

Executive Summary

Authors: Mary Kieser, Dorie Goldman, Valerie Jensen

Date: May 16, 2011

GEO Pilot Background:

GEO Reading

The Communication General Education Outcome (GEO) selected RDG094 for the first GEO pilot summer 2009. Pilot assessments continued in RDG094 College Reading through spring 2011, branching out for one section with 12 students summer 2009 to all sections of RDG094 taught by full-time and adjunct faculty. The Reading Rubric evolved from a 5-point Likert Scale to a 4-point Likert Scale in an attempt to better align with CAC's desire to standardize the scale for all GEO assessment activities. Thus benchmarking the data from 2009 and 2010 requires a slight recalibration to the new 4-point scale.

The spring 2011 GEO initiative to create a CAC Institutional GEO Rubric led to revision of the GEO Outcomes language and revision of the Reading section of the Communication GEO Rubric. See attached CAC GEO Institutional Rubric which reflects the changes, specifically the language change from Critical Reading to Effective Reading. The attached document uses the former language and is entitled: *Critical Reading Assessment Administration Directions*. This change was prompted by the GEO Critical Thinking and Analytical Reasoning Subcommittee discussions and the Executive GEO Subcommittee discussions with the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee. Prompted by the Governing Board's new GEO Policy language and to provide further clarity, the GEO rubrics were revised to clearly gauge Critical Thinking and Reading as two separate suites of student learning outcomes. The new GEO Reading Rubric will be used by all faculty teaching RDG094 Fall 2011.

The analysis of data process has expanded from the lead GEO faculty and Communication GEO chair compiling, analyzing, and extrapolating results and next steps from the GEO Pilot data to a team of three Communication department faculty completing this work. To ensure consistency and accuracy of assessment, the Reading department created *GEO Effective Reading Assessment Administration Directions, Communication GEO Assessment Timeline, GEO Communication Subcommittee GEO Assessment Project* (spring 2009 – spring 2011), (attached).

Since RDG094 is a required course for all degree seeking students, it serves as a CAC gatekeeper course and a gauge of students' reading ability upon entry to CAC. The Communication GEO Subcommittee plans to continue conducting GEO Pilots in RDG094 for the 2011-12 academic year.

GEO Writing

The second suite of GEO Writing Outcomes were refined for the Fall 2010 pilot which was deployed with the updated Writing Rubric for a larger GEO Pilot study. Fall 2010 all full-time English faculty were asked to evaluate one course assignment from any English course using the GEO Communications Rubric. Nine (9) English faculty participated in the GEO Writing Pilot, including ENG100 English Composition II, ENG101 English Composition III, and ENG102 English Composition IV.

Spring 2011 a large scale GEO Writing pilot was conducted in ENG101 by all full-time faculty to validate earlier GEO findings and to benchmark data collected to determine improvement in student learning in ENG101.

GEO Speaking

Assessing the GEO Speaking Outcomes has occurred throughout the GEO Reading and Writing pilots since 2010. The Communications Division Chair has been instrumental in this assessment activity and supported GEO assessment across the division. Results from various pilots which also assessed the GEO Speaking Outcomes are reported in this document.

GEO Listening

The newest GEO Communication Outcomes addressing Effective Listening Skills were prompted by the CAC Governing Board's inclusion of Listening in the ratified GEOs June 15, 2010. The Communication GEO Rubric was expanded to include the essential observable and measurable attributes of good listening.

Instrument Design and Administration of the Instrument:

GEO Reading

Per the *Effective Reading Assessment Administration Directions* to RDG094 faculty, students were taught the essential skills through Chapters 12 and 13, given a practice assessment which was the same GEO RDG094 assessment instrument in conjunction with any controversial article selected by the faculty member. Students were permitted to work in pairs or teams to complete the pre-assessment. The answers were posted on the student Blackboard site under "Controversial Article Answer key" so that students could later review the answers to further solidify their learning.

