



Liberal Studies Program Academic Program Review

2004 - 2005

The Office of Instruction

Paul Kessel, Interim Chief Academic Officer
Barbara Wing, Dean of Instruction and Curriculum
Tom Schumacher, Dean of Instruction, Verde Valley Campus

The Office of Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment

Tom Hughes, Director
Diane Mazmanian, Senior Research Analyst
Sandra Thurman-Jackson, Research Assistant

Liberal Studies Program

Academic Program Review

2004 - 2005

Committee Members

Jim Hinton, Liberal Arts Assistant Dean, Chair
Debbie Roberts, Prescott Faculty
Dieter Bartels, Verde Faculty
Greg Grahlmann, Student
Steve Sparks, Prescott Faculty
Tania Sheldahl, Student Services
Terence Pratt, Verde campus Division I Assistant Dean

Table of Contents

	Page
A. Mission, Goals and Planning	1
Mission Statement.....	1
Historical Sketch.....	1
Origins.....	1
Program Structure and Purpose.....	1
Program Evolution.....	2
Program Supervision and Instruction.....	4
Academic Program Planning and Current Goals.....	5
B. Student, Class, and FTSE Profiles/Trends	7
Student Profiles.....	7
Class and FTSE Profiles.....	7
Distance Learning/Non-Traditional Classes.....	11
C. Curriculum Analysis	13
Curriculum and Course Content.....	13
LSC 101 Connections Courses.....	13
LSC 102 Introductory Portfolio.....	14
LSC 200 Capstone Portfolio.....	14
HUM 205 Technology and Human Values.....	15
LSC 201/202/203 Western Civilization.....	16
LSC 251 Cultural Diversity.....	16
Curriculum Content Review.....	17
Course Outline Review.....	17
Syllabi Comparison with Course Outlines.....	17
Articulation.....	17
Overview of Liberal Studies Curriculum.....	18
Instructional Delivery.....	19
In-Class Assessment.....	25
General Education.....	25
D. Program Faculty and Personnel	26
Liberal Studies Faculty.....	26
Supervision and Coordination	27
Credentials.....	28
Administrative and Support Personnel.....	29
Professional Development.....	29
Service Contributions.....	30
Support From Other Areas.....	30
E. Physical Resources	33
Facilities and Equipment.....	33
Faculty Offices.....	34
Financial Resources.....	34

F. Advisory Committee/Partnerships.....	36
G. General Outcomes.....	37
Student Evaluation of Instructors.....	37
Grades.....	38
Retention.....	41
H. Student Outcomes Assessment.....	42
Organization.....	42
Program Assessment Plan.....	42
Assessment Results.....	42
I. Strengths and Concerns.....	44
Strengths.....	44
Concerns.....	45
J. Recommendations.....	47
K. Action Plan.....	49
L. Addendum.....	52
EXHIBITS	
Exhibit A: Liberal Studies Program Demographics.....	59
Prescott West Civilization Demographics.....	60
Prescott HUM205 Demographics.....	62
Verde Liberal Studies Demographics.....	63
Exhibit B: End of Year Gen Ed Review of Capstone Portfolio.....	65
Exhibit C: Articulation of Liberal Studies Courses	67
Exhibit D: Liberal Studies Program Faculty.....	69
Capstone Instructors	70
Western Civilization/Technology and Human Values Instructors.....	71
Connections Class Instructors.....	72
Exhibit E: Liberal Studies Program Grading Data.....	76

A. Mission, Goals and Planning

MISSION STATEMENT

Liberal Studies supports the mission of the college by providing an intellectually challenging and academically rigorous education for all students and by a commitment to teaching excellence. It is a core general education discipline and comprises one of three general education areas required to earn associate degrees at Yavapai College.

Liberal Studies courses feature interdisciplinary instruction that guides students in interdisciplinary thinking through the study of history, literature, music, philosophy, humanities, economics, science, and art. The interdisciplinary approach allows students to experience their study of cultural literacy from a variety of perspectives. Students are encouraged to value diverse philosophical and methodological approaches in their academic pursuits.

Liberal Studies is committed to providing students with an educational experience that provides the foundation for the development of curiosity about the world and empathy for the diverse human cultures. Liberal Studies courses aim to provide a framework in which students can achieve a higher level of self-understanding, a global understanding and appreciation of people from diverse backgrounds and cultures, the ability to critically think and analyze, integrate information from different perspectives, and appreciate that learning is a lifelong endeavor. Open and clear communication is encouraged on a broad range of ideas, which allows students to explore their position within local, national, and international realms.

HISTORICAL SKETCH

The Liberal Studies Program was created as part of a movement designed to raise the standards of general education for Yavapai College students. Planning was facilitated by two grants, Title Three and Ford Foundation, designed to support general education curriculum reform. An ad hoc committee, chaired by Ken Meier, met during the summer of 1987 charged to establish a distinctive and innovative liberal studies/general education curriculum at Yavapai College. Recommendations from that summer's work were submitted to the college committee structure, the faculty senate and administration. On January 12, 1988 the Board of Governors for Yavapai College gave official approval for the Liberal Studies Program. Ken Meier was appointed program coordinator and a liberal studies committee was created to advise him in the implementation of the new program. In 1989, lead instructors in the LSC program, from the Prescott and Verde Campuses, traveled to California State University at Sonoma, to attend a summer workshop on critical thinking skills for students. This workshop proved to be a seminal experience for the instructional team as it provided focus, direction and encouragement for the new program.

Program Structure and Purpose

The program pieces were finalized and in place for the Fall semester of 1988. The revised general education structure featured the creation of a tripartite division of courses into Foundation Studies (e.g. basic English and Mathematics courses), Liberal Studies Core, and Area Studies (e.g. courses in Science, the Humanities, and Social Sciences). All general education courses, but the liberal studies core especially, were to emphasize critical thinking, critical reading, and thoughtful writing, and to meet standards established by the Liberal Studies Committee for each area of concentration.

The Liberal Studies Core (LSC), in addition to emphasizing critical thinking/reading/writing skills, was to expose students to multiple voices simultaneously through the interdisciplinary nature of the courses, engage students in issues connected to their lives, and teach cultural literacy. The core consisted of Western Civilization (divided into three semesters) and a unique set of one credit modules labeled “connections” courses. Through the Western Civilization courses students would be exposed to cultural literacy in the Western European tradition and learn critical thinking skills from a basis of historical knowledge.

The “connections” courses were created as one credit modules dealing with contemporary issues—topics that would be “values volatile” and subject to conflicting interpretation. The interdisciplinary approach used would provide for an examination of alternative conceptual frameworks and enable students to perceive connections among disciplines, cultures, institutions, modes of consciousness and the environment. A key goal was for students to relate the course subject with personal and cultural values, which would make the class more relevant to their personal experiences. These modules were inspired by the work of Dr. Ernest Boyer who issued the challenge to begin teaching students how to make connections and to emphasize the human commonalities which help us understand our interdependency and what integrates us.

Program Evolution

To facilitate district implementation of the Liberal Studies Core, a full-time instructor was hired at the Verde Valley Campus in 1989 to teach with an emphasis in the Liberal Studies Core area. In 1990 a full-time liberal studies instructor was hired for the Prescott campus. For the first couple of years, the Core Studies courses (Western Civilization and Connections) were taught via interactive television. This was intended as a temporary measure until an on-site Verde campus team could be established. By 1990-91, this team began teaching the Western Civilization sequence at the Verde campus. Initially, there were three members on the team, but after a year or two, the team was reduced to two, who have been teaching the Western Civilization sequence ever since.

