chris Spengler (EET 252), David Wagenblast (EC 201).

Spring Term: John Evans (MTH 112 and MTH 253), Gretchen Gebhardt (GS 108), Emilie Miller (BI 211), Todd Meislahn (BA 212 and BA 213), Pam Morse (MTH 111), David Wagenblast (EC 202).

4 faculty and the director of accreditation and assessment 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 2020 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: Quantitative Literacy
3. Institutional Core Learning Outcome Assessment Schedule

Report on the analysis of CLO#3 completed by: Kristen Kane with the help of the CLO Assessment Committee (Susan Lewis, Zip Krummel, Gretchen Gebhardt and Katy Jablonski)

Date: 9.17.20