

**Degrees and Certificates Committee Retreat
September 16, 2010
Conference A, 9am-1:30pm**

In attendance: Phil Christain, Eriks Puris, Steve Smith, Djambel Unkov, Kathleen Bradach, Loretta Goldy, Sally Earll, Rebecca Mathern, Scott Huff, Dave Stout, Kendra Cawley, Veronica Garcia, Susanne Christopher, Pamela Blumenthal, Amy Alday-Murray, Joanne Harris, Janeen Hull,

Retreat Topics

1. Welcome and agenda

2. Informational items

a. Outcomes – SACs asked to present outcomes in November and December

Eight to ten SACs were called and asked to consult Sally Earll. A letter will go out asking these SACs to present their degree and/or certificate outcomes at the November or December Degrees and Certificate meeting.

b. Adult High School Diploma (AHSD) – Passed out course handout.

Steve Smith provided committee members with an update on the AHSD. Several committee members were involved with reviewing courses for the AHSD list in the 09-10 academic year. In 2009/2010 the course list was reviewed with the intent of removing all courses that did not meet all the standards and to provide a more equitable unit to credit conversion. Part of the rationale was that a high school student could receive an AAS before graduating with an AHSD due to the number of credits needed for an AHSD. In the process of reviewing courses it was realized that if all courses which didn't meet all the high school standards were removed it would decimate certain areas and make it very difficult to obtain an AHSD. It was decided to grandfather in the 3, 4 and 5 credit courses at .5 high school units who did not meet all the high school standards. However, from here on out all courses that do not meet all the standards will not be added to the list. It was also decided to delay sending in a new plan as at the statewide meeting they explained they are looking into redoing some of the OARs.

3. Outcome guidelines and outcomes

a. Update on Accreditation and assessment at PCC

A quick update was provided by Steve, Susanne, and Kendra. Committee members had attended meetings throughout the inservice week where this was a topic.

b. Outcome discussion. Common language and expectations for degree and certificate outcomes during 10-11 year. Our role and assessment. Standardized outcomes for statewide degrees. Is it one outcome that states that graduates will be prepared to meet statewide outcomes? - See pp 15-18

There needs to be a difference in outcomes between a 2 year certificate and AAS degrees. Sally wants clarity on the number of outcomes expected. The 3 questions at the top of page 17 are under review as per request by Sally Earll.

Degree and certificate outcome discussion items:

1. Use of the word practice. There is ambiguity in this word. According to Webster's Dictionary: 1) the exercise of a profession or 2) repeated performance in order to perfect or learn a skill
2. Discuss the outcome that may be used to differentiate between a 2-year certificate and an AAS, this relates to the Gen Ed required courses. Need samples to evaluate
3. Develop standard outcome that may be used or amended for national or state accreditation. (See suggestion and examples below)

The committee reviewed the current degree and certificate outcome information found on the committee's web page. After reviewing the document, the discussion focused on three areas: guidelines for how many outcomes, the difference in outcomes between the AAS and a 2 year certificate and whether the AAS degrees and certificates need to meet all college core outcomes. Discussion ensued. Several thoughts were expressed about the number of outcomes and rationale for the numbers. The Curriculum Committee holds outcomes to a 6 max in courses. After a lengthy discussion that moved in and out of this topic to other outcome topics, it was agreed to stick with the current language of 3-10. The primary rationale is that CTE SACs are just completing a five year process to have outcomes for each AAS degree and certificate using the 3-10 outcome guideline. Without a rationale to change the number, it seems arbitrary to change this guideline and suggests a potential of additional work for SACs.

The relationship between AAS degree outcomes, certificate outcomes and Core Outcomes were discussed. The LAC is asking the CTE SACs to map course outcomes to the degree outcomes to show how they are connected. Committee members discussed the "All graduates" language for core outcomes. Should a graduate for a certificate be held to the same standard as a graduate of an AAS program? Kendra reminded committee members that the college is focusing on AAS degrees for the next couple years as far as assessment and will address certificates in year three. Susanne pointed out that the current guidelines state that the AAS degree needs to meet all the core outcomes. Susanne asked committee members, in light of the assessment work being done in SACs and LAC, is this what we want as one of our criteria? Is it consistent with the assessment work being done? Brainstorming discussion ensued. Several ideas were suggested and examined. Susanne asked Kendra how she would like it worded. Kendra proposed some language. Eriks and others proposed modifications. Djambel read back our wording several times, more edits. We agreed to the following criteria for AAS outcomes:

- Identify which AAS degree outcomes align to individual core outcomes. It is possible that all core outcomes may not be addressed by the AAS degree outcomes.