During the summer of 1990 a sub-committee of the Liberal Studies Committee convened to evaluate the progress of the program. The result of that summer work included an impressive list of accomplishments and strengths as well as weaknesses and concerns. A key recommendation was to replace the Liberal Studies Committee with a broader based standing general education committee. Subsequently the General Education Committee was formed with the Liberal Studies Coordinator on the Prescott campus serving as chair. General Education Committee meetings began in late fall 1990. The committee was charged to oversee the implementation of recommendations coming from the summer evaluation and debate issues involving the Liberal Studies Core (i.e. transferability, the cost of the program, the nature of critical thinking, and whether students in technical programs should also be required to take Core classes). Some of the issues that developed with the formation of the Liberal Studies Program include: “What constitutes interdisciplinary instruction?” “How should LSC classes be loaded?” and “How do you assess student learning?” These are issues that are still debated today.

Through the years Liberal Studies credits have changed as a result of internal and external requirements. A significant external demand for change came in the 1990s. State transfer agreements negotiated jointly by the state universities and community colleges were established that resulted in block transfer of general education credits to state universities. These

agreements became known as the Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC). To facilitate Yavapai College’s involvement in this process, the position of General Education Coordinator was established. Although Yavapai College had determined the size and weight of its own core prior to the state-wide agreements, when the AGEC was instituted, Yavapai College found it necessary to refashion its core to meet AGEC guidelines. The AGEC is comprised of thirty-five credits that, when completed, must be accepted by any other state post-secondary institution as having fulfilled general education requirements. As a result of the AGEC agreement the Liberal Studies requirements were reduced. Table 1-1 shows the evolution of the requirement changes through time.

Table 1-1. Evolution of Liberal Studies Core Requirements

Year	Credits	Explanation of Requirements for Associate of Arts Degree
1988-89	12	Three connections classes and all three Western Civilization courses.
1989-90	12	Same as previous year.
1990-91	12	Same as previous year.
1991-92	9	Three connections classes and at least two of the Western Civilization sequence.
1992-93	7	One connections class and two from the Western Civilization sequence.
1993-94	7	Same as previous year.
1994-95	7	Same as previous year.
1995-96	7	Same as previous year.
1996-97	7	Same as previous year.
1997-98	7	Same as previous year.
1998-99	7	Same as previous year.
1999-00	6	Two options: (1) Three connections class and one course from Western Civilization or HUM 205; (2) Two courses from Western Civilization sequence and/or HUM 205.
2000-01	6	Same as 1999 but one of the LSC courses must have a portfolio component. Western Civilization, HUM205 and LSC200 all have portfolio component.
2001-02	6	Same as previous year.
2002-03	6	Three connections classes including LSC200 Capstone Portfolio and one course from Western Civilization sequence or HUM 205. Portfolio requirement dropped.
2003-04	6	Same as previous year.
2004-05	6	Same as previous year.

For a time, the Prescott campus Liberal Studies Coordinator and the college General Educational Coordinator were the same person. With the Liberal Studies Program firmly established, the AGEC in place and with personnel changes at the college, the two positions (General Education Coordinator and Prescott Campus Liberal Studies Coordinator) were

assigned to different individuals. In 1998 the functions previous performed by the General Education Committee were assumed by the college Curriculum Committee and the General Education Committee dissolved. The position of General Education Coordinator, however, remained.

From the outset, faculty in the technology disciplines of the college expressed concern about the Liberal Studies Program addressing their needs. As result of this concern, a connections class (Technology and Society) was created and team-taught with technology faculty. In 1994, sensing the need for a humanities course that would fulfill the needs of students in technical programs, the humanities instructor created Technology and Human Values (HUM 205). The course was so well-received by students and faculty that the Liberal Arts Division Chair (who was handling liberal studies matters on the Prescott Campus at the time) suggested the course become an alternative to Western Civilization in the Liberal Studies core. After approval by college leaders and the curriculum committee, HUM 205 became a team-taught course serving as an alternative to Western Civilization beginning with Fall semester 1998.

In the late 1990s faculty began talking about creating a course that might culminate the Yavapai College experience for graduating students. This course was envisioned as an opportunity for students to demonstrate achievement of the general education learning outcomes as well as outcomes for programs, majors, and degrees. As a result of this effort the Capstone Portfolio course was born. It required students to select and organize evidence of learning and provided opportunities for students to develop their skills of reflection and self-assessment. It was felt that these tools would help them better understand their level of achievements and knowledge, which in turn would enable them to plan more effectively and efficiently for future education and career choices. Also it was hoped that it would help students see their educational process as a unified rather than a fragmented experience. Beginning with Fall semester 2000, this course (LSC 200) became a required connections class in order to complete AA, AS, ABUS, AA Fine Arts, and AA Elementary Education degrees, and the AGECE Certificate.

Program Supervision and Instruction

On the Prescott campus for the first 7 years the program was directed by a full time faculty member with the title of Liberal Studies Coordinator. In 1996 coordination of liberal studies was divided between the Liberal Arts division chair and faculty who taught in the Liberal Studies program. On the Verde Valley Campus one faculty member has always managed the Liberal Studies Program. All of these coordinators help to manage teams, assist other instructors, and provide leadership in terms of curriculum development, work on program reviews, and other district-wide issues.

In the beginning, the LSC coordinator received release time to perform his/her duties. This release time practice was discontinued when the Liberal Arts division chair assumed a role in coordinating LSC matters. On the Verde campus, in the beginning, an hour of release time was granted to the Verde coordinator; this was expanded to three hours in 1998-99.

On the Prescott Campus, in the early 1990s, as many as eight interdisciplinary instructors were interacting in the Western Civilization core, which combined two hours of lecture and two hours of discussion/lab weekly. For instructors, the interactive nature of the course became a successful mechanism for professional growth. As of Fall 2004, the Western Civilization core has but three active instructors. As indicated previously, the Verde Campus initially employed

three Western Civilization core instructors, but now has a team of two.

On the Prescott Campus, a regular sequence for the Western Civilization courses has been consistently followed. The rotation has been Western Civilization 201 in the day during the Fall with Western Civilization 202 in the day during the Spring. Western Civilization 203 has been offered both semesters (day and evening). A section of Western Civilization has typically been offered during each summer. Since HUM 205 has been added as an alternative to Western Civilization, typically two HUM205 sections are offered each semester, one during the day and one in the early evening.

At the Verde campus, the regular sequence for the Western Civilization core has been Western Civilization 201, 202, and 203 in sequence each semester with the course offered during the day one semester and in the evening the following semester. HUM 205 was first added to the Verde class offering in Fall 2002 with one section each semester. Since the introduction of HUM 205 the Verde has cut back to offering only one Western Civilization class each semester.

Connection courses have been offered in a variety of forms. Pre-session classes (which meet the week before the normal semester starts) have been taught by Verde and Prescott faculty members, using the interactive television system. Connections classes have been offered on-site in a variety of time blocks--day and evening, full-semester, five-week blocks, and weekend blocks. These classes are taught by both full-time and adjunct faculty, in teams of two.

