College Mission:
At Leeward Community College, we work together to nurture and inspire all students. We help them attain their goals through high-quality liberal arts and career and technical education. We foster students to become responsible global citizens locally, nationally, and internationally. We advance the educational goals of all students with a special commitment to Native Hawaiians.

Program Mission:
The Associate in Arts (AA) degree program offers a solid liberal arts and sciences foundation in preparation for transfer to four-year colleges and universities. The AA degree program also develops critical thinking, technology and information literacy, communication, and problem-solving skills needed for a successful career.

The general education received in the program

- Encompasses the common knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed by individuals to be effective as persons, family members, workers, and citizens.
- Provides opportunities to develop understanding, abilities, values, and personal attributes which should help students apply their knowledge, skills, and talents to make sound decisions and to analyze and solve problems in a multi-cultural community.
- Helps the students gain a more integrated view of knowledge, a more realistic view of life and a more defined sense of community and social responsibility.

Because knowledge leads to action, students should be actively engaged in learning. This holistic point of view provides the student a foundation of lifelong learning in a changing world.

Part I. Executive Summary of Program Status
As a follow up to prior year action plans and assessment results, division chairs report the following initiatives:
1. Please identify and describe any specific initiatives that are occurring (e.g., curriculum, pedagogy, professional development, other.)

The English and Math disciplines are both involved with the Acceleration Initiative of providing curriculum to students who do not qualify for the college level English and/or math classes to complete their college level English or math course within a year of entering our college. Eight courses within Social Sciences are among the most commonly taken courses by AA in Liberal Arts graduates. These include: PSY 100, SOC 100, GEOG 101, POLS 110, FAMR 230, PSY 240, ANTH 200 and ECON 130; all of
them are also offered in an online format. A Studio Art and a Digital Arts Pathway is being planned by the Art Department to ensure that appropriate course are taken by students who intend on transferring to UHM or UHWO.

2. Please identify and describe any specific initiatives that are occurring to meet Student Success goals (improve the number of graduates and transfers to 4-year institutions, eliminate gatekeeper courses, improve student success rates, and decrease time spent in developmental education).

In Language Arts, the DevEd Steering Committee met in Fall 2015 to analyze and evaluate developmental education reading and writing courses. The Acceleration Initiative continues with ENG 24, an accelerated 6-credit course for the lowest placed students and ALP (Accelerated Learning Program), a co-requisite model that provides support for students one level below while they are simultaneously enrolled in college-level English. ENG 24 faculty meet bi-weekly to discuss and develop curricula, as well as assess course pedagogy and SLOs.

In Math, the Acceleration Initiative has introduced co-requisite math courses for Math 100 (Survey of Math), Math 103 (College Algebra), and Math 115 (Statistics). The co-requisite courses were developed with the ALEKS program and are taken in the Emporium classroom. Acceleration Initiative funds have been provided to renovate a room with computers that will allow students to use during Math Lab Hours and receive additional help in all levels of math courses. Computers were also upgraded to allow faster and more efficient accessibility to computer programs in the Emporium classrooms.

In order to eliminate “gatekeeper” courses in Social Sciences PSY 100 and SOC 100 changed the course prerequisite to “ENG 22” or “ENG 24” with a grade of C or better or equivalent, resulting in the improvement of success rates of both courses and SOC 100 is no longer considered a gatekeeper course. A change of faculty in both disciplines may also have contributed to increased success rates. Social Science division faculty have been reassessing course learning outcomes and pedagogy in an effort to improve student success through their assessment of 48 out of 60 courses taught for an 80% assessment rate. In Arts & Humanities, 14 Pacific Islander students were supported with free tuition and paid books to help them meet the Foundations Symbolic Reasoning Requirement during Summer 2016; all passed with the lowest grade of a B.

3. The AA degree contains the following outcomes: Critical Thinking, Technology and Information Literacy, Oral Communication, Quantitative Reasoning, Written Communication, Written Communication, Arts, Humanities, and Sciences, and Cultural Diversity and Civics; according to data from AA graduates, of the seven learning outcomes of the program, students rate themselves high on communication skills but low on quantitative reasoning and information literacy. What recommendations do you have to inform an action plan to address this?