The Reading instrument consists of 16 questions. The GEO closed-book assessment given near the end of the term must be taken independently, proctored, completed within a standard, 50-minute class hour, and instructors may respond to student questions about "directions" only during the assessment. Faculty independently use the GEO Reading Rubric to score the exams, forward them to the GEO lead faculty by the end of the semester and then the team of three faculty collectively score a random sampling. Results are shared with the RDG094 fall faculty without tying any scores to individual instructors.

GEO Writing

Fall 2010, the GEO Writing Pilot faculty members selected an existing assignment in their respective courses which aligned well with the GEO Writing Outcomes and could be assessed using the Writing Rubric. Some faculty chose a cumulative, multi-disciplinary project which could be assessed for two GEOs, such as GEO Writing and Reading Outcomes, or GEO Writing and Speaking Outcomes. Other faculty, chose to only assess based on the GEO Writing Outcomes, i.e. one essay.

Feedback from faculty were requested after each GEO Pilot, including: 1. the use and effectiveness of the assessment tool, 2. the implementation process, 3. the data review process and results, and 4. the analysis of those results and suggestions for next steps/improvements based on the GEO data analysis.

The Spring 2011 ENG101 random student sample of 68 students was determined by randomly generating a list of all students enrolled. Faculty were then assigned to solicit a persuasive essay from those students in their class section. The group of 68 randomly selected students wrote the essay in class during final exam week (week 16) on May 11, 2011. The resulting essays were collected by the respective faculty member, submitted to the GEO faculty leader and randomly distributed to small groups of faculty assessors (two groups of three and one group of two faculty members). After a brief norming session to calibrate scores using the GEO Writing Rubric and scoring on essays not part of the actual Spring 2011 GEO Pilot sample, each small group scored the GEO pilot essays according to the GEO Writing Rubric. For the group that contained only two faculty, if the scores were identical, the essay did not receive another score; if the scores were different, a third reader evaluated the essay.

This process has been recognized by higher education organizations as a valid, reliable process for achieving standardized scoring results. For example, the College Board which develops and revises examination scoring rubrics, fosters scoring calibration exercises, and standardizes the scoring of examinations using rubrics, follows this process. The College Board hosts the following internationally recognized academic programs: Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate Diploma Program, CLEP and others.

GEO Speaking

Fall 2010, the GEO Speaking Outcomes were assessed alongside the GEO Reading and Writing Outcomes using the same multi-disciplinary assessment tools identified for those pilots.

Student Sample Population:

GEO Reading

Summer 2009, 12 students enrolled in one section of RDG094 served as the sample population. By spring 2011, a random sample was drawn from the assessments which were completed by all students enrolled in RDG094, or a participation rate of nearly 100%.

Spring 2010, 15 students enrolled in one section each of ENG100 English Composition II and COM100 Fundamentals of Human Communication participated in the GEO assessment. These CAC degree-seeking student gatekeeper courses were chosen to gauge students' communication abilities and knowledge early in their college career at CAC.

The RDG094 students represent a significant sample population to secure valid, reliable data. However, the small populations from ENG100 and COM100 need to be enlarged to gather valid, reliable data.

GEO Writing

Fall 2010, 20 students enrolled in two sections of ENG100 were assessed for GEO Writing Outcomes, however only 7 students were also assessed for GEO Reading Outcomes.

For ENG101, 107 students or 100% of students enrolled in 8 sections taught by four faculty were assessed; All 107 students were assessed for GEO Writing Outcomes, 54 students, or 50.5% were assessed for GEO Speaking Outcomes, and 25 students or 23% were assessed on GEO Reading Outcomes.

The results from the Spring 2011 sample of 68 students from all sections of ENG101 taught by full-time English faculty were quantitatively analysed using a variety of quantitative research methods. See the Results section for details.

Likewise for ENG102, 40 students or 100% of students enrolled in 3 sections were assessed. Faculty did not follow-up with students who chose not to submit the assignment which was also used for GEO assessment.

Results:

GEO Reading Outcomes

Spring 2010, the RDG094 results were compiled with the GEO Writing and GEO Speaking assessment results. The tables below reflect the combined GEO Communication assessment results with the exception of assessing the GEO Listening Objective which CAC plans to launch fall 2011.