With the creation of the Capstone Portfolio class as a Yavapai College degree requirement in the Fall of 2000, a full-time Verde instructor began teaching with Prescott faculty over the interactive system the first semester. Following that, the full-time Western Civilization team instructors offered the class on-site. Since the initial semester, a pool of instructors (both full-time and adjunct) with experience teaching the Capstone course has been developed. As in the case of the other Connections classes, the Capstone class is being offered in a variety of time banks, with instruction continuing to be handled by both full-time and adjunct faculty.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM PLANNING AND CURRENT GOALS

On the Prescott campus Western Civilization courses are regularly reviewed by the instructional team. Such review has noted the lack of instructors of different disciplines participating in the program. During Fall 2004, meetings were held with the different college divisions to recruit diverse faculty to the Western Civilization instructional team. These meetings revealed that many full-time faculty were not able to participate due to the demands of their own discipline; however several faculty expressed interest and a list of instructors has been developed to potentially expand the western civilization instructional team. In addition, class enrollment data was evaluated resulting in the development of a two-year plan for offering the western civilization sequence to better address student's needs.

The instructional team is also looking into the possibility of converting the western civilization sequence of courses to online format. The team is also aware that other institutions throughout the country have begun to replace western civilization courses with world history. This development is being reviewed by the team. In light of these and other activities the following are proposed as goals for the Liberal Studies program.

1. Enlarge the Liberal Studies instructional team by increasing participation from other disciplines.

2. Determine the appropriateness of expanding liberal studies courses to an online format.
3. Consider broadening the cultural literacy focus to world history rather than just western civilization.
4. Revise outdated course outlines and review regularly.

B. Student , Class and FTSE Profile/Trends

STUDENT PROFILES

Student profile data are found in Exhibit A. These data show 60% of Liberal Studies students are female (down from 67% in 1999). Three quarters of the students are white and 78% come from Yavapai county. The majority of Liberal Studies students attend full-time (54% in 2004, down from 62% in 1999). Just over sixty percent of Liberal Studies students are under age twenty-five.

CLASS AND FTSE PROFILES

Table 2-1 provides five-year data of Liberal Studies enrollments.

Table 2-1. Liberal Studies Enrollment Summary - Prescott

Year	Connections Sections & Enrollment	Capstone Sections & Enrollment	HUM 205 Sections & Enrollment	Western Civ Sections & Enrollment	Total Sections & Enrollment
1999-2000	25 - 628 (25)	--	4 - 117 (29)	16 - 201 (12.6)	45 - 946 (21.0)
2000-2001	29 - 593 (20.4)	3 - 25 (8.3)	5 - 129 (25.8)	15 - 179 (11.9)	52 - 926 (17.8)
2001-2002	27 - 609 (22.6)	7 - 87 (12.4)	5 - 117 (23.4)	12 - 159 (13.3)	51 - 972 (19.1)
2002-2003	33 - 717 (21.7)	7 - 139 (19.9)	6 - 148 (24.7)	15 - 162 (10.8)	61 - 1166 (19.1)
2003-2004	31 - 792 (25.5)	12 - 196 (16.3)	5 - 133 (26.6)	13 - 172 (13.2)	61 - 1332 (21.8)
Totals	145 - 3339 (23)	29 - 447 (15.4)	25 - 644 (25.8)	71 - 873 (12.3)	270-5342 (19.8)

Note: The first number in each column is the number of sections offered. The number following the dash is the number of enrolled students. The number in brackets is the average number of students per section. The enrollment data is based on the final class day rather than census day or 10th class day.

Liberal Studies enrollment figures generally show a 35% increase between 1999-2004. Prescott campus enrollment data show that the number of Western Civilizations sections offered have decreased slightly since 2001 and enrollment has likewise decreased slightly. The Western Civilization average class size is a little misleading when contrasted with HUM205 in that there are two instructors for each HUM205 section but only one instructor for each Western Civilization section. Western Civilization sections are combined for the lecture portion of the class to meet the interdisciplinary requirement but divide to meet with their individual instructor for the discussion portion. There is an enrollment cap of 20 students for each Western Civilization section.

The number of HUM 205 sections offered has been consistent (2 sections per semester with a summer section). Student enrollment in HUM 205 was highest in 1999-00, decreasing to a low in 2002 and gradually increasing since. Over the past five years the average HUM 205 section class size is nearly 26 students. The enrollment cap for HUM 205 is 30 students. The number of Connections sections offered and enrollments have steadily increased over the last five years. The average class size for the five year period is 23 students. There has been no

enrollment cap on Connections classes other than the seating capacity of the room. The Capstone Portfolio sections offered and enrollment have increased dramatically with the average class size being just over 15 students per class. An enrollment cap on Capstone sections has been set at 20 students per class.

Verde campus enrollment data (see Table 2-2) reveal that the number of Western Civilizations sections offered decreased by half in 2003-04 as a result of introducing HUM 205. Enrollment in Western Civilization has been decreasing. The average section size over five years is 8.6 students. HUM 205 was only introduced on the Verde Campus in 2002-03, so there has not been enough time to establish an enrollment trend. The number of Connections sections offered

Table 2-2. Liberal Studies Enrollment Summary - Verde

Year	Connections Sections & Enrollment	Capstone Sections & Enrollment	HUM 205 Sections & Enrollment	Western Civ Sections & Enrollment	Total LSC Sections & Enrollment
1999-2000	12 - 180 (15.0)	--		4 - 47 (11.8)	16 - 227 (14.1)
2000-2001	15 - 179 (11.9)	2 - 14 (7.0)		4* - 28 (7.0)	21 - 220 (10.5)
2001-2002	15 - 182 (12.1)	2 - 34 (17.0)		4 - 36 (9.0)	21 - 252 (12.0)
2002-2003	16 - 186 (11.6)	3 - 35 (11.7)	2- 21 (10.5)	4 - 27 (6.8)	25 - 280 (11.2)
2003-2004	14 - 193 (13.8)	3 - 49 (16.3)	1 - 14 (14.0)	2 - 17 (8.5)	20 - 273 (13.7)
Totals	72 - 920 (12.8)	10 - 132 (13.2)	3 -35 (11.7)	18 - 155 (8.6)	103-1252 (12.2)

Note: The first number in each column is the number of sections offered. The number following the dash is the number of enrolled students. The number in brackets is the average number of students per section. The enrollment data is based on the final class day rather than census day or 10th class day.

*One student enrolled in LSC203H resulting in this being listed as a separate section. That separate section is not included in this section figure though the student is included in the enrollment total.

has not varied much while Connections enrollments show a slight increase over the last five years with an average class size of nearly 13 students per class. Capstone Portfolio enrollments have been up and down with the class average at just over 13 students per class.

An examination of the information in these tables show considerable difference in average class size between the Prescott and Verde campuses: 23 students versus 13 in Connections classes, 26 versus 12 in HUM205 and 12 vs under nine in Western Civilization. Only the Capstone classes are close (15 versus 13). This suggests a heavier class load for Prescott instructors and raises an equity issue.

The differences in class size also raise a question regarding the guidelines used for “go/no go” decisions. Are different rules being used for making “go/no go” decisions on the two campuses? The Prescott campus minimum class size guidelines call for at least 24 students per class for Connections classes, HUM205 and combined sections of Western Civilization. This is twice the guideline (12) for most Yavapai College courses. The reason given for a higher Liberal Studies minimum enrollment rule is the requirement of having two instructors per Liberal Studies class. The college feels the financial burden is too great to pay two instructors full salary each to teach a class with less than the 24 minimum enrollment. It appears from these data that if the Prescott minimum class enrollment guidelines were followed on the Verde

campus many of the Liberal Studies sections would not make. If that were the case it would impact Verde students being able to complete degree requirements—a student access issue. This issue has already surfaced at the Chino Valley Center. Liberal Studies classes have been offered there but have not always received sufficient enrollment to make. District-wide this raises a question of student access. Does the interdisciplinary nature of Liberal Studies courses, which requires a higher minimum class size than other discipline classes, serve as a barrier to students completing degree requirements? It does not appear so on the Prescott campus, but if the Prescott enrollment minimums are applied on the Verde campus it may be so, and certainly is for other campus centers.