English faculty work closely with Library staff to promote information literacy by having their ENG 24 and ENG 100 students complete the Information Literacy tutorial and exam created by the Library staff. While faculty across disciplines and divisions may rely on English faculty to assume the responsibility of instructing students regarding appropriate source selection, integration, and citation within written and oral assignments, all faculty should discuss and reinforce information literacy within their courses. Math
**& Science** faculty have imbedded Critical Thinking and Quantitative Reasoning skills in all math and sciences courses. First year students should be counseled to take their math courses in the first semester to allow for additional math courses that might be needed in their chosen program pathway. Also impress upon students that there are many options of receiving tutorial assistance including peer mentoring and math lab services.

The **Social Science** division offers many courses in the Writing Intensive (WI) format to help fulfill the college’s general education outcomes of “Written Communication” and “Critical Thinking.” The division offered 12 different courses in the WI format, including courses in American Studies, Anthropology, Education, Sociology, and Women’s Studies. The laboratory courses for ANTH 215 and GEOG 101 include activities, which include observation, measurement and the collection of data, analysis and discussion, and finally the drawing of valid conclusions, helping to fulfill the “Quantitative Reasoning” learning outcome. The Division is also planning to offer a statistical techniques course in Psychology covering frequency distributions, graphic methods, central tendency, variability, correlation, reliability and tests of significance.

With the university system’s decision to phase out FS (Symbolic Reasoning) with FQ (Quantitative Reasoning) we expect less enrollment in PHIL 110 (FS). Leeward CC has developed a PHIL 111 (Inductive Reasoning) a course which should meet the FQ hallmarks. This course is already taught at UHM and at KCC. PHIL 111 (Inductive Logic) is a humanities version of MATH 115 (Statistics).

**Part II. Program Description**

The AA degree consists of seven general education outcomes, which also serve as the degree’s program learning outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Make critical judgments and apply critical reasoning to address challenges and solve problems.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Technology and Information Literacy</td>
<td>Make informed choices about uses of technology and information literacy for specific purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Oral Communication</td>
<td>Gather information appropriately and communicate clearly both orally and in writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>Use numerical, symbolic, or graphical reasoning to interpret information, draw valid conclusions, and communicate results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Written Communication</td>
<td>Use writing to discover, develop, and communicate ideas appropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Arts, Humanities, and Sciences</td>
<td>Understand the content and use the methodology of the major areas of knowledge: art, humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cultural Diversity and Civics</td>
<td>Appreciate the values and beliefs of diverse cultures and recognize responsibility for local, national, and global issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parts III Quantitative Indicators and IV Analysis

Demand

In the last three academic years (2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016) we see a decrease in demand in the number of Liberal Arts majors: from a 10.6 percent decline to a 6.6 percent decline for the past two years. This decline is rated Unhealthy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majors</td>
<td>3,424</td>
<td>3,197</td>
<td>2,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-10.6%</td>
<td>-6.6%</td>
<td>-9.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The decrease in the number of Liberal Arts majors is partially explained by better enrollment management. Fewer students are being shunted into the LBRT major if they are, in fact, undecided. More students are being redirected by counseling into other majors that they, in fact, might be interested in. The decrease in the number of LBRT majors has been accompanied by an increase in the number of CTE majors. In addition, the availability of more specialized liberal arts majors—the ASNS and TCH—have further reduced the number of the more general LBRT majors.

The percentage of majors who have Native-Hawaiian ancestry has remained consistent around 29% over the last three years—reflecting the overall distribution of the college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majors</td>
<td>3,424</td>
<td>3,197</td>
<td>2,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH Majors</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efficiency

The overall class fill rate continues to be high: 86.9 – 88.8 percent well inside the “Healthy” range. Average class size is consistent ranging from 22.7 to 26.8

The majors to FTE faculty ratio—33.1 to 1—is an improvement from the past two years and “Healthy.”

Together, they indicate a “Healthy” program in terms of efficiency.

