2020-21 ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOMES

Section One: Overview

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

A. Academic Year:

2020-21

B. Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) Assessed:

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

C. 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 WR 121 and 122. These 100-level writing courses were recommended by the Writing Department with the rationale that these are often the last writing courses that most degree-seeking students would take at CGCC before they graduated.

As recommended by the ILO Assessment Committee when this ILO was last assessed in 2015-16, the expectation is that students should achieve the level of Accomplished (3) by the time that they graduate from CGCC with a 2-year degree.

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

A. Previous year ILO was assessed

2015-16

B. List recommendations from previous reviews:

2015-16 had one recommendation related to the assessment of the Communication ILO:

It is recommended by the ILO Assessment Committee that actions be taken by all faculty in their classes, since accountability for student achievement of Institutional Learning Outcomes is the responsibility of all faculty as indicated by their CCOGs when they specify that they address the ILO, Communication, in depth and/or list some kind of communication course outcome.

The Committee recommends that faculty of CGCC focus on 2 objectives for the next year and a half to be chosen from: "Sources and Evidence" and/or "Organization and Presentation" (for written communication) and /or "Delivery" for oral communication. As Faculty In-Service is in the process of being revamped, there is potential for faculty training opportunities. Training could be developed, led by the writing and speech departments, so that instructors in all courses could add intrinsic teaching and assessment for the 2 objectives. These workshops could also contribute to creating a common language with regard to communication across the campus. This training could be presented during Spring In-service (or as Winter Professional Development Training). Faculty could begin to implement a plan to address increased instruction in these areas starting spring term 2017. Increased instruction, on an

institutional level, in these areas could continue and the effectiveness of this focus on these 2 areas could be assessed during the next scheduled assessment of the Communication ILO in 2020-21.

C. Summarize actions taken in response to recommendations:

Results and an overview of the analysis were reported out to faculty during the spring 2017 in-service. Faculty worked together to provide a list of ideas and resources that could support students in improvement in the recommended areas of "Sources and Evidence" and "Organization and Presentation". "Delivery" was not addressed by faculty due to the concern that it would be easier for faculty to focus on two categories instead of three. Since only 2 courses and a total of 16 student artifacts were scored with the Oral Communication rubric (compared to 19 courses 237 student artifacts scored with the Written Communication rubric) consideration was given to the results from the rubric that was chosen more often by faculty and used to score the greatest number of student artifacts. The list of Ideas & Resources for Teaching to ILO#1: Communication was posted on the web. Faculty reported out on the implementation of support strategies that they added or practiced in their courses in the Part B of Course Outcomes Assessment (COA). The strategies were organized into a spreadsheet (see Appendix 1) Faculty were reminded of their commitment to focus on these areas during each in-service and as well when they completed their Part A of COA. While trainings led by the writing and speech departments focusing on adding intrinsic teaching and assessment for the 2 objectives did not occur (due to lack of time during in-service and focus on other teaching-related areas), a workshop that focused on developing assignments that could be assessed using the ILO #1 rubrics was included during fall 2020 in-service. The workshop, titled "Creating Assignments and Activities to Support Student Achievement of ILO#1: Communication", was led by Gretchen Gebhardt, Kristen Kane and Susan Lewis, and attended by a number of faculty.

Comparison of the results between 2015-16 and 2020-21 show an increase in 12% for students achieving accomplished or better when scored for both "Sources and Evidence" and "Organization and Presentation" indicating that faculty efforts over the last 5 years have been effective. Although faculty did not focus instruction on improving student achievement "Delivery" from the Oral Communication rubric, student achievement in this area saw a 33% increase as well.

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

Instructional Council voted to change the name of Core Learning Outcomes (CLO) to Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO). Core Learning Outcomes was too close in name to Core Themes and often confused faculty. The name "Institutional Learning Outcomes" is also more intuitive as the name reflects what these outcomes really are. The hope is that this name change will help with some of the confusion regarding the three levels of academic outcomes.