In 1998, HUM 205 was added to the Liberal Studies core as an alternative to Western Civilization, particularly for students in the technology fields. Responses from supervisors in technology programs reported this addition to be positive for their students. Enrollment data in the tables above show the popularity of this course. Every section offered on the Prescott campus in recent years has quickly filled to room capacity (30 students) with waiting lists that often are in double digits. Its popularity with students has had an impact on Western Civilization offerings on both campuses as fewer Western Civilization sections have been offered. This has led to a slight decrease over the five year period in total Western Civilization enrollment. This decline is of concern to Liberal Studies faculty and supervisors. In an effort to see what factors might be influencing student enrollment in the Liberal Studies core, a student survey was conducted on the Prescott campus at the beginning of Fall semester 2004. All students who enrolled in HUM205 and Western Civilization sections (165 in all) were surveyed. Two questions provided insight to student enrollment decisions.

Table 2-3 shows student responses to the following open-ended question: Western Civilization and HUM 205 are different courses that fulfill the Liberal Studies core degree requirements. Why did you choose to enroll in the course that you did?

Table 2-3. Student Enrollment Choice

Categories of student responses	HUM205*	Western Civ
Fits my schedule better.	16 (25%)	35 (30%)
The subject was of greatest interest.	11 (18%)	34 (29%)
My advisor or other person recommended the course to me.	12 (19%)	10 (9%)
I like this course better than the other one.	11 (18%)	5 (4%)
This class meets my degree requirements.	10 (16%)	17 (15%)
Because of the teacher or course reputation.	2 (3%)	11 (10%)
Other	1	3 (2%)
Totals	63	115

* The first number in each column is the total number of students giving the response. The percent figure in each column indicates what percent of the total number of student responses fit in that category

The most frequently given student response, regardless of the class, related to how the particular class fit into student’s schedule. Student familiarity with the subject area was also a

significant factor in students enrollment decisions, particularly for Western Civilization. Advisors, friends or others played a larger role in enrollment in HUM205 (19%) than in Western Civilization (9%). For students who were aware of both courses and had personal feelings about each, more were likely to favor HUM 205 (18%) than Western Civilization (4%). Instructor reputation played a greater role in student choice for Western Civilization (10%) than HUM 205 (3%). These data suggest that student enrollment decisions are based less on instructor or course reputation than other factors.

A second question in the survey attempted to explore in greater depth the social influence of advisors, friends and others in the enrollment decision. The question was: Often students will learn about a course from friends, other students, counselors, etc. What have you heard from such sources about the course you are enrolled in? Table 2-4 present these data.

Table 2-4. Student Sources of Course Information

Categories of student responses to the question	HUM Students	Western Civ Students
I have heard nothing.	24 (37%)	43 (38%)
That it is a difficult course.	8 (12%)	31 (27%)
The course is interesting, enjoyable, fun.	12 (18%)	14 (12%)
The course was recommended by my counselor, friends or others.	8 (12%)	15 (13%)
The instructor is good.	5 (8%)	8 (7%)
The class is easier than Western Civilization.	5 (8%)	
The course is required.	3 (5%)	2 (2%)
Totals	65	113

These data show that the most common response (for each class) was that students had heard nothing about the course (37% for HUM205 and 38% for Western Civilization). The second highest response by Western Civilization students was that the class was hard (27% of responses), whereas the second highest response by HUM205 students was that the class was interesting, enjoyable/fun (18%). The fact that each class had been recommended by a counselor, friends or others was small for both classes (12% for HUM205 and 13% for Western Civilization). Only 5 respondents reported hearing that HUM205 was easier than Western Civilization. None reported the opposite.

These data suggest that the major reasons for student enrollment choice of Liberal Studies core courses have less to do with difficulty differences between the courses, or advisors recommending one course over the other, than with other factors. The addition of HUM 205 to the Liberal Studies program has impacted Western Civilization sections and enrollment, but the impact has been minor.

The following tables provide a review of FTSE history for the Liberal Studies Program on the Prescott and Verde campuses.

Table 2-5. Liberal Studies FTSE – Prescott

Term	Fall	Spring	Summer	Short	Annualized
FY 1999-2000	26.3	28.2	5.0	19.9	52.1
FY 2000-20001	27.6	26.7	5.3	16.5	49.0
FY 2001-20002	22.0	26.1	4.1	19.3	47.4
FY 2002-2003	22.8	27.1	5.3	24.2	54.4
FY 2003-2004	24.1	36.6	4.8	23.9	59.1

Table 2-6. Liberal Studies FTSE – Verde

Term	Fall	Spring	Summer	Short	Annualized
FY 1999-2000	6.7	8.2	0.5	5.2	13.1
FY 2000-20001	3.9	9.3	0.5	4.4	11.5
FY 2001-20002	6.3	8.1	1.2	4.9	13.2
FY 2002-2003	8.9	7.6	0.6	6.0	14.9
FY 2003-2004	2.5	9.9	0.0	5.6	11.9

Annual FTSE reached a five year low point during fiscal year 2001-2002 on the Prescott campus at 47.4, but reached a five year high for fiscal year 2003-2004 with 59.1 annualized FTSE. The Verde campus has fluctuated without a discernable trend. The five year high (during fiscal year 2002-2003) of 14.9 was followed the next year by the 4th lowest of the five year period (fiscal year 2003-2004) with 11.9 annualized FTSE.

DISTANCE LEARNING/NON-TRADITIONAL CLASSES

The Liberal Studies Program utilized ITV technology to beam Western Civilization and Connections classes between the Prescott campus and the Verde campus in the late 1980s; however, enrollment growth, by the early 1990s, resulted in discontinuing the ITV system except for a select few Connections courses. In the last five years the only courses to use the ITV system are 101B: Aids–A Modern Plague, 101AK: Contemporary Issues in Child Care and 101AN: The Lewis and Clark Expedition.

The only Liberal Studies courses to be offered online are 101AN: The Lewis and Clark Expedition, and LSC 200: Capstone Portfolio. Enrollment in both courses has been heavy. Dr. Angie Parker, Associate Dean for Distance Learning, has encouraged developing more Liberal Studies online courses. Supervisors and coordinators in the Liberal Studies program have been hesitant to move to online instruction feeling that the online delivery method was not compatible with the methods and techniques that were central to the interdisciplinary Liberal Studies philosophy. In order to obtain a broader perspective on this matter, a question was included in a

survey conducted with current and past Liberal Studies instructors. The question asked was: Do you think it is possible to keep the unique interdisciplinary emphasis of Liberal Studies in the online format?

Nine of seventeen instructors responded with a definite “no.” Reasons listed include: “Synergy between students and instructors is lost with online.” “Synergy between students is lost online.” “Online is a thief of interpersonal contact.” “Loss of immediate student spontaneity and interaction.” Of the other eight survey responses only one gave an unqualified “yes,” the other responses were qualified (i.e. “It depends on the course.” “It could work.” “Not enough expertise with online instruction.”).