Effectiveness
The health call for Effectiveness is “Healthy” due to a continued improvement in the degrees and certificates awarded indicator.

Indicator 1: Increasing the number of Associate Degrees awarded by 3% per year (5% for AY 2015-2016).

The number of students earning degrees has decreased from 743 to 644 and 645 but remains above the goal. This indicator is considered “Healthy.”

Indicator 2: Increasing the number of Transfers to UH 4-year institutions by 3% per year (5% for AY 2015-2016).

The number of transfers to four-year institutions continues to be above goal, with 508 students transferring to a UH 4-year institution in the most recent academic year, a 35.1 percent increase from prior years. This indicator is considered “Healthy.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal (AA Degrees)</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA Degrees Earned</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Short of Goal</td>
<td>+39.9%</td>
<td>+17.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Increase/Decrease</td>
<td>+4.37%</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>+14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undupl Degr &amp; Cert</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal (Transfers)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to 4-Yr UH</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Short of Goal</td>
<td>+71.4%</td>
<td>+66.3%</td>
<td>+114.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Increase/Decrease</td>
<td>+20.1%</td>
<td>+3.0%</td>
<td>+35.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 3: Persistence from Fall to Spring
Persistence has remained stable over the past years: from 68.1 percent in 2013-2014 and 69.1 percent and 69.5 percent to in 2014-2015 and 2015-2016. But this indicator remains at the “Cautionary” level and would require a six percentage point increase to achieve a healthy call.

While Successful Completion Rate (C or Higher) is not used to calculate a health call, it is an important measure of performance. It has remained stable in the low 70’s for several years. This rate is somewhat positive, but it is also only a little above the rate that defines Gatekeeper courses in the UH CC System.

Together, the three effectiveness indicators (the number of Associate Degrees awarded, the number of transfers to UH 4-year institution, and persistence from Fall to Spring) place the college at a “Cautionary” level.

**Part V. Curriculum Revision and Review (if required)**

Minimum of 20% of existing courses is to be reviewed each year so that within the timeframe of the comprehensive program review, all courses have been reviewed and revised as appropriate.

The Curriculum Committee presents the following in its annual report.

**2013-2014**

Modified, reviewed, and recommended the AA Liberal Arts program outline proposal.

Conducted two outline proposal/Curriculum Central workshops to help proposers write outline proposals and use Curriculum Central.


Added content to the outline proposal guides and related resources on the Curriculum Committee’s website.

Reviewed, recommended, and presented to the Faculty Senate every outline proposal submitted during the academic year (except for outline proposals were cancelled by the proposers). For comparison, the number of outline proposals from the 2010-2011, 2011-12 and 2012-2013 academic years are given in parentheses:

- proposals reviewed (163, 154 and 175)
- new, modification, or Deletion proposals recommended (144, 133 and 156)
- diversification proposals recommended (6, 6 and 3)
- experimental proposals recommended (4, 6 and 7)
- outlines cancelled by proposers (5, 2 and 0)
- experimental outlines Deleted (1, 7 and 5)

**2014-2015**

Modified, reviewed, and recommended the AA Liberal Arts program outline proposal.

Conducted two outline proposal/Curriculum Central workshops to help proposers write outline proposals and use Curriculum Central.
Updated the outline proposal guides on the Curriculum Committee’s website.

Streamlined and standardized content on the Curriculum Committee’s website.

Reviewed, recommended, and presented to the Faculty Senate the following outline proposals submitted during the academic year:

- 30 new courses
- 79 course modifications
- 269 course deletions
- 0 new programs
- 32 program modifications
- 5 program deletions
- 10 experimental courses
- 112 experimental courses deleted
- 137 course modifications - added “or ENG 24” as a prerequisite to courses with ENG 21 or ENG 22 as prerequisites

2015-2016

Modified, reviewed, and recommended the AA Liberal Arts program outline proposal.

Added content to the outline proposal guides and related resources on the Curriculum Committee’s website.

