TO: AIC Steering Committee/Mark Silliman, Chair
FROM: AIC for Degrees and Certificates/General Education and Student Learning Outcomes:
- J. De Ste Croix, Co-Chair
  Candice Hochstein, Co-Chair
SUBJECT: Final Report
DATE: March 28, 2003

The final meeting for the AIC for Degrees and Certificates took place on Oct. 4, 2002. The Co-Chairs convened the meeting in order to assess the committee’s progress and to formulate a direction for the future. In general, the committee concluded that it had fulfilled the original charges for which it was responsible and that the April First Progress Report had outlined the particulars supporting that conclusion. (A copy of that report is attached to this memo.) The Committee does recommend, however, that the General Education Outcomes and Associate in Arts Degree Competencies (pages 45-49 in the 2002-2003 LCC Catalog) be shared with all of the Divisions and Curriculum Committee members. They should be aware that any course proposed for the Core will need to conform to the requirements denoted in these documents.

During the October fourth meeting, the subject of the committee’s future prospects constituted the bulk of the discussion. After considering several possibilities (some of which are listed on the minutes for that meeting), committee members settled on an exploratory approach. Because the committee’s original tasks had centered on issues having to do with assessment, concluded the members, it might be reasonable for this committee to assume a leading role in the formation of a campus-wide assessment committee, one linked to other similar bodies throughout the system. In order to look into the possibilities for this development, the committee members decided to create a proposal suggesting this possibility and outlining the conditions it would see as necessary in order for a successful assessment committee to operate.

The October fourth meeting took place on a Friday afternoon. On the following Monday, the LCC administration announced its formation of a wholly separate campus-wide pre-assessment committee in charge of creating the group which would establish and implement assessment for the LCC community. In light of this latter development, the AIC for Degrees and Certificates has decided that its decision to offer a proposal is now unnecessary and, as a result, will not be formulated. Unless the AIC Steering Committee sees compelling reasons for this AIC to continue, we propose that it be discontinued.

A system-wide community college task force headed by Dave Cleveland of Honolulu Community College is working on consolidating the AA degree learning competencies. Moreover, Bernadette Howard, Leeward Community College’s Acting Assistant Dean of Instruction, is currently consulting with individual disciplines in order to form standard learning student learning outcomes for all courses.
TO: AIC Steering Committee/Mark Silliman, Chair  
FROM: AIC for Degrees and Certificates/General Education and Student Learning Outcomes:  
        J. De Ste Croix, Co-Chair  
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SUBJECT: April First Progress Report  
DATE: April 1, 2002

In August of 2001, the AIC for Degrees and Certificates was formed in order to address specific concerns the recent accrediting body noted in its accrediting report on Leeward Community College. At its first meeting in the fall of 2001, the committee established a co-chair organization and began its work of identifying its particular tasks in this campus-wide effort of self-study and action plans. As the fall semester progressed, the responsibilities of the committee began to take concrete form in a list of seven "charges" arranged in order of importance. As that first semester came to a close, we initiated work on the first charge.

The spring semester brought unexpected changes in our committee personnel. Because our Acting Dean of Instruction left the campus to facilitate LCC's international efforts, one of our co-chairs left the committee in order to fill the administrative vacancy. A new co-chair was appointed and has since executed the responsibilities of the position. The full committee has met twice this spring semester (so far), and the co-chairs have met more than five times. Following is a list of the seven charges, each in bold type. After each charge is an explanation of the committee's response to that charge— as of April 1, 2002.

1. Identify and make public expected student learning outcomes for all of its [LCC's] degree and certificate programs.

Leeward Community College now has three degree programs (A.A., A.S., and A.A.S.) and several certificate programs, all of which have been approved by the community college system. Learning outcomes for these degrees and certificates have likewise been formulated and approved at the systems level and can be found in "Chancellor for Community Colleges Memo" #6004 (November 4, 1996) and "University of Hawaii General Education Project Memo," dated March 17, 1997. (An additional skills standard, "non-linear thinking," was added by the LCC Senate.*) As a committee, we incorporated these outcomes into the appropriate sections of the LCC catalogue and, on February 12, 2002, edited the final incorporation. This suggested revision to the LCC catalogue was then forwarded to the AIC Steering Committee (with an accompanying memo) in mid-March, 2002. Whether these revision suggestions will appear in the next LCC catalogue depends on those responsible for assembling it and the timelines they must work with.
2. **In the Catalogue, publish in clear and complete terms the general education component of all degree programs.**