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

A. Overview of methodology used for assessment:

During the 2020-21 academic year, faculty assessed students in achievement of ILO #1 "*Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills*. (Communication)" for the second time. Faculty initially assessed student achievement of this ILO in 2015-16. Instructors used either the Oral Communication Rubric or the Written Communication Rubric to score student work, depending on the type of assignment used to assess the ILO. Both rubrics were adapted by the ILO

Assessment committee from the AACU's (Association of American Colleges and Universities) LEAP (Liberal Education and America's Promise) Value (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) (http://www.aacu.org/). The rubrics were the same rubrics used to assess students on the communication ILO that were used in 2015-16, with the exception of three differences made over the span of the last 5 years:

1. The terms "Beginning", "Developing", "Accomplished" and "Mastery" were removed from the adapted rubrics following a recommendation from the ILO Committee Meeting fall 2017. The levels were replaced with the numbers 1-4, so that faculty may be less likely to inflate their scoring (Limitation 2; Report 2016-17: ILO#2 Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving).
2. The web form was also updated to include a comments area for the level "Not Applicable", so that faculty could explain why they scored a particular student artifact into the category as "Not Applicable". (Recommendation 2; Report 2016-17: ILO#2 Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving).
3. A better explanation of the difference between "not demonstrated" and "not applicable" was included on the 2020-21 Communication rubrics. This change was made as a result of the ILO Assessment Committee's concerns of inflated scoring and lack of norming during their 2018 meeting. (Recommendation 2; Report 2017-18 ILO#4 Cultural Awareness)

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 Learning Outcome: Communication. These upper-level courses were chosen with the understanding that students, in theory, would have had a few freshmen level courses that included communication as a course outcome, allowing CGCC to assess students who were closer to graduation and who had received more instruction and practice in building communication 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 WR 121 and 122 were also assessed as recommended by the Writing Department with the rationale that these are often the last writing courses that most degree-seeking students would take at CGCC before they graduated

Each term, instructors who were teaching courses that addressed communication in-depth or minimally, as indicated in the CCOGs, were contacted to determine if they had a suitable assignment to be scored using one of the adapted Communication rubrics. 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.

In looking at the methodology, it is important to remember that assessment of Institutional Learning Outcomes is different than Course Outcomes Assessment or Instructor Evaluations: CGCC is compiling information on student achievement of ILOs in order to be analyzed by the Institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee and shared with CGCC faculty to determine where adjustments and improvements need to be made. Assessment of Institutional Learning Outcomes is not about an individual instructor or an individual course: the purpose is to obtain a snap-shot on a more global perspective of student ability in formal college-level communication, and as well, the institution's ability to effect change and improvement through the implementation of focused teaching strategies.

B. Summary of timeline and steps in assessment process:

1) Week prior to start of term: The academic assessment coordinator (AAC) looked at the CCOGs of courses and selected those courses that either had communication as a course outcome or indicated that ILO #1 was addressed as a major or minor. A list of suggested courses was sent by the curriculum and assessment administrative assistant (CAAA) to each department chair (DC) for consideration. DCs responded either confirming the selection or recommending revisions.

2) 2nd - 3rd week of term: Once a course was confirmed by the DC, instructors were contacted via email by the CAAA informing them that their course had been selected for assessment of the first ILO. Information about the process of assessing ILOs was provided, as were directions and the rubrics.

3) 3rd - 4th week of term: the AAC contacted the instructor to determine whether they had an appropriate assignment that could be scored with one of the Communication rubrics. 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 ILO#1 for the term.

4) 6th week of term: a check-in/reminder email that included the instructions and scoring rubrics were 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. 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) 3 weeks before fall term 2021: The ILO Assessment Committee met to review and analyze results, including a comparative analysis of the results from the previous assessment of ILO#1 (2015-16). The committee made recommendations based on the results to improve student achievement of ILO#1, compared the assessment results between 2015-16 and 2020-21, analyzed of the effectiveness of faculty interventions over the past 5 years, reviewed the ILO assessment process and made recommendations for improvement to the process.

8) Fall In-service: Results were shared with faculty, as well as the committee's recommendations to help improve student achievement of communication.

9) Faculty will be reminded of their commitment to implementing 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:

672 students were 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.