Reviewed, recommended, and presented to the Faculty Senate the following outline proposals during the academic year:

- 35 new courses
- 82 course modifications (and 7 more in approval process)
- 81 course deletions (and 12 more in approval process)
- 2 new programs
- 26 program modifications (and 1 more in approval process)
- 0 program deletions (and 3 more in approval process)
- 10 experimental courses (and 1 more in approval process)
- 11 experimental courses deleted
- 120 courses - removed ENG 21 as a prerequisite, corequisite, and/or recommended preparation

Part VI. Survey Results

In Spring 2014, the campus conducted a survey of AA Degree graduates to identify to what degree our graduates perceived their level of proficiency in the degree program’s seven general education outcomes. As displayed below, AA degree graduates generally reported high levels of proficiency in nearly all of the learning outcomes.

Figure 1. Perceptions of Mastery of General Education Learning Outcomes – Combined responses for I can do this very well (“4”) or I can do this (“3”).
Overall, graduates of the AA degree program in Liberal Arts rated their mastery of the program’s and college’s general education learning outcomes very high with over 90 percent indicating mastery of six of the seven learning outcomes. The general education learning outcome that appears to be of most concern for graduates is Quantitative Reasoning. This outcome was ranked the lowest in mastery (79%) and was the highest in the category of “I know what this looks like but need help to do it” (18%).

The graduating class of Spring 2014 indicated that a wide range of courses helped them master the learning outcomes. Support services that the graduates identified as most helpful included counseling, the library, the writing center and tutoring, as well as the computer lab. Involvement in extracurricular activities also was helpful. A copy of the survey results can be found at http://intranet.leeward.hawaii.edu/system/files/indirect_assessment_of_the_aa_degree_spring_2014_final_0.pdf.

In Spring 2015, a qualitative study was conducted to gather student insights about the learning outcomes, the Leeward CC experience and to identify ideas on how the college can improve student learning and achievement of the learning outcomes.
Across all groups, three patterns emerged. Areas of greatest strengths consistently are written communication, critical thinking and oral communication. Mid-range areas grouped around cultural diversity and civics and the arts, humanities, and social sciences. Areas identified as weak consistently included technology and information literacy and quantitative reasoning.

Importantly students identified specific courses where these skills are taught. As displayed below, opportunities to learn and practice an outcome is aligned with the level of proficiency students identify.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Proficiency</th>
<th>General Education Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Opportunities to learn and practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>ENG 100, WI courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Multiple courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>Speech, other courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Cultural Diversity and Civics</td>
<td>Hawaiian Studies; Religion (other courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Social Sciences (numerous courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Technology and Information Literacy</td>
<td>A little in ENG 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the outcomes students felt strongest mastery in (high), students clearly identified and articulated how written communication is taught – this was consistent among all groups. Students also clearly identified that critical thinking was taught throughout many of their courses, including their WI courses as illustrated by student “critical thinking and writing go hand in hand.” Similarly, speech was the primary course students easily identified as to where they learned oral communication and that this skill was used throughout numerous other courses whether through formal presentation or interactive classes where they are required to speak to the class or in small group formats.

While not identified consistently as the strongest skill set, cultural diversity and civics and the arts, humanities, and social sciences were areas that students generally felt confident about. Again, students were clearly able to name specific courses where this is taught. It was noted that those who identify themselves as Hawaiian Studies majors ranked cultural diversity and civics as a strength (high).

The two outcomes that were consistently identified as their weakest are technology and information literacy and quantitative reasoning. For each outcome, only one course was identified as the opportunity to learn and master the outcome.
Part VII. Overview Analysis of Program

In 2011, the college issued a comprehensive review and evaluation of the Associate in Arts Degree “Assessment of the Associate in Arts Degree at Leeward Community College (2005 - 2010)”\(^1\). The report’s conclusions included

> While the data suggest that students are meeting some general education outcomes, and not meeting others, the more solid conclusion is that, overall, the college needs to improve its assessment process. Specifically, the college should recognize that other program level assessment strategies and methods are available.

In response, Faculty Senate and the Administration created an AA Degree Program Review Coordinator position to facilitate regular and on-going evaluation of Leeward CC’s Associate of Arts degree and to recommend and facilitate appropriate actions to respond to the findings of the prior assessment of the degree.