This question was asked at the DAD’s focus group. There was an initial reaction in opposition to going online. The sentiment was that going online would result in a loss of immediate interpersonal interaction (student to student and instructor to student) and thus be too detrimental. However, as discussion progressed, some suggested that since many Liberal Studies classes (especially on the Prescott campus) are fairly large that this fact tends to inhibit students from active participation in a normal class. Because of the relative privacy of an online class, these students might get involved and participate in the online chat room environment. In the end there was no consensus on the matter.

Students have not been surveyed about this issue. However, enrollment is often an indicator of student views. As indicated above, enrollment in the two Liberal Studies classes that have been taught online (LSC200 and LSC101AN) has been extremely good. The LSC101AN class has almost always filled to a cap of 40 students with a wait-list. The online section of LSC200 nearly always filled before any of the other Capstone sections.

The information reported above indicates controversy regarding taking Liberal Studies courses online. Students appear to like it, but the consensus among program instructors, coordinators and supervisors was against going online. It may be that some Liberal Studies courses are more appropriate for online delivery than others (i.e. Connections classes as opposed to core courses). Also it is possible that hybrid online courses (the online LSC200 course is actually a hybrid) might be created that feature online delivery with some actual class meetings.

C. CURRICULUM ANALYSIS

CURRICULUM AND COURSE CONTENT

The Liberal Studies course bank consists of the following courses:

- LSC 101 Connections
- LSC 102 Introductory Portfolio
- LSC 200 Capstone Portfolio
- LSC/HUM 205 Technology and Human Values
- LSC 201 Western Civilization I
- LSC 202 Western Civilization II
- LSC 203 Western Civilization III
- LSC 251 Cultural Diversity

LSC101 Connections Courses. These courses were created as one credit modules dealing with contemporary issues—topics that would be “values volatile” and subject to conflicting interpretation, thus enabling students to perceive connections among disciplines, cultures, institutions, modes of consciousness and the environment. A key goal was for students to relate the course subject with personal and cultural values, which would make the class more relevant to their personal experiences.

The LSC101 course listing shows 41 one credit courses that have been created over the years. This growth has resulted in a wide variety of courses but has led to questions about course integrity, course duplication, cumbersome prefix listing, interdisciplinary instruction, and concerns that focus too often on content and not enough on critical thinking and making connections¹.

Student input regarding connections courses was reviewed by the Committee. Input came from the Spring 2004 Focus Groups, review of student evaluations of connections courses, and a wide range of anecdotal reports from students. In general, students expressed a very favorable view of the connections curriculum suggesting the classes were broadening, opened the mind, taught them how to critically think, to look beyond the obvious, and to apply this material to life. However, students did express some frustrations and difficulties with connections classes. Most of the students felt that the work level was relatively heavy for a one credit course. They also reported that too much material was packed in without allowing an in-depth analysis and enough time to absorb the information.

Instructors who had taught connections classes were very supportive of the curriculum. Some felt that connections classes provided students the best opportunity to experience the synergy of interdisciplinary co-teaching at work, as they would see two or three different sets of instructors modeling the interdisciplinary co-teaching approach. Kathryn Reisdorfer reported that students constantly draw examples from their connections classes when selecting material for their Capstone Portfolio classes, and suggested this as a strong indication of the value and impact that connections classes have on students. The college assessment coordinator backed up

¹ Information the committee reviewed dealing with these questions is available in the LSC Program Review Data Notebook.

this comment with these data in Table 3-1 after a sample review of 43 capstone portfolios from five sections (sections came from Spring 2003 through Spring 2005).

Table 3-1

Exhibits from Connections classes	Exhibits from HUM 205	Exhibits from Western Civ	Exhibits from more than one LSC course	Portfolios with no LSC exhibits
18 (41%):	10 (23%)	10 (23%)	7 (16%)	12 (30%)

These data show the value and impact that connections classes have on students, but they also show that all Liberal Studies classes have significant impact on students. This information suggests that the connections curriculum plays an important and significant role in the Liberal Studies Program, however there are areas that require attention as the Program moves forward.

LSC 102 Introductory Portfolio. This course was created to be part of an accelerated business certificate that was team-taught during two summers. Its function was to provide instruction for certificate students to develop employability portfolios showing evidence of their achievement of course outcomes within a specialized learning community. This certificate has not been offered recently and there are no plans to offer it again. In reality it was not a course that promoted the Liberal Studies goals and values.

LSC 200 Capstone Portfolio. Beginning with Fall semester 2000, this course became a required connections class as part of the Liberal Studies Program and a requirement for students to complete AA, AS, ABUS degrees, the AGECE Certificate and other selected certificates. It requires students to demonstrate achievement of the general education learning outcomes as well as outcomes for programs, majors, and degrees. Students must select and organize evidence of learning and it provides opportunities for students to develop their skills of reflection and self-assessment. It was felt that these tools would help students better understand their level of achievement and knowledge, which in turn would enable them to plan more effectively and efficiently for future education and career choices. Also it was hoped that the course would help students see their educational process as a unified rather than a fragmented experience. Student portfolios from this class have provided assessment data documenting student completion of general education outcomes.

The student focus group survey conducted during Spring 2004 sought student input regarding LSC200. Students reported that the reflecting back it required of them helped reinforce their learning as well as to see their strengths and weaknesses. They reported that it helped them to understand why general education classes were necessary. However, about half the comments were negative and reflected frustration with the course such as: “Didn’t feel learned much new from the class.” “Didn’t gain anything when I finished.” “It was boring.” “Worst experience of my life.” “It was just material pushed into a notebook—there was nothing learned from that.”

Each semester students are given an opportunity to evaluate courses and their instructors. Item #15 on the evaluation is: “I would recommend this course to others.” Students respond on a

five point scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Table 3-2 shows student responses to this question in LSC200, Connections classes, Core LSC classes and other courses in the Liberal Arts Division (Anthropology, Geography, Humanities, Philosophy, Psychology, Sociology etc.

Table 3-2

Semester	LSC200	Connections	LSC Core	Other LA Div
Spring 2004	(3)* 3.03	(4) 4.40	(7) 3.97	(25) 4.44
Fall 2004	(1) 3.30	(6) 4.23	(9) 3.66	(21) 4.32

* Figure indicates number of different sections evaluated. The other figure is the average score of the sections for item #15.

These data show lower scores for LSC200 Capstone Portfolio when compared with other courses. In addition to this student input, instructors on the program review committee reported anecdotal accounts of student frustration with the course. The student member of the program review committee expressed a strong view questioning the purpose and value of the course.

Although LSC200 has proven especially useful in assessing general education outcomes, it does not match well with the goals and values of the Liberal Studies program. It is considered in the same category as a connections class, but it does not have a content focus dealing with contemporary issues that are values volatile and subject to conflicting interpretation as required of connections classes. It takes up one of the six Liberal Studies degree requirements without enhancing and promoting the program.