As in the first charge, systems-level standards for the general education Component of all degree programs can be found in "Chancellor for Community Colleges Memo" #6004 (November 4, 1996) and "University of Hawaii General Education Project memo," dated March 17, 1997. At the same time that we incorporated the modifications for our first charge, we also incorporated the modifications for our second charge. In other words, both are contained in the revisions we forwarded to the AIC Steering Committee in mid-March, 2002.

3. **Make sure that the general education component is based on a philosophy and rationale that are clearly stated and publicized.**

The philosophy and rationale for the general education requirement is clearly stated on page 12 of 12 of Appendix 2 of CCCM# 6004. This two-paragraph statement presents a clear rationale and philosophy for the general education component and does so at the systems level. Although it references the Associate in Science Degree in a footnote, that reference does not, in the opinion of this committee, mean that the rationale need be so restricted. The text of the statement speaks otherwise.

4. **Provide the criteria by which the appropriateness of each course in the general education component is determined.**

The criteria for the appropriateness of the inclusion of courses into the general education component were, again, established at the systems level. University of Hawaii General Education Project Memo, dated March 17, 1997, provides an explanation of the mechanism through which these standards were developed. The appropriate section reads as follows:

The skill standards set for the in this document are the result of (1) a 1995-96 survey of faculty, the results of which were presented at 12 campus and system meetings, (2) a 1996 survey of graduating/leaver students at all university of Hawaii campuses, (3) five system-wide meetings of faculty and administrators, and (4) faculty responses to previous drafts of these skill standards. (Page 2 of 10)

The standards themselves are those which have been forwarded to the AIC Steering Committee. (See numbers one through three of this memo.)

5. **Evaluate the Liberal Arts AA degree program and integrate this evaluation with those of all other established academic programs as part of the overall institutional evaluation and planning.**

Charge #5 breaks down into two sections. The first part asks that we evaluate the Liberal Arts AA degree program in terms, we assume, of how we determine any particular class fits into the general education core. In order to address this half of the charge, this committee sent memos to all Division Chairs (dated February 4), asking that each division review courses it has included in the general education core and indicate how those courses meet “at least one of the specified academic skills standards.
mentioned in the University of Hawaii General Education Project and LCC Faculty minutes regarding non-linear thinking.” This committee asked that responses be forwarded by April 1.

The second part of Charge #5 asks that this committee “integrate this evaluation with those of all other established academic programs as part of the overall institutional evaluation and planning.” As a committee we felt that this vague and ambiguous part of the charge required expertise and authority beyond the scope of the committee. As a result, we forwarded a memo to the AIC Steering Committee concerning our evaluation and received a response on March 10, a response that agreed with our assessment.

6. Establish the Academic Assessment Committee to develop instruments to measure student competence in specific skill areas, e.g., oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, and critical analysis/logical thought.

And

7. Established formalized and institutionalized policies and procedures to use such instruments to assess student learning outcomes across the disciplines and to effect change.

Charges six and seven represent two very important and time-consuming tasks. The scope of these jobs prompted this committee to forward a memo to the AIC Steering Committee, recommending that a campus-wide authority be established to address these concerns. It is the opinion of this committee that this authority have both authority and responsibility to see that the campus addresses these concerns and establishes the mechanisms required in Charge seven. More specifically, this committee asked that a position be created so that that person “be designated in charge of this very complex task.” In the request memo, this committee understood that the person in this position would be drawn from faculty and provided with release time.

The response to this committee’s memo arrived on March 8. In it, the AIC Steering Committee Chair, Mark Silliman, agreed with our assessment and indicated that an ad-hoc planning committee would be established by the LCC Acting Interim Dean “to think through the recommendation and to make concrete plans, including a timetable and projected costs, to implement the recommendation.”

*This committee could see no essential distinction between the LCC standard for Non-Linear thinking and the system-wide skill standard for Critical Thinking.