RDG094, Spring 2010: Total student sample: 24

Total students: 24	RDG094	Spring 2010	Faculty: Kieser			
Levels	Highly Competent	Competent	Emerging Competence /Consistent	Emerging Competence /Inconsistent	Not Competent	Mean
Scale*	4	3	2	1	0	
Reading	4% (1 students)	29% (7 students)	42% (10 students)	25% (6 students)	0	2.1 33%
Writing	4% (1 students)	25% (6 students)	33% (8 students)	25% (6 students)	13% (3 students)	1.5 29%
Speaking	4% (1 students)	25% (6 students)	38% (9 students)	29% (7 students)	4% (1 students)	2.0 29%
Overall Communication Competency						1.87 30%

*Note: Numbers are rounded up, thus percentages may not total 100%. A Mean of 3.0 equates to a “perfect score” whereby all students sampled earn a score of Level 3, Accomplished.

For GEO Reading Outcomes, the resulting data show that 8 out of the 24 or 33% (8 divided by 24 = 33%) of RDG094 students demonstrated GEO Reading competency and another 10 students or 42% demonstrated “Emerging Competence/Consistent.” All students included in the sample demonstrated some level of Reading competence per the GEO Reading Outcomes assessed via the GEO Reading Rubric. CAC students are expected to gain reading skills throughout their matriculation and to demonstrate GEO Reading competency before graduating with their degree.

For GEO Writing Outcomes, the data show that 7 out of 24 students or 29% of RDG094 students demonstrated GEO Writing competency per the GEO Writing Outcomes. Another 33%, or 8 students demonstrated “Emerging Competence/Consistent” while in this developmental course 25% or 6 students were still at the “Emerging Competence/Inconsistent” level per the GEO Writing Outcomes.

For GEO Speaking or Oral Communication Outcomes, RDG094 students demonstrated competency at the same level as Writing, i.e. 29% or a 2.0 Mean score.

GEO Writing Outcomes

Spring 2010, eight (8) ENG100 students in one (1) section participated. Scoring was based on the GEO Writing Rubric and completed by the course instructor. Note that that the GEO Rubric uses the CAC Student Learning Outcome Assessment Committee’s (SLOAC) approved 4-point Likert Scale and the language levels recommended by the SLOAC. However, the resulting data is collapsed into broad categories rather than reported based on each GEO Objective within each category, i.e. Reading, Writing, Speaking, and Listening.

ENG100, Spring 2010: Total student sample: 8

Total students: 8 out of 23	ENG100	Spring 2010	Faculty: Goldman			
Levels	Highly Competent	Competent	Emerging Competence /Consistent	Emerging Competence /Inconsistent	Not Competent	Mean
Scale	4	3	2	1	0	
Reading*						
Writing	25% (2 students)	37% (3 students)	25% (2 students)	0	13% (1 student)	2.6 62.5%
Speaking	25% (2 students)	37% (3 students)	25% (2 students)	0	13% (1 student)	2.6 62.5%
Overall Communication Competency						2.6 62.5%

**Note: Numbers are rounded up, thus percentages may not total 100%. 35% participation rate.

The faculty member conducting the assessment determined that the student product could not be assessed using the Reading Rubric, thus no data was collected.

The percentage after the Mean represents the percentage of students who demonstrated competency by earning a score of “3 or 4” per the GEO Writing Rubric. Thus, only 13% or one (1) student was determined “Not Competent” in both writing and speaking near the end of the semester.

Using ENG100 student results, the Spring 2010 mean or average score for GEO Writing Outcomes was 2.6 which means that on average students were demonstrating competency on the assessed assignment or 6/8 students or 62% of students demonstrated competency in GEO Writing Outcomes. In addition, the Spring 2010 mean or average score for GEO Speaking Outcomes was also 2.6 which means that on average students were demonstrating competency on the assessed assignment or 6/8 students or 62% of students demonstrated competency in GEO Speaking Outcomes.

Overall, 62% of the eight (8) students in ENG100 demonstrated GEO Writing and Speaking competency. The percentage next to the Mean represents the students who demonstrated competency by earning a score of “3 or 4” per the GEO Rubric.