HUM 205 Technology and Human Values. This course became a Liberal Studies core course in 1998. This was partly in response to requests from the technology areas, such as Gunsmithing, Automotive and Welding, to provide more current topics and be more relevant to interests of technology students. On the Prescott campus it has generally been offered as HUM205 rather than LSC205. On the Verde campus it typically has been offered as LSC205. The course has been popular with students. Sections on the Prescott campus have always filled with wait-lists in double digits. Some, however, have questioned whether HUM205 should be considered as an equal to the Western Civilization sequence. Although there is agreement that the course teaches critical thinking and deals with contemporary values and volatile issues, they feel it lacks the substance of cultural literacy provided by Western Civilization courses. Input received in the Dean's focus group found preference for HUM 205 over Western Civilization among technology deans/directors. On the other hand, deans from the more traditional academic areas expressed a preference for Western Civilization and even suggested increasing the Western Civilization requirement to two courses rather than just one. A suggestion was made in the Dean's focus group that Liberal Studies requirements be segregated such that technology students be required to take HUM 205 whereas other academic areas be required to take Western Civilization. When the question of transferability is raised, counselors say there are fewer transfer problems with Western Civilization courses than with HUM 205 (See articulation discussion on pages 17-18).

LSC201/202/203 Western Civilization. This sequence of Western Civilization courses has served as the Liberal Studies core since the inception of the program. This core was to emphasize critical thinking/reading and writing skills. It aimed to expose students simultaneously to multiple voices through the interdisciplinary co-teaching nature of the courses and engage students in issues connected to their lives as well as teach cultural literacy.

The sequence of Western Civilization courses has been offered on a consistent and regular basis on both the Prescott and Verde campuses. Over the years there has been a gradual emphasis shift from content to themes/issues. Since HUM 205 was introduced, Western Civilization students have questioned why they are required to be in class one hour per week more than HUM 205 students that receive the same credit. All LSC core courses are three credits each but students spend four hours per week in Western Civilization sections whereas they spend only three hours per week in HUM 205 classes. The reason given for the difference in hours is that in Western Civilization classes two of the hours are regarded as traditional lecture hours with the other two as lab hours—used for student discussion. Student surveys regarding this matter show support for raising the credits to four; however, that would create difficulties with regard to the AGEC transfer agreement and thus make that option unlikely. The other alternative, reducing Western Civilization to three hours per week rather than four and thus equalizing the class time issue with HUM 205, appears the more realistic solution if this issue is to be resolved.

A question has been raised about the three course Western Civilization sequence. Many colleges and universities only offer a two semester sequence. In addition, the Liberal Studies requirement is just six hours which suggests the Western Civilization sequence should only be two courses. Under the present arrangement, a Yavapai student takes only one of the three Western Civilization courses which leaves a large gap in understanding the breadth of Western Civilization. Reducing the sequence to two courses and requiring both would overcome this problem. This position is countered by the argument that the LSC core classes are theme and issue based with an emphasis on teaching of critical thinking of issues---rather than focusing on specific content; thus covering the entire period of Western Civilization is not necessary. Historians also point out that the Western Civilization sequence is Euro-centric and that nationally, colleges and universities are moving to coverage of world history in lieu of Western Civilization. These are curriculum issues that need to be resolved in the near future for the good of the Program.

LSC 251 Cultural Diversity. This course was created in the early 1990s in response to a growing emphasis on cultural diversity, nationally. At the time Yavapai College did not have a course that specifically dealt with the psychology and sociology of race, gender, and ethnic relations. This course was created to fill that void and to meet the “ethnic, race and gender awareness” general education requirement. Since then, the sociology discipline has added this same course to the sociology curriculum. In the ten year history of offering the course it has only once been offered on the Prescott campus. When offered on the Verde campus it has been linked (master/slave) with the sociology class. Enrollment in the Liberal Studies section was small (average of 6 students) with the larger enrollment coming from the sociology side. It has not been successfully offered since Spring of 2001. It does not appear that this course is a vital course for the Liberal Studies Program.

CURRICULUM CONTENT REVIEW

This curriculum review consisted of four separate examinations. The first involved reviewing course outlines to insure they complied with curriculum committee guidelines. The second compared course outlines with course syllabi to insure syllabi consistently followed the outlines. The third looked at articulation of Liberal Studies courses with other colleges in Arizona. The final appraisal consisted of considering whether the totality of Liberal Studies offerings was appropriate for the mission/goals of the program. We begin first with the course outline review.

Course Outline Review

The course outline review involved looking at a sample of 21 Liberal Studies outlines. These included all three Western Civilization courses, HUM205, LSC200, and a sample of 16 different Connections courses. This review found Western Civilization and Technology and Human Values course outlines to be in need of updating. Learning outcomes terminology did not consistently follow curriculum requirements (e.g. not all outcomes began with action verbs) and learning outcomes were not specific to course content. The LSC 200 course outline met curriculum guidelines. The Connections course outlines reviewed were from courses that had been offered most recently (i.e. within the last 18 months). Twelve of the 16 failed to meet curriculum guidelines and were in need of revision.

Syllabi Comparison with Course Outlines

Twenty-nine Liberal Studies syllabi were reviewed, including syllabi from both campuses. Twenty-three of the syllabi contained the key elements of the course outline (e.g. course description, course content, and learning outcomes) exactly as they appeared in the outline. However, when a comparison was made between the course content items and the topics/subjects listed in the semester schedule, it was difficult to verify that all content areas were being addressed. In addition, all these syllabi had grading criteria, but it was not clear exactly how the learning outcomes were being assessed. Six syllabi (21%) listed content or outcomes that were not the same as the course outline.

Articulation

Generally Western Civilization 201, 202 and 203 are not a problem for transfer. Students usually need 6-9 social/behavioral science credits at most four year colleges and universities. Western Civilization transfers as a social/behavioral science, however it would be a smoother transfer if the courses were offered under the HIS prefix. Most transcript evaluators will look at course title as well as prefix, but some students encounter problems with out of state schools because Yavapai has an unusual prefix (i.e. LSC). Generally this is cleared up by providing copies of course descriptions. There are no issues with articulation within the Arizona university and community college systems. See Exhibit C for CEG information on articulation.

HUM 205: Technology and Human Values is a little more tricky for students. Yavapai has direct articulation with NAU, ASU will accept the course as an elective, and U of A will accept the course as a humanities department elective. If students take the course as part of the Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC) core there is no problem with articulation. If students leave Yavapai without the AGEC core complete and transfer to ASU or U of A on a course-by-course basis, they will encounter transfer problems. HUM205 is taught under the

LSC prefix on the Verde Valley campus, and the transfer guide currently indicates that the course under that prefix is not transferable to U of A. This just may be a curriculum issue that can be cleared up quickly, but should be looked into. Students also encounter transfer problems with out-of-state schools who may not recognize this course with an LSC prefix. If a student petitions and submits course descriptions and/or course outlines, Yavapai advisors can usually facilitate a resolution for students. If students are considering transfer to out-of-state schools, they are advised to take only courses approved by that institution, and generally they are encouraged to take one of the Western Civilization courses rather than HUM205.

Connections courses cause the most problems for those students who do not complete the AGECE core at Yavapai prior to transfer to an Arizona university. NAU is the only university that articulates these courses into their Liberal Arts/General Education category. Both ASU and U of A will accept these courses as elective credit only. The same is true for any students transferring out-of-state. A comment was made during the DAD's focus group that technology students in some programs (e.g. Fire Science) have a limited number of universities to transfer to (e.g. schools with their particular program) and for them our one credit connections classes do not transfer well. Generally, if students know which institution they are transferring to, these issues may be addressed since articulation is taken into account within their academic plan.

The capstone portfolio course, like connections classes, is a problem for students who do not complete the AGECE prior to transfer. Although it satisfies a Social and Political Worlds requirement at NAU, it is only elective credit at ASU. The University of Arizona has not made a transfer determination regarding the course.