KK: September, 2021

The sampling size from the first assessment of ILO #1 in 2015-16 was much smaller, with 325 students enrolled in 19 courses from 13 disciplines with 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.

D. Assessment Instrument(s):

The Oral and Written Communication rubrics were 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.

In 2015-16 related to the first use of the Oral and Written Communication rubrics, the ILO 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 Mastery (4); Accomplished (3); Developing (2); Beginning (1); Not Demonstrated; and Not Applicable (CGCC Written Communication Scoring Rubric and CGCC Oral Communication Scoring Rubric). The ILO Assessment Committee considered the adapted student achievement categories to be more applicable to the standards CGCC used for assessing and measuring student achievement.

Per Recommendation 2 from the 2017-18 ILO Analysis, the ILO Assessment Committee replaced the names of each category from the rubrics anticipating that the adapted numbered student achievement categories would be less influential on instructor decisions, and encouraging instructors to instead, focus on the performance indicators for guidance.

E. Data Analysis Procedures.

Include a description of faculty involvement in the assessment and analysis process.
Once instructors scored the student artifacts using the adapted LEAP Value Rubrics for Oral and Written Communication, results were gathered by the AAC and presented to the ILO Assessment Committee. The ILO Assessment Committee compared and analyzed the results and reviewed the process. Notes were taken of the analysis during the meeting and captured in this analysis template

26 faculty from 17 disciplines were involved in the assessment of the ILO:

Fall Term: Ed Andree (BI 233), Diana Bailey (NRS 221), Andrew Burke (CS 260), Jules Burton (BI 211), Annette Byers (MTH 211), John Evans (MTH 251), Gretchen Gebhardt (GS 106), Katy Jablonski (WR 122), Jenn Kamrar (WR 122), Kristen Kane (PSY 202A), Tom Lieurance (EET 221), Emilie Miller (BI 234), Tina Ontiveros (WR 248), Dave Wagenblast (EC 202), Andrea Ware (WR 122), Mandy Webster (WR 227)

Winter Term: Annette Byers (MTH 212), Gretchen Gebhardt (GS 109), Kristen Kane (PSY 201A), Tom Kaser (WR 121), Tom Lieurance (EET 222), Todd Meislahn (BA 208), Emilie Miller (BI 211), Siri Olson (CAS 216), Diane Uto (COMM 237), Andrea Ware (OS 220).

Spring Term: Elizabeth Anderson (ART 286), John Copp (HST 201), Mike Davis (BA 205), John Evans (MTH 253), Gretchen Gebhardt (GS 108), Leigh Hancock (WR 121), Bill Hughitt (OS 245), Katy Jablonski (ENG 201), Kristen Kane (PSY 215), Tina Martinez (SOC 204), Diane Uto (COMM 214), Dave Wagenblast (EC 202), Mandy Webster (WGS 202).

3 faculty* and the director of accreditation and assessment (DAA) were involved in analysis process: Katy Jablonski, Kristen Kane, Zip Krummel, and Susan Lewis.

*The ILO Assessment Committee is made up of 4 faculty members and the DAA . One faculty member was unable to attend the 2021 meeting..

Section Four: Results

A. Describe results of assessment work related to competency:
Provide detailed results of assessment, including charts, graphs or other visuals

Overall Communication Results:
A total of 672 students were enrolled in the courses that participated in the assessment of the ILO Communication. Of those students, 601 students completed the assignments and were scored using the Written or Oral Communication Rubric. A total of 81.4% of those students scored as accomplished or better when the scores of the Written Communication and Oral Communication Rubrics were combined. 13.5% were scored into the Developing category and 4.1% were scored into Beginning.