Fall 2010, 20 students in two sections of ENG100 students were assessed by a team of two English faculty. One ENG100 faculty member with 7 students chose to assess both GEO Reading and Writing Outcomes. One faculty member assessed only the GEO Writing Outcomes. Both chose not to assess Speaking. Note that the 5-point Likert scale was reduced to 4-points and the labels revised to achieve standardization.

Referencing the ENG100, Spring 2011 table on page 4, 5 students were assessed as proficient or above for Reading, or 71.5% of the 7 students who submitted the assignment. A strong 70% of responders or 14 out of 20 students were assessed as proficient writers, per the GEO Writing Rubric. An additional 5 students scored in the “Developing” range and should have subsequent writing assignments in sequential English writing courses and/or the degree coursework to improve their writing skills and demonstrate competency prior to graduation. One student struggled to demonstrate sufficient writing skill and thus scored at the “Insufficient” level. Overall, 71% of the ENG100 students demonstrated GEO Writing competency.

ENG100, Fall 2010: Total student sample: 20

Total students: 20: 7 RDG only	ENG100 (2 sect.s)	Spring 2011	Faculty: (2 faculty)			
Levels		Accomplished	Proficient	Developing	Insufficient	Mean
Scale	4	3	2	1	0	
Reading (7 students)		28.5% (2 students)	43% (3 students)	28.5% (2 students)	0	2.0 71.5%
Writing (20 students)		40% (8 students)	30% (6 students)	25% (5 students)	5% (1 student)	2.6 70%
Speaking*						
Overall Communication Competency**						2.6 71%

*Speaking was not assessed. **Note: Numbers are rounded up, thus percentages may not total 100%.

Note the 8% increase in ENG100 students' assessed Writing ability using the GEO Writing Rubric. This improvement in student learning will be addressed under the *Reflections on Data Analysis* section of this report.

Two other courses were assessed Fall 2011 for the GEO Writing Outcomes, ENG101 and ENG102.

ENG101, Fall 2010: Total student sample: 107

Total students: 107	ENG101 (8 sect.s)	Fall 2010	Faculty: (4 faculty)			
Levels		Accomplished	Proficient	Developing	Insufficient	Mean
Scale	4	3	2	1	0	
Reading (25 students)		56% (14 stu.)	20% (5 stu.)	12% (3 stu.)	12% (3 stu.)	2.2 76%
Writing (107 students)		36% (38 stu.)	33% (35 stu.)	21% (22 stu.)	10% (12 stu.)	2.86 69%
Speaking (54 students)		28% (15 stu.)	52% (28 stu.)	11% (6 stu.)	9% (5 stu.)	2.01 80%
Overall Communication Competency*						2.36 75%

* Note: Numbers are rounded up, thus percentages may not total 100%. GEO Listening Outcomes were not assessed.

Note that the Mean is determined by adding all the students' scores and dividing by the total student sample population, i.e. 14 students X 3 points = 42 points (3 level), + 10 points (2 level) + 3 points (1 level) + 0 points (0 level) = 55 total points divided by 25 students = Mean of 2.2. ENG101 Fall 2010 students demonstrated strong skills and GEO Communication competency levels. Thus the Mean is the averaged score based on the sample population.

All four faculty used the Writing rubric (107 students sampled), two assessed Writing and Speaking (54 students sampled) in multiple classes, and one assessed Writing and Reading (25 students sampled). Based on their assessment results, the following student percentages reflect competency at or above the proficiency level: Reading 76%; Writing 69%, and Speaking 80%.

Overall, 69% of the 107 students sampled demonstrated GEO Writing competency. On an average, 75% of ENG101 Fall 2010 students sampled demonstrated GEO Communication competency. These

findings may be significant since they were derived from a substantial, representative CAC student population.