Overview of Liberal Studies Curriculum

When first created, the Liberal Studies curriculum consisted of 12 required credits for graduation. Students were required to take all three Western Civilization courses and three connections classes. Through this curriculum students had considerable opportunity to be immersed fully in the goals, values and ideology of Liberal Studies. Over the years, however, the Liberal Studies requirements have been reduced and modified. The most significant changes have been mandated through statewide transfer agreements. Today the Liberal Studies curriculum is less than half of that experienced 15 years ago. The committee regards this diminishing of the Program as unfortunate. Students completing the six Liberal Studies requirements today could hardly be expected to obtain the breadth and depth provided students who experienced 12 Liberal Studies requirements, as was the case in the beginning of the Program. External and internal constraints make it quite unlikely that Liberal Studies requirements can be increased. Despite these developments the committee finds value in continuing the Liberal Studies curriculum; however, a few adjustments are in order as follows:

- Move to a two semester Western Civilization (or World History) sequence to replace the three semester Western Civilization sequence.
- Reduce the number of class hours for a Western Civilization section to three hours per week rather than four.
- When building semester schedules, list the "core" classes as History or Humanities classes (rather than Liberal Studies) to reduce transfer issues.
- Remove LSC 102, LSC 200 and LSC 251 from the Liberal Studies curriculum.
- Provide students alternatives in meeting the six hour Liberal Studies requirements by

requiring three of the six hours from the core courses (HUM205 or Western Civilization) and then allowing students to choose the other 3 credits from the option of three connections classes or one more core class.

INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY

From the inception of the Liberal Studies program a key requirement has been that instruction be interdisciplinary co-teaching, bringing varied perspectives to the same subject matter so students might examine the curriculum from alternative conceptual frameworks. Therefore, a key issue for this review was the question: Is Liberal Studies instruction interdisciplinary? The definition used by Liberal Studies for “interdisciplinary” has been “two or more instructors representing different academic backgrounds who teach class from their different perspectives.”

To determine if Liberal Studies instruction actually fits this definition, this review examined the matter in three different ways. The first focused on looking to see if Liberal Studies courses did in fact employ two or more instructors per class. Institutional Research provided Liberal Studies course data district-wide from the past five years. Tables 3-3 (Prescott campus) and 3-4 (Verde campus) present these data. They reveal that 347 Liberal Studies courses were offered during the last five years and that at least two instructors were employed in all courses but two. These two exceptions may have been the result of failure to enter the information rather than employing only one instructor. The conclusion by the review committee was that this aspect of the “interdisciplinary” requirement was met.

The second examination of interdisciplinary instruction focused on instructor credentials.² Credential records were obtained from Human Resources and the Office of Instruction. Tables 3-3 and 3-4 present these data as well. The review found that on the Prescott campus, overall 87 % of Liberal Studies instructors had credentials from different academic areas. The highest percentage was in the Capstone Portfolio classes (100%), and the lowest was in the Western Civilization/ HUM205 classes (76%). The questionable category surfaced when two instructors had credentials in the same field (e.g. history); however, one instructor had a second credential that was in a different discipline (e.g. journalism).

TABLE 3-3. Prescott Campus

²The assumption that having different credentials will automatically result in a dialogue from differing backgrounds is not necessarily true. For example, one Connections class dealing with Guns in American Culture (LSC101R) featured three instructors with backgrounds in religion, physics and law. However, all three instructors were pro-gun control and taught the class from that perspective. Although they identified anti-gun positions, it was done in a manner that did not invite sympathy with that view. It is likely that liberal versus conservative political ideology may often have more relevance for synergistic course discussion than academic credentials.

	Courses	Did Instructors have credentials in different disciplines?		
Category	Offered	YES	NO	Questionable
West Civ and Hum205	54	41/54 = 76%	13/54 = 24%	0
Connections Classes	150	132/150 = 88%	16/150 = 11%	2/150 = 1%
Capstone Portfolio	32	32/32 = 100%	0/32 = 0%	0
Totals	236	205/236 = 87%	29/236 = 12%	2/236 = <1%

TABLE 3-4. Verde Campus*

	Courses	Did Instructors have credentials in different disciplines?		
Category	Offered	YES	NO	Questionable
West Civ and Hum205	37	35/37 = 95%	0/37 = 0%	2/37 = 5%
Connections Classes	63	39/63 = 62%	19/63 = 30%	5/63 = 8%
Capstone Portfolio	11	8/11 = 73%	1/11 = 9%	2/11 = 18%
Totals	111	82/111 = 74%	20/111 = 18%	9/111 = 8%

* This table includes three Liberal Studies classes taught at the Chino Valley site. All three had instructors with credentials in different academic disciplines.

On the Verde campus, 74 % of the courses over the last five years employed instructors from different academic backgrounds, with the highest percentage coming in the Western Civilization/ Hum 205 classes (95%) and lowest in connections classes (62%). Based on these data, it appears that though not all Liberal Studies instructional teams employed instructors with credentials from different academic backgrounds, the large majority did and that a good faith effort was being made on both campuses to meet this requirement.

The third examination of the “interdisciplinary” matter was more challenging. This examination asked the question: “Did the instructors actually teach the subject matter from their different academic backgrounds?” In an attempt to answer this question, information was obtained from program instructors, Liberal Studies students and program supervisors.

During Fall 2004 Institutional Research surveyed Liberal Studies instructors. Survey questionnaires were sent to 55 instructors (full time and adjunct) district-wide. Twenty-six completed surveys were returned. Twelve respondents reported teaching Western Civilization and/or HUM 205 classes (LSC core classes), and nineteen reported teaching one or more Connections classes.

To determine how instructors viewed “interdisciplinary co-teaching” they were asked to describe how the LSC class they worked with was interdisciplinary. The majority of respondents mentioned differing backgrounds of the instructors. Examples include: “My partner adds topics I would not have included. He brings a different view of the subject to class;” “Because we are in different disciplines in the same field we were able to present our interdisciplinary approach;” “Seeing an issue not just as a philosophical issue but also a religious

or scientific one;” “Discussing content and issues from our own discipline areas;” “Instructors from different academic areas with different views.”

Instructors were then asked: How often did the interdisciplinary nature of the course actually occur?” Of the twelve Western Civ/HUM205 instructors, seven reported it happened “most class periods.” Four reported that it happened “occasionally.” Of the 19 connections instructors, 13 reported it occurred “most” class periods, three reported “more often than not” and two said “occasionally.” The responses suggest that student exposure to differing perspectives happened fairly regularly.

To determine if instructors saw a difference in teaching Liberal Studies classes as compared with teaching in other disciplines, respondents were asked to describe how teaching in Liberal Studies was different from teaching in other subject areas. Most responses did not reflect directly on the differences. The most common response (7 of 24) had to do with adjusting to sharing the class with another instructor. Examples include: “The team approach added a huge new dimension;” “ongoing coordination with team teaching colleagues;” “team teaching, division of duties;” and “enjoying the experience of teaching with another instructor.” Four responses focused on the nature of the students (they were more exciting, participated more) and four responses focused on how it was more challenging personally and gave them a chance to expand their experience. Three comments specifically mentioned teaching class from a different perspective than the co-teacher. As a follow-up, and to try to establish more clarity between Liberal Studies instruction and instruction in other areas, respondents were asked: “What advantages did you find in teaching LSC courses as contrasted with your teaching in other subject areas?” Twenty instructors responded and seven offered comments that were relevant to this issue with comments like: “it was refreshing to hear different viewpoints/goals/directions;” “I learned more due to synergy with colleagues, students see critical thinking and respectful disagreements in action;” “presents contrasting views;” and “their various approaches continually enrich and renew mine.” Such responses indicate that contrasting academic views and perspectives were a part of the instructional mix.