Table 1
Results of 2020-21 Assessment of Student Achievement of Communication (Written and Oral scores combined)

Institutional Learning Outcome #1:	Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can: 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**
Totals (Combined Scored Written and Oral Communication Rubric)	49.8%	31.6%	13.5%	4.1%	1.0%	8.2%
Total Percentage of Students Scored as Accomplished or Better for Communication:	81.4%					

Written Communication Results:

581 students were enrolled in the courses that participated in the assessment of the ILO Written Communication. Of those students, 526 students completed the written assignments and were scored using the Written Communication Rubric. A total 79.9% of students scored as Accomplished or better for the categories totaled, with a range between 78.1% and 82.4% within the categories. The categories with the lowest scores (below 80%) were Content Development (78.1%), Organization and Presentation (78.7%), and Control and Syntax (78.9%). The remaining categories had over 80% of students scoring into accomplished or better: Audience, Context and Purpose (82.3%), Sources and Evidence (80%) and Visual Aids (82.4%).

Table 2

Results of 2020-21 Assessment of Student Achievement of Written Communication

Institutional Learning Outcome #1:	Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can: Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. (Communication)						
Written Communication: Total Number of students enrolled 581 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 526	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
Written Communication Rubric: Audience, Context and Purpose: TOTALS	264	169	68	20	5	0	82.3%
Written Communication Rubric: Content Development: TOTALS	251	156	81	27	6	5	78.1%
Written Communication Rubric: Sources and Evidence TOTALS	249	154	72	23	6	22	80.0%
Written Communication Rubric: Organization and Presentation: TOTALS	267	147	79	30	3	0	78.7%
Written Communication Rubric: Control of Syntax and Mechanics: TOTALS	220	195	78	26	7	0	78.9%
Written Communication Rubric: Visual Aids: TOTALS	118	116	40	6	4	242	82.4%
Total percentage of students scored into category using Written Communication Rubric	47.4%	32.5%	14.5%	4.6%	1.1%	9.3%	
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better with Written Communication Rubric	79.9%						

Oral Communication Results:

91 students were enrolled in the courses that participated in the assessment of the ILO Oral Communication. Of those students, 75 students completed the oral assignments and were scored using the Oral Communication rubric. A total of 93.3% of those students scored as accomplished or better in Oral Communication. 6.4% were scored into the Developing category and 0.3% were scored into Beginning.

More than 92% of students scored as Accomplished or better in all the categories, with the lowest percentage of students scoring accomplished or better in General Purpose and Delivery (92%), followed by Organization and Evidence Based Support (93.3%) and the highest percentage of students scoring into Language (96%).

Table 3

Results of 2020-21 Assessment of Student Achievement of Oral Communication

Institutional Learning Outcome #1:	Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can: Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. (Communication)						
Oral Communication: **Total Number of students enrolled 91** **Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 75**	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
Oral Communication Rubric: General Purpose: TOTALS	51	18	6	0	0	0	92.0%
Oral Communication Rubric: Organization: TOTALS	54	16	5	0	0	0	93.3%
Oral Communication Rubric: Language: TOTALS	47	25	2	1	0	0	96.0%
Oral Communication Rubric: Delivery: TOTALS	50	19	6	0	0	0	92.0%
Oral Communication Rubric: Evidence Based Support: TOTALS	55	15	5	0	0	0	93.3%
Total percentage of students scored into category using Oral Communication Rubric	68.5%	24.8%	6.4%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better with Oral Communication Rubric	93.3%						

Section Five: Analysis of Results

Assessment at this level measures whether CGCC degree-seeking students can demonstrate the Institutional Learning Outcomes at a two-year lower-division competency level. Reflect on what was learned and what the impacts might be (not a repeat of findings). Reflection should include the implications of the findings to the General Education Program.

A. Analysis, discussion and implications of current year results

In 2015-16, the committee concluded that accomplished was the appropriate category that students should be achieving by the time that they have earned a 2-year degree at CGCC. While neither the committee nor the college (at this time) has set a target for student achievement of ILOs, the committee considered that the overall results for Written Communication (79.9%), Oral Communication (93.3%),

and Communication as a whole (81.4%) were satisfactory. Results showing a higher percentage of achievement may be indicative of scoring inflation, a possibility that could happen when instructors score their own student work.