ENG102, Fall 2010: Total student sample: 40

Total students: 40	ENG102 (3 sect.s)	Fall 2010	Faculty: (3 faculty)			
Levels		Accomplished	Proficient	Developing	Insufficient	Mean
Scale	4	3	2	1	0	
Reading (30 students)		77% (23 stu.)	23% (7 stu.)	0	0	2.76 100%
Writing (40 students)		67.5% (27 stu.)	30% (12 stu.)	2.5% (1 stu.)	0	2.86 97.5%
Speaking**						
Overall Communication Competency*						2.65 98.75%

* Note: Numbers are rounded up, thus percentages may not total 100%. **GEO Speaking and Listening Outcomes were not assessed.

ENG102 Fall 2010 student sample netted very high assessment results for both Reading and Writing. Clearly these scores are skewed by the student population, i.e. students completing the final course in the two-year composition sequence and on the cusp of completing their degree.

Spring 2011, ENG101 results include:

ENG101, Spring 2011: Total student sample: 68

Total students: 68	ENG102 (8 sect.s)	Spring 2011	Faculty: (8 faculty)			
Levels		Accomplished	Proficient	Developing	Insufficient	Mean
Scale	4	3	2	1	0	
Reading**						
Writing		25% (17 stu.)	32% (22 stu.)	42% (28 stu.)	1% (1 stu.)	1.8 57%
Speaking**						
Overall Communication Competency*						1.8 57%

* Note: Numbers are rounded up, thus percentages may not total 100%. **GEO Reading, Speaking, and Listening Outcomes were not assessed.

The Standard Deviation of 0.9 was calculated using the new CAC Assessment Data Calculator created by Clark Vangilder, GEO Mathematics/Sciences chair and approved the SLOAC.

The Mean of 1.8 indicates that 39 out of 68 students, or the majority of students are achieving proficiency in the GEO Writing Outcomes while another 28 students are approaching competency. This means that students understand some writing concepts, but they need additional practice to achieve competency. Hence, ENG102 is needed as the capstone composition course. Compared to the results from previous GEO pilots on ENG101, the number of students achieving the Accomplished level declined.

GEO Oral Communication/Speaking Outcomes

COM100, Spring 2010: Total student sample: 7

Total students: 7	COM100	Spring 2010	Faculty: Jensen			
Levels	Highly Competent	Competent	Emerging Competence /Consistent	Emerging Competence /Inconsistent	Not Competent	Mean
Scale*	4	3	2	1	0	
Reading	28.5% (2 students)	28.5% (2 students)	28.5% (2 students)	14% (1 student)	0	2.71 57%
Writing	14% (1 students)	43% (3 students)	43% (3 students)	0	14% (1 student)	2.71 57%
Speaking	14% (1 students)	58% (4 students)	28% (2 students)	0	0	2.85 71%
Overall Communication Competency						2.76 63%

*Note: Numbers are rounded up, thus may not total 100%.

Using COM100, the Spring 2010 mean or average score for GEO Reading Outcomes was 2.71 which means that on average students were demonstrating competency on the assess GEO Reading instrument or 4/7 students or 57% of students demonstrated GEO Reading competency. GEO Writing Outcomes also averaged a 2.71 mean with 57% of students, or 4 out of 7 students scoring a “3 or 4” using the GEO Writing Outcomes on the assessment rubric. In addition, the Spring 2010 Mean or average score for GEO Speaking Outcomes was 2.85 which means that on average students were demonstrating competency on the assessed assignment or 5 out of 7 students or 71% of students demonstrated competency in GEO Speaking Outcomes.

Overall, 63% of the eight (8) students in COM100 demonstrated GEO Reading, Writing, and Speaking competency.

Improvements:

Based on prior GEO Pilot results, the GEO Reading Objective was revised to “Use effective reading skills” and the rubric revised spring 2011 to align with the CAC institutional rubric language which is under development with an anticipated launch date of mid-August 2011. The institutional rubric under construction reflects improvements in the measurable student learning outcomes (MSLOs) assessed. These revised MSLOs will contribute to the strengthening of the curriculum as proposals are modified, course MSLOs are mapped to the GEOs, and programs map their suite of course MSLOs to the GEOs to confirm that their degree seeking students can and do achieve competency on the six CAC General Education Outcomes.