Still trying to identify instructional differences, respondents were asked to compare the workload of LSC team teaching compared with teaching solo. Of the LSC core instructors, 11 of the 12 reported the workload to be from slightly to considerably heavier. Of the Connections instructors, nine of 19 reported the workload as slightly to considerably heavier, five reported it as about the same and five reported it as slightly to much lighter. From these comments it appeared that LSC core instructors perceived team teaching to be more work than teaching solo, and though half the Connections instructors reported the same, there was an equal amount who disagreed.

Respondents were asked: “On average, how often did you coordinate with your team teaching partner(s) outside of class?” Four of nine LSC core instructors replied with “prior to every class.” Four others replied with “weekly.” Seventeen connections instructors responded to this question. Seven of the 17 Connections instructors replied with “prior to every class,” and seven others replied with “weekly,” but since most Connections classes meet weekly, these two different responses may be considered the same. The conclusion drawn is that coordination is a regular and ongoing aspect of Liberal Studies teaching.

To get an idea as to what things needed to be coordinated, respondents were asked: “In your coordination meetings, describe the specific matters that your coordination activities centered around.” Thirty-five percent of the responses focused on content of lectures and who

would cover what. Thirty percent said coordination focused on assessment and grading.

In summary, instructors were surveyed to see if the subject matter was actually taught capitalizing on the different academic backgrounds of the instructors. A significant portion of the responses suggest that it did. Basically instructors found co-teaching different from normal teaching and teaching from differing perspectives was a central part of that. Also it did require extra work to coordinate teaching and grading.

To determine if others (besides instructors) observed instructors contrasting the material from their different academic backgrounds, students and supervisors were consulted.

During April 2004 four student focus groups (27 students) were held on the Prescott and Verde campuses. Students were asked questions about the effects of team teaching. Seven positive comments were offered which included: "Team teaching provides the opportunity to experience a different perspective on the subject;" "often the skills of one instructor will complement the skills of another;" and [we] "benefitted from different perspectives and styles." Students also had some negative responses such as: "When one instructor is the dominant instructor it doesn't work well;" "lack of coordination between the two instructors made the experience confusing;" "animosity among instructors with different political views made students uncomfortable sharing views and opinions;" "perhaps too many instructors, or not a clear outline of what the instructors should be teaching;" and "it seemed a little one-sided at times, where one teacher just sat and the other taught." The student input therefore contained positive and negative comments about interdisciplinary co-teaching but the message of differing perspectives and background was very evident.

Supervisors of Liberal Studies instructors were consulted as another external information source regarding whether Liberal Studies instructors actually taught from their differing backgrounds. The DAD's focus group survey provided contrasting accounts. There were reports of Liberal Studies classes where instructors simultaneously shared class time in a collegial interchange of ideas and debated issues in front of and with students. There were also reports of traditional presentations where one instructor lectured while the other sat silently and uninvolved.

The supervisor information therefore was mixed on the matter.

In summary, the information gathered to determine if instructors consistently taught class from their different backgrounds, allowing students to contrast and compare the material from different intellectual positions, was inconclusive. Instructors tended to report that their classes were interdisciplinary (however they defined it) most of the time and that this approach required more of their time and effort than normal classes. Students reported that different perspectives and styles were evident but they also reported negative aspects of this approach as well. In a similar vein, supervisor reports varied as to how interdisciplinary co-teaching played out. It is likely that teaching from differing positions on a subject varies a bit, depending on the length of time an instructor has taught in Liberal Studies, the number of times a team has taught together, and on the personality and style of each instructor.

From the very beginning a basic assumption of the Liberal Studies program has been that students would benefit more from interdisciplinary co-teaching than from traditional instruction. This review has not been able to substantiate or refute that assumption. The most frequently cited advantage was the benefit *instructors* got from being involved in the program---the exceptional professional growth experience gained from teaching with a colleague, study and researching new ideas, teaching in front of colleagues, observing colleagues weekly in the classroom, and thus

benefiting from observing alternative ways of instructing. This is an important benefit; however, the Liberal Studies program was implemented, not as a professional growth opportunity for instructors, but to benefit students in significant and substantive ways beyond traditional instruction. Although the student survey information suggested students enjoyed the interdisciplinary co-teaching, this review was not able to document that students learned more, or less, from interdisciplinary co-teaching classes as contrasted with traditional instruction.

The founders of the Liberal Studies program proposed that their interdisciplinary co-teaching approach was more demanding than team teaching in other disciplines. Because of this, Liberal Studies courses are more expensive. Each Liberal Studies course has two instructors with each paid full salary for the class. This practice at times is referred to as double loading. However, in the Liberal Studies program it does not mean that an instructor gets paid twice the salary for the class, only that a course has two instructors, each receiving full pay to co-teach the course. It is the course that is double loaded, not the instructor. When this matter was discussed in the DAD's focus group, some of the DADs (Nursing, Fire Science, Agribusiness) pointed out that their programs employed team teaching and regarded it as a valuable educational tool; however, they strongly disagreed that the Liberal Studies interdisciplinary co-teaching approach was different and more demanding than their team teaching and resented the compensation difference. To them this was an equity or fairness issue. They didn't feel it fair that LSC instructors were fully compensated when other team teachers split the salary for teaching a class. Science lab instructors also see this as an equity issue. They are loaded at .7 per lab hour, with labs requiring advance set up and after class cleanup, besides spending the full class time in the lab. They don't see how it could be fair for them to be compensated for lab classes at a partial rate when two LSC instructors are getting full load in the same class.

Liberal Studies instructors, particularly of the core courses, are quick to point out how their co-teaching differs from traditional team teaching. For example, both Liberal Studies instructors prepare material for each class period, are present for the duration of each class period, and participate actively in each class period. When one instructor is making the main presentation the other is following along and interjecting comments that support, expand, clarify or reflect on the matter at hand. Traditional team teaching generally does not involve both instructors being present in class, does not involve preparing class material from alternative/contrasting intellectual frameworks, and thus does not involve the two instructors actively engaging in content dialogue. An additional consideration is the fact that minimum class size for Liberal Studies classes (at least on the Prescott campus) is double the minimum class size at the college generally (24 vs 12). On the Prescott campus HUM 205 sections typically have 30 or more students each. Many connections classes have 35-40 students. This means that Liberal Studies instructors typically carry a heavier student load than most other disciplines.

Double loading is done in other ways at the college. For example, when an instructor develops an online class for the first time, he/she will be paid double the first time the course is taught. Also, emeritus faculty are paid load and one half when they teach a course. But such situations, where instructors are paid more than normal for a class, are rare. Generally, in team taught situations, instructors divide the course salary equally. The issue of loading for the Liberal Studies program is not well understood across the district. Some regard this as a serious equity issue where Liberal Studies instructors are advantaged over others as a result of double loading. Liberal Studies instructors argue that their co-teaching is not traditional team teaching because each Liberal Studies class requires full load responsibilities of each instructor in addition

to extensive coordination that does not occur in team teaching situations. This is a difficult matter as it gets to the heart of the Liberal Studies Program. The founders of Liberal Studies envisioned a program that would be, not only new to Yavapai College, but unlike anything else in the state and rarely found elsewhere. Interdisciplinary co