In Spring 2014, the AA Degree Program Review Coordinator proposed an assessment strategy to the Dean of Arts & Sciences, the four division chairs of the AA Degree (Arts and Humanities, Language Arts, Math and Science, Social Sciences) and the Office of Planning, Policy, and Assessment (OPPA). The assessment of student learning would continue to utilize course level outcome data that is collected through Tk20 (the college’s assessment database) and reported annually through the Annual Report on Program Data.

However, a new assessment process involving the development of common rubrics to measure three general education learning outcomes was proposed as a pilot study to determine if the college could develop more direct measures of student learning and an ongoing process of assessing the effectiveness of the degree program. To accomplish this, the AA Degree Program Review Taskforce was created.

Members of the AA Degree Program Review Taskforce included:

- Jeff Judd, Faculty Senate, Program Review and Assessment Committee, Chair
- Susan Wood, Susan Waldman, Kathryn Fujioka-Imai, Leah Gazan (subcommittee on Written Communication)
- Michael Lane, Blanca Polo, P. Jayne Bopp (subcommittee on Critical Thinking)
- James Fujita, Bruce Lindquist, and Luukia Archer (subcommittee on Cultural Diversity)
- Guy Nishimoto, Institutional Effectiveness Officer and Adam Helemano, Assessment Coordinator, OPPA
- James Goodman, Dean of Arts and Sciences
- Eunice L. Brekke, AA Degree Program Review Coordinator and Chair

---

\(^1\) A copy of the report can be found at http://intranet.leeward.hawaii.edu/system/files/assessment_of_the_aa_degree_fall_2011_final.pdf
**Assessment Methodology**

The pilot study focused its work on measuring three general education learning outcomes: written communication, critical thinking and cultural diversity. Task force members were trained on basic assessment principles and provided with resources and technical assistance to help guide the development of common rubrics. Each of the sub-committees (organized by learning outcome) reviewed the degree’s current general education learning outcome and associated academic skill standards and VALUE rubrics developed by ACC&U and developed a revised learning outcome and its associated rubric that would best assess student learning of these outcomes.

The three revised general education learning outcomes and their associated criteria (academic skill standards) are:

1. **Written Communication** - Develop, support, and communicate ideas to a particular audience through writing.
   - Develop a position or thesis to communicate main ideas.
   - Use language, style, and organization appropriate to particular purposes and audiences to communicate position or thesis.
   - Develop appropriate content to support position or thesis.
   - Gather and document credible sources to support position or thesis.
   - Use appropriate grammar and mechanics to communicate position or thesis.

2. **Critical Thinking** - Use critical thinking to address issues and solve problems.
   - Describe an issue or problem.
   - Analyze the issue or problem.
   - Develop a position (perspective, thesis or hypothesis) on the issue or problem.
   - Evaluate conclusions and implications on the issue or problem.

3. **Cultural Diversity** - Describe and analyze the nature of culture and its variations, past and present.
   - Describe culture and the variation of cultural practices, expressions, and/or experiences.
   - Analyze the variation of cultural practices, expressions, and/or experiences associated with culture.
   - Compare and contrast cultural practices, expressions, and/or experiences among different societies; past and/or present.

To create a rubric, each of these criteria were further defined and described along a scale of exceeds proficiency, meets proficiency, developing proficiency and below proficiency. Copies of the rubrics can be found in Appendices A, B, and C.

From Spring 2014 to Fall 2015, the rubrics for each of the learning outcomes were tested or normed by the task force. Norming sessions typically involved an overview of the learning outcome and rubric
followed by an all group reading of various student papers, using the rubric to score. Each member’s scores were recorded and reviewed to locate how close or far the group was in administrating or interpreting the rubric. When discrepancies were found, discussion was held to understand why. In some cases, revisions to the rubric were suggested and accepted. In some cases, we learned how various disciplinary perspectives influenced the interpretation of the rubric. This process continued until each rubric across a variety of student work representing all divisions and a variety of disciplines was normed with one standard deviation.