Next Steps:

Based on data, SLOAC, and GEO Executive, other GEO Subcommittee feedback, and the GEO Institutional Rubric Task Force (established spring 2011), the Reading Rubric Outcomes were revised for use at the CAC institutional level and updated on the rubric. ENG102 English Composition IV will assess GEO Reading, Writing, GEO Effective Thinking, and GEO Informational Literacy for the Fall 2011 GEO pilot.

For Fall 2011 and future assessments of ENG101, faculty plan to include samples of argumentative essays from adjunct faculty taught course sections. Fall data should be compared with Spring GEO Pilot results for ENG101 to determine if the identified spring downward trend continues. Although faculty are satisfied with the holistic rubric they plan to enhance it as a criterion-based scoring rubric which they believe will improve the correlation with course MSLOs and the GEO Writing Outcomes.

Faculty also agreed that the assessment exercise was beneficial in order to better understand how individual faculty privilege certain aspects of student writing and how assignment design can impact faculty evaluation of a student writing project.

For future assessments, a larger student sample population will be drawn from multiple sections of ENG102. We plan to correlate GEO RDG094 data over time to determine trends and whether improvements implemented as a result of GEO data analysis has improved student learning.

For the GEO Writing Outcomes, English faculty suggested an ENG102 common final examination to assess both GEO Reading and Writing Outcomes. Since ENG102 the capstone course in the composition sequence requires refined, researched writing, this course focus also demands skilful, Effective reading skills.

Reflections on Data Analysis:

The GEO data gathered from ENG101 will not directly benchmark with the Fall 2011 ENG102 data, however the sequencing of student learning for GEO Reading and Writing may be gauged. Also, learning trends based on the GEO Outcomes may be detected through analysis and overall GEO performance in both courses may help CAC identify the “best courses” to use for GEO Reading and Writing assessment.

The Fall 2010 ENG101 assessment compared to the Spring 2010 results showed a marked improvement in student learning, i.e. an 8% increase in assessed proficiency on GEO Writing Outcomes. Faculty expressed no surprise at these results and the score distribution for Writing, however several observations were made regarding the other Communication skills assessed. Some students scored well in Writing but not in Speaking and vice versa. This observation reinforces the fact that while these skills/knowledge/values are related, they are not mutually dependent. Some faculty accounted for low scores in Writing by rationalizing the assignment was either: 1. A new writing genre for students, or 2. Required research writing skills that students had not mastered.

In addition, students demonstrated proficient and accomplished level Speaking skills; 80% of students sampled in ENG101 communicated well orally. This result may be attributed to students concurrently enrolled in a speech course or skewed scores by writing faculty untrained in scoring Speaking competency who may have scored more generously than an Oral Communication faculty expert.

Since ENG101 is a foundational course for language arts skills, the GEO pilot shows that the majority of students sampled are indeed learning Reading, Writing, and Speaking skills and can demonstrate them at a proficient or higher level.

By assessing several GEOs in one pilot, such as ENG102, CAC hopes to streamline the assessment process to more efficiently gather and analyse student learning data.

In addition, the GEO Writing faculty leader noted that overall students appear to be mastering GEO Communication Outcomes. Though some students still lack skill proficiency, these students are often invisible in the pilots due to course attrition and/or failure of students to submit assignments. For those reasons, students with less proficiency were oftentimes excluded from the GEO assessment and ultimately the resulting GEO data.

The multi-discipline GEO assessment theoretically is sound, however the current department culture does not permit for that type of standardized assessment activity. The ENG100 Fall 2010 faculty evaluators noted satisfaction with the results since the majority of students scored at the proficient or higher level. The faculty attributed these strong scores to two main factors: 1. The project was assigned late in the semester and students in both sections were given over three weeks to complete the assignment; 2. One instructor noted that many students who were performing poorly in the course had

withdrawn prior to beginning, completing, or submitting the assignment. Thus, the strong competency scores of 71.5% for Reading and 70% for Writing of the assignment submitters in ENG100 is significant though clearly the results may be skewed due to the small sample size.