As in previous years the committee looked to the rubric and student scores to better understand where faculty could focus intentional instruction, with the goal of moving more students closer to accomplished or mastery in those categories where students seem to be struggling most. "Content Development" (78.1%) had the lowest score of any dimension, followed closely by "Control of Syntax and Mechanics" (78.9%). Although the category of "Organization and Presentation" had a slightly lower percentage of students scored into accomplished or better (78.7%) than "Control of Syntax and Mechanics", the committee acknowledged that faculty have already integrated a number of strategies and focused instruction over the last 5 years towards "Organization and Presentation" (see Appendix 1) and that students could benefit by faculty now designing focused instruction for these two other areas. Strategies designed during the first cycle of assessment will continue to be relevant and be applied in an effort to improve students' abilities in "Organization and Presentation".

The committee also discussed their own experience with students who did not achieve accomplished or better when scored for "Control of Syntax and Mechanics" and what may be happening for students who are not able to demonstrate their ability to meet the expectations of the rubric: "*Uses straightforward language that conveys meaning to readers with clarity. The language in the work has few errors."* ([2020-21 CGCC Written Communication Rubric adapted from AACU's Written Communication VALUE and SFA Rubrics](#)). The committee was concerned that some students may not be able to afford access to or be familiar with electronic spelling/grammar check technologies, such as those found in Microsoft Word. Moreover, there may be some students, such as those whose first language is not English, who may struggle to find others to read over their papers for syntax and mechanics. The committee found it difficult to make any kind of conclusion related to populations of students who may fall into these groups without any disaggregated data to see who may need more focused support.

The committee also noticed that 5 students were scored into the "Content Development" category as "Not Applicable", and wondered how content development or "*The ways in which the text explores and represents its topic in relation to its audience and purpose*" ([2020-21 CGCC Written Communication Rubric adapted from AACU's Written Communication VALUE and SFA Rubrics](#)) could be considered "Not Applicable" within a written document. The committee concluded that some faculty may not understand the rubric and could use continued training with the rubrics to better understand how to apply each of the categories. The same conclusion could be made with the dimension of "Visual Aids", given that 46% of student work scored indicated that "Visual Aids" were "Not Applicable". While the use of visual aids may not be appropriate for all disciplines, the committee wondered whether there were some disciplines where the inclusion of visual aids, such as graphs or other visual representation of data might be more applicable.

The ILO Assessment committee further recognized that the majority of assignments were scored with the Written Communication rubric (526) in comparison to the use of the Oral Communication rubric (75) and that faculty may want to consider choosing an assignment to be scored with the Oral Communication rubric the next time ILO #1 is assessed. With only 12% of student work being scored with the Oral Communication rubric, the committee considered that there may be room for more

faculty to apply the Oral Communication rubric next time, so that we can better assess students' oral communication skills. Alternatively, as suggested by one faculty member who initially tried to apply the Oral Communication Rubric, the committee may want to consider "*broadening our definition to include those of us who use and assess discussion formats*" when we review the communication rubrics (see Recommendation 4)

In terms of the implications of ILO#1 achievement and the General Education program, it's interesting to compare the results of communication using ILO assessment and the assessment used for General Education degrees (see Appendix 2) which focuses on using end of term grades to assess student achievement of outcomes, including outcomes related to communication. The degree outcomes assessment process indicates a higher percentage of students achieving outcomes related to communication when using end of term grades (between 87.9% and 91.7% depending on the outcome and the degree). Although this year's ILO assessment's results are closer to those of the degree outcomes assessment results than in past years, there is still a discrepancy of 6% -10% in results related to student achievement of the communication outcomes, depending on the assessment process.

Another area of concern occurs in reviewing the mission for the General Education program as outlined in the [2015-16 General Education Program Review](#) "*General Education" refers to the educational foundation of skills, knowledge, habits of mind, and values that transcend the boundaries of specialization and provide all students with a common language and common skills. …. At Columbia Gorge Community College, this educational foundation is defined by CGCC's Core Learning Outcomes … 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."* With close to 20% of students not achieving accomplished or better in the area of communication, according to the results of ILO assessment this year, it's clear that we may be failing to provide some of our students with "*a common….set of skills*" related to communication. Currently, the college cannot disaggregate ILO assessment data, making it difficult to identify which students may be struggling with the skills related to communication. Without this disaggregated data, while faculty may be able to focus their instruction in particular areas related to low scores in certain dimensions, faculty may not be able to provide the focused instruction that particular student populations require to be successful in this learning outcome.