Sally will work on the guidelines and forms and bring this back to committee. The guidelines on the website will be modified:

1. Take out the word “new” by AAS Degree and Certificates and replace with New and Revised.
2. Reorganize the current bullets into two areas: criteria and parameters
 - a. Criteria:
 - i. Distinction between certificate and AAS Degree outcomes
 - ii. Three-Ten Outcomes
 - iii. Identify which AAS degree outcomes align to individual core outcomes.
It is possible that all core outcomes may not be addressed by the AAS degree outcomes.
 - b. Writing Outcomes Guidelines: - This section will remain the same

Sally also brought forth discussion about a standard outcome that distinguishes AAS Degrees from 2-year certificates where the difference is general education courses. A potential second standardized outcome could address statewide degrees. **Susanne and Eriks to meet before next meeting and look at the statements to bring to the next DAC meeting.**

Finally, committee members agreed that degree and certificate assessment will not be on the forms this year and not a formal part of our discussions with SACs although this may come up as a natural flow of committee conversation.

4. Outcomes for PCC degrees – See P8 for PCC core outcomes, p 19,20 for state AGS and AS guidelines

NW Accreditations recommendation in this area is clear. DAC will lead the college wide process to determine outcomes for our degrees other than AAS. Conversation initially focused on the AS and AGS degrees. Later it expanded to include AAOT and ASOT in Business.

To assist committee members in this discussion, Steve presented the degree information from CCWD Handbook. Committee members concluded that core outcomes have to be in the conversation as well as guidance from the state handbook on degree purposes. Committee members discussed the complexity of issues and determined that the best place to start the college discussion on this topic was to recommend that each degree, except AGS, have the six core outcomes as its outcomes with one additional outcome that distinguishes the unique purpose/goal/function of the degree. After reading the CCWD Handbook information on the AGS, it was determined that the Professional Competency outcome does not apply to this degree. While memories are unclear about the intent of Professional competence, whether it was intended to apply only to CTE programs or not, the CCWD Handbook is clear that the AGS degree cannot be a career technical degree.

AAOT and ASOT in Business : Kendra suggested the committee members discuss these two degrees in the same way as the previous two. Does the six core outcomes plus one unique

outcome apply for these degrees too? It was determined that it does and provides a solid place to start college discussion. Scott Huff offered to write a outcome for each of these degrees based on current language in the catalog and CCWD Handbook. Susanne and Scott will work on this and have a document ready for the September 27th EAC meeting and EAC Leaders/DOI meeting. In addition, the document will be shared at ASAC and LAC.

5. Math 30 or higher in the AGS

Rebecca Mathern, registrar, presented her concern about our current AGS requirements which allow a sub-100 course to count to the 90 credits. Specifically the course is Math 30. The question before committee members: Is it appropriate for math classes 30 or higher but below 100 to be counted in the AGS degree? These courses are called post secondary remedial by the state. After reviewing the CCWD Handbook, which clearly states sub-100 courses may not be applied to this degree, we believe this requirement needs to be amended. This does not change the Math competency requirement for the AGS degree.

Recommendation for the EAC: Beginning Fall 2011, sub-100 courses may not be applied to the AGS degree.

The current Math competency, listed below, will remain the same.

Math: Competency in mathematics must be demonstrated by either:

- Completing MTH 65 or MTH 63 with a C or better, or
- Passing the PCC competency exam for MTH 65, or
- Passing a math class (minimum of 3 credits) with a C or better for which MTH 65 or higher level math skills are a prerequisite. Excludes MTH 93.

6. 300-400 level courses

Rebecca shared background in this area and current practice. In CTE programs, the current practice is to accept 300 and 400 level courses as substitutions for degree and certificate completion in certain cases. In addition, occasionally 300 level courses are accepted for 200-level courses when the course title and description concur. Examples of this could be two and three-hundred anatomy and physiology.

Committee members asked about CCWD and Accreditation. CCWD appears to be fine with this. NW Accreditation expressed concern about mission “creep”. Community College courses are supposed to be broad and foundational. Accepting higher level courses may deprive students of the foundational elements of courses.

Initially thinking by committee members seemed to indicate

1. that 300-level courses needed to be treated differently than 400-level courses
2. setting a maximum number than would be part of 60 credits allowed to be transferred in. 12-16 credits were mentioned throughout the committee discussion.

3. restricting them to electives and/or CTE course substitution (this last one is current practice)

*Susanne recommends Rebecca Mathern write up a proposal. Susanne will go to EAC and show them the committee's ideas to discuss.

7. Repeatable classes applying toward a degree

a. See p 10 for presentation

Susanne explained which repeat policy we are discussing, which is should students be allowed to take a class several times and have all those credits count towards a degree? Currently there is no degree limitations on this, the limitation is set by the SAC through individual course repeat policies.

Committee discussed several aspects of this issue. Some SACs use the same courses multiple times, such as PE and ART. Committee members asked how does this current situation help or harm the most students? How does this current situation, of unlimited repeat credits in a degree, support the individual degree outcomes?

Supporting the committee members' earlier work with unique outcomes for PCC degrees, the members agreed that our current thinking is that repeated courses' credits may only be used once for the AAOT, AS and ASOT in Business Degrees. The AGS Degree has a different purpose and outcome and repeated course credits current policy should remain in place. Susanne will bring this issue and our current thinking to the EAC for a larger discussion.