The Spring 2011 ENG101 results are distressing to the English faculty since most of the persuasive essays were written during the final week of the semester after a significant amount of instruction and practice. The low scores achieved by a large number of students, 32% indicates that the assessment was challenging and forced students to write under the pressure of a short timeline. Faculty rationalized that students in ENG101 are often exposed to a wide variety of writing genres and persuasion/argumentative writing is a more challenging cognitive task than other genres that may have been practiced during the semester. Thus, the low skewed scores may be attributed to the fact that many students were writing their first academic argument, a genre of writing which is reinforced in ENG102. Additionally, spring semester is typically the "off" semester for students in ENG101. Enrolled students are typically out of sequence in their course taking and trying to catch up. Also, it is likely that students enrolling in ENG101 spring semester are retaking the course so this student population also includes "at-risk students" in that they either: 1. Completed a developmental/basic-writing course fall semester; 2. Did not complete ENG101 in the fall with a "grade of C or better" and were required to repeat the course; or 3. Recently completed the GED program. Without further analysis of the student population, it is difficult to determine the value and validity of the results.

In addition, the ENG101 Spring 2011 results require further analysis to determine the specific areas where student learning needs to be improved, i.e. development and support of the thesis, sentence level construction, interpretations requiring Effective reading, Effectively thinking supported arguments, and/or other writing concepts. Also, the faculty team of evaluators suggested standardizing the rubric language, adding the GEO Informational Literacy Outcomes to address citation/documentation of sources, and to develop a plan to overcome logistical barriers and ensure essays are collected from students in all sections. For example, all faculty from across the district were required to gather for 3-4 hours after mid-terms to ensure meaningful and sufficient instruction prior to implementation of the assessment. Since the ENG101 assessment evaluation should only be conducted during the final examination week when faculty schedules are more flexible this means a heavy work load for faculty who are also grading final papers and examinations, calculating final grades, and submitting grades.

This ENG101 assessment led to faculty discussing how ENG102 GEO Writing Outcome assessment should be improved. ENG102 papers should cover more GEOs beyond the GEO Communication Outcomes. This presents the challenge of standardized, common readings, an activity that may not fit well into the faculty member's course plan. Repeating this assessment will provide another year's worth of scores to analyse, compare, and determine trends, strengths, and weaknesses which can be improved.

The stellar results on ENG102 may be interpreted positively since ENG102 is a capstone English composition course so students are expected to demonstrate proficiency or accomplished Reading and Writing skills. However, one faculty member noted that several students did not submit the assignment selected for the GEO assessment. That faculty speculated that students who chose not to submit the assignment, an undisclosed number of students, most likely would have scored at the "Developing" or "Insufficient" level. By triangulating GEO assessment data, including the total number of students enrolled and completing the course in the statistics, with the final student grades, and the student overall Grade Point Average (gpa), a more comprehensive snapshot of student learning and improvements in teaching methods and instruments resulting in improved student learning may be achieved.

The ENG102 results from Fall2010 also indicate that Effective Reading skills improve over time with practice by reading and critiquing more complex texts. By the end of the two-year matriculation at CAC, students should have experienced reading documents from various disciplines at increasing levels of difficulty. The resulting reading experience and expertise contributed to the 100% Reading score achieved on the assessment.

English faculty critiqued the Communication Rubric and overall found it satisfactory and user friendly. The 4-point Likert Scale change from the 5-point scale continues to be controversial, however the following reasons support retaining the standardized 4-point Likert Scale: 1. The scale is not designed to correlate with an A-F grading scale, 2. Odd numbered rubrics force evaluators to evaluate work as either proficient or not proficient, and 3. Focusing on scoring a level of student learning proficiency supports the 4-point scale.

On the Speaking/Oral Communication Rubric, several faculty commented that the “Communication positively enhances the relationship within which it occurs” outcome requires clarification or revision. Faculty found the language confusing and subject to multiple interpretations. The rubric should be revised before fall 2011 GEO pilot implementation.

Information gathered through these GEO pilots may be considered preliminary since the assignments varied, the timeframe during the course when the assignment was submitted for assessment varied, and the interpretation and implementation of the GEO Rubric by the eight faculty may have varied.