B. Comparative analysis of results from multiple years.
Address effectiveness of actions taken from previous assessment of ILO

With the exception of the category "Visual Aids" (addressed in Recommendation 4), all dimensions saw an increase in the percentage of students who were scored into Accomplished or better from 2015-16. Overall, there was a 17% increase for students who scored into Accomplished or better using the Written Communication rubric, an increase of 14% of students scored into Accomplished or better using the Oral Communication rubric and a 10% increase overall when scores from both rubrics were combined.

Of note are the increases in the percentage of students scoring into Accomplished or better in the dimensions that faculty have been focusing on for the past 5 years: 12% for both "Organization and Presentation" and "Sources and Evidence" (Written Communication).

Table 4

Comparison of 2015-16 and 2020-21 Results from Assessment of Student Achievement of Combined Written and Oral Communication scores followed by Written Communication Scores

Institutional Learning Outcome #1: Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can: Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. (Communication)			
Year of Assessment	2015-16	2020-21	Comparative Difference
Total Number of Students who completed scored assignments for Written & Oral Communication	269	601	332
Total Percentage of Students Scored as Accomplished or Better for Communication:	71%	81%	10%
Written Communication:	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better	
Written Communication Rubric: Audience, Context and Purpose: TOTALS	77%	82%	5%
Written Communication Rubric: Content Development: TOTALS	73%	78%	5%
Written Communication Rubric: Sources and Evidence TOTALS	68%	80%	12%
Written Communication Rubric: Organization and Presentation: TOTALS	67%	79%	12%
Written Communication Rubric: Control of Syntax and Mechanics: TOTALS	73%	79%	6%
Written Communication Rubric: Visual Aids: TOTALS	98%	82%	-16%
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better with Written Communication Rubric	63%	80%	17%

Similar increases in student achievement were seen in those artifacts scored with the Oral Communication rubric. Although faculty did not focus efforts on the categories of this rubric, all dimensions saw an increase in student achievement. Of note is the 33% increase in student achievement related to "Delivery", one of the three dimensions that the ILO Assessment Committee initially suggested faculty focus their efforts.

Table 5

Comparison of 2015-16 and 2020-21 Results from Assessment of Student Achievement of Oral Communication Scores

Institutional Learning Outcome #1: Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can: Communicate effectively using appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. (Communication)			
Year of Assessment	2015-16	2020-21	Comparative Difference
Oral Communication:	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better	
Oral Communication Rubric: General Purpose: TOTALS	84%	92%	8%
Oral Communication Rubric: Organization: TOTALS	84%	93%	9%
Oral Communication Rubric: Language: TOTALS	94%	96%	2%
Oral Communication Rubric: Delivery: TOTALS	59%	92%	33%
Oral Communication Rubric: Evidence Based Support: TOTALS	75%	93%	18%
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better with Oral Communication Rubric	79%	93%	14%

In reviewing the actions that faculty have implemented into their teaching and classrooms in the last 5 years, the ILO Assessment Committee noted that the actions were not just occurring in the classes where the assessment was taking place, but also in the classes that lead up to the 200-level courses, such as ESOL and Pre-College (see Appendix 1). It's clear to the ILO Assessment Committee that the actions taken have been college-wide and faculty should be congratulated for their efforts and the effectiveness as seen in the results.

The ILO Assessment Committee concluded that faculty have not only accomplished their goal of increasing the percentage of students who achieve the Institutional Learning Outcome of Communication, but faculty have worked together to build a "culture of assessment", measuring student achievement of an outcome by scoring student artifacts with rubrics, analyzing data to determine where efforts should be focused, documenting the implementation of strategies to produce positive change, then re-assessing students to determine whether faculty efforts have been effective.

Both the increase in students' achievement of the areas of focus, and the overall increase in percentage of students scoring into accomplished or better for ILO #1, support the effectiveness of the actions faculty have taken in their classrooms.