Sampling Strategy

Throughout the norming process, it became evident that the better student papers or artifacts to measure the learning outcomes were papers that captured what students could do at the end of a course, for example a final research paper or essay. In collaboration with the Writing Intensive Focus Board, a list of all Writing Intensive (WI) courses for Fall 2015 was obtained representing 30 courses. Each of the instructors were contacted to request their participation. Instructors were asked if they were willing to participate by submitting end of the semester final papers and to also indicate which of the three learning outcomes they thought their assignment would measure. A total of 175 student papers were collected representing 13 different courses and the four academic divisions of the degree program.

The AA Degree Program Coordinator collected the papers and respective assignments. Each student paper and the instructor’s name were hidden to protect student and instructor confidentiality. The papers, assignments, and rubrics were uploaded into Tk20 and task force members received training on how to conduct the assessment using Tk20. A final group norming session was held using all three rubrics.

The task force scored 175 student artifacts for written communication and critical thinking. The number of student papers scored for cultural diversity was 41 (three courses were used as indicated by participating instructors). The data was reviewed by the AA Degree Program Review Coordinator to ensure consistency (i.e., standard deviations were less than 1.0).

Results

Figure 1 (below) presents the percentage of students meeting or exceeding proficiency in each of the three general education learning outcomes. A little over half of papers met this level of proficiency in written communication and critical thinking (58 and 56 percent) and a third (30 percent) in cultural diversity.

Figure 1. Students Meeting or Exceeding Proficiency in Written Communication, Critical Thinking and Cultural Diversity
Written Communication

For written communication, 13 percent exceeded proficiency and 45 percent met proficiency levels (58 percent or 102 papers). Another 35 percent were assessed as developing proficiency and 8 percent below proficiency (43 percent or 73 papers).

In analyzing specific areas of how students perform, student strengths are in developing a position or main idea (63%) and using appropriate grammar and language (62 and 60 percent). Areas of challenge are gathering and documenting credible sources (51%) and developing appropriate content to support the position (53%).

Critical Thinking

For critical thinking, 13 percent exceeded proficiency and 43 percent met proficiency levels (56 percent or 98 papers). Another 38 percent were assessed as developing proficiency and 7 percent below proficiency (45 percent or 77 papers).

In evaluating critical thinking, students appear to doing best in describing an issue or problem (65%). Areas of challenge are analysis, developing a position, and evaluating conclusions and implications (51 to 54 percent).

Cultural Diversity
For cultural diversity, 30 percent (12 papers) met proficiency. Another 38 percent were assessed as developing proficiency and 32 percent below proficiency (70 percent or 29 papers).

Although the number of students meeting or exceeding proficiency in cultural diversity is much smaller compared to written communication and critical thinking, these students do best in describing culture and its variations (44%). Analysis and the ability to compare and contrast were lower (22-24 percent).

Conclusions

While these results indicate that students do have areas of strength (description of issues or practices, developing a thesis or position to communicate main ideas and using appropriate grammar and language), overall, there is room for improvement.

Specific areas that need improvement are developing a perspective on an issue or problem, developing and gathering appropriate content and credible sources, and analysis and evaluation of an issue or problem. These areas reflect higher levels of knowledges according to Bloom’s Taxonomy (see Appendix D).

Recommendations

The task force respectfully makes the following recommendations to the Faculty Senate:

Take action on these results to provide ongoing assessment of the Associate of Arts in Liberal Arts degree.

One approach is to convene the WI instructors who participated in this study to review the results, discuss different strategies to make improvements, select a strategy and after implementation, reassess student learning in written communication and critical thinking to see what has changed. We encourage the administration to support this effort.

Identify courses in the degree program that address aspects of culture and cultural diversity (describe and analyze the nature of culture and its variations, past and present) and also where they practice and develop this outcome so that they can meet proficiency in this area. The sample size to measure cultural diversity was much lower than hoped for. There is a need to locate better assignments or student work to measure cultural diversity.

Finally, we ask that the college accept the work of the task force - the revised general education learning outcomes, associated criteria and rubrics. These outcomes and criteria used to assess the outcomes should be reflected in the college’s official description of its general education learning outcomes.