KK: September, 2021

C. Recommendations and Action Items

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

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

   Recommendation 1: The committee recommends that faculty 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 move more students towards the level of accomplished or better in the areas of content development and control of syntax and mechanics. Faculty will be reminded of their commitment to increase or integrate instruction for content development and control of syntax and mechanics when they complete Part A of course outcomes assessment, and will then describe what they did to support students in achieving this ILO at a higher level when completing Part B. The AAC will track these interventions on a spreadsheet and CLO#1 will be assessed again in 2025-26 to determine the impact of these interventions.

   Recommendation 2: The committee recommends that the college consider the implementation of an Editing Desk, similar in purpose to the Writing Desk, but with a narrower scope that focuses on supporting students in the achievement of the control of syntax and mechanics.

   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.

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

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 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 Institutional Learning Outcomes and is developed primarily through a set of general education course requirements that all*

students take, regardless of their major. Ultimately, the mission of the General Education program at CGCC is to provide our students with a common experience and set of skills that prepare students for success in their majors, as citizens of the US and the world and in their personal and professional lives after graduation." The action of CGCC faculty intentionally providing resources and extra support for students to improve achievement in communication 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.

Resolving the issue related to the lack of degree requirements for courses that address ILO #4 and #5 will further support the General Education program's goals of "providing a common experience and preparing students for the roles of citizens of the US and the world".

Section Six: Evaluate the Assessment Strategy

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

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

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

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

A workshop that focused on developing assignments that could be assessed using the ILO #1 rubric was included during fall 2020 in-service. The workshop, titled "Creating Assignments and Activities to Support Student Achievement of CLO#1: Communication", led by Gretchen Gebhardt, Kristen Kane and Susan Lewis, was attended by a number of faculty

Results: The results of this recommendation are difficult to track, as the AAC does not have access nor the time to review all faculty syllabi. Faculty have yet to see the new 2021-22 syllabus template and whether ILO alignment is required for General Education course syllabi. **This recommendation should continue into 2021-22**

Recommendation 4. To address the concerns of the lack of familiarity that faculty may have with the criteria of the rubric, future in-services will include workshops designed around creating assignments specific to the criteria of the rubric. These workshops will not only help faculty become more familiar with the criteria, but also ensure that courses are supporting student achievement in the appropriate ILOs as indicated in the CCOGs. It is recommended that the Instructional Council member of the

committee remind the General Education department chairs about the major/minor designation of ILOs so that the department chairs can continue to educate faculty in their departments.

Actions: Two workshops were offered during Fall 2020 In-service: "Creating Engaging Assignments: Helping Students Achieve Outcomes" (Courtney Cunningham, Kristen Kane and Susan Lewis) and "Creating Assignments and Activities to Support Student Achievement of CLO#1: Communication" (Gretchen Gebhardt, Kristen Kane, Susan Lewis). The first workshop focused on creating multi-purpose assignments that would address outcomes of various levels (course, degree and ILO). The second workshop was focused specifically on creating assignments that addressed ILO #1-Communication.

Results: The workshops had fair attendance and the increase in faculty participation in scoring student work for this ILO suggests that faculty may becoming more familiar with the criteria of the rubrics. **The committee decided that this recommendation should span the next 4 years so that faculty experience the same opportunity for all ILOs and their rubrics**

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

Actions: One workshop related to this recommendation "*Creating Assignments and Activities to Support Student Achievement of CLO#1: Communication*" was held fall term. Spring term in-service and faculty workshops addressed other areas of faculty interest.

Results: The workshop had a number of faculty in attendance which may have contributed to the increase in faculty participation in the scoring of ILO#1, since faculty may have become more familiar with the rubric and developed an assignment that could be scored with the rubric. **The committee determined that this recommendation should also span the next 4 years for the same reason as the above recommendation.** Another workshop is planned for later in fall term 2021, this one focusing on creating assignments for ILO #2

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

Given that the assessment methods and LEAP rubrics developed by the 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.

The committee did discuss some concerns about the limitations of the assessment methods:

- Faculty may be more comfortable with the rubric in the second assessment of ILO#1 which may have contributed to a difference in how they scored student work
- Faculty are most likely not scoring the same students from 2015-16, so the increase in student achievement is seen using two different sampling sets. The committee agreed, however, that the changes and strategies implemented by faculty as the result of the previous assessment in 2015-16 (see Appendix 1) were improvements that supported all subsequent students. Any

students taking the courses after the 2015-16 set of students would have benefitted from the new approaches and efforts of faculty interventions.

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#1 2015-21](#)
2. 5 Year Average of Student Achievement of the Communication Outcomes by General Education degree
3. 2015-16 Results for the Assessment of ILO#1
4. [AACU LEAP VALUE Rubrics](#)
5. [AACU LEAP VALUE Rubric: Written Communication](#)
6. [AACU LEAP VALUE Rubric: Oral Communication](#)
7. [CGCC Written Communication Scoring Rubric](#)
8. [CGCC Oral Communication Scoring Rubric](#)
9. [Results for Assessment of CLO (ILO) #1 Communication 2015-16](#)
10. [Analysis Report for Assessment of CLO (ILO) #1 Communication 2015-16](#)
11. [Ideas & Resources for Teaching to ILO#1: Communication](#)
12. [Outcome Assessment Schedule](#)
13. [2016 General Education Program Review](#)

Appendix 2: 5 Year Average of Student Achievement of the Communication Outcomes by General Education degree

Degree/Certificate/Program	5 Year Average of Students who Achieve Outcomes 2015-2020
Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer	
AAOT Outcome 6A	91.1%
AAOT Outcome 6B	91.7%
AAOT Outcome 6C	89.7%
AAOT Outcome 7A	89.1%
AAOT Outcome 7B	90.8%
AAOT Outcome 7C	87.9%
Associate of Science Oregon Transfer - Business	
ASOT - BUS Outcome 1	90.1%
Associate of Science	
AS Outcome 1	90.1%
Associate of General Studies	
AGS Outcome 1	90.2%

Appendix 3: 2015-16 Results for the Assessment of ILO#1

2015-16 Overall Communication Results:

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
Totals (Combined Scored Written and Oral Communication Rubric)	**36%**	**35%**	**14%**	**2%**	**1%**	**12%**

2015-16 Written Communication Results:

Institutional Core Learning Outcome #1:	Through their respective disciplines, CGCC students who earn a degree can:						
Written Communication: Total Number of students enrolled 278 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 237	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
Written Communication Rubric: Audience, Context and Purpose: TOTALS	76	106	52	3	0	0	76.79%
Written Communication Rubric: Content Development: TOTALS	53	120	60	4	0	0	73.00%
Written Communication Rubric: Sources and Evidence TOTALS	64	98	51	5	3	16	68.35%
Written Communication Rubric: Organization and Presentation: TOTALS	52	106	55	9	0	15	66.67%
Written Communication Rubric: Control of Syntax and Mechanics: TOTALS	47	125	61	4	0	0	72.57%
Written Communication Rubric: Visual Aids: TOTALS	23	23	5	1	0	190	97.9%
Total Percentage of Students Scoring with Written Communication Rubric	22%	41%	20%	2%	0%	16%	
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better with Written Communication Rubric	63%						

2015-16 Oral Communication Results:

Oral Communication: Total Number of students enrolled 38 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 32	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better
Oral Communication Rubric: General Purpose: TOTALS	16	11	3	2	0	0	84%
Oral Communication Rubric: Organization: TOTALS	18	9	3	2	0	0	84%
Oral Communication Rubric: Language: TOTALS	15	15	2	0	0	0	94%
Oral Communication Rubric: Delivery: TOTALS	13	6	1	0	0	12	59%
Oral Communication Rubric: Evidence Based Support: TOTALS	17	7	4	0	4	0	75%
Total Percentage of Students Scoring with Oral Communication Rubric	49%	30%	8%	3%	3%	8%	
Total Percentage of Students who Scored Accomplished or Better with Written Communication Rubric	79%						

Assessment completed by:

Report on the analysis of ILO#1 completed by: Kristen Kane and the ILO Assessment Committee (Susan Lewis, Zip Krummel, and Katy Jablonski)

Date: 09.14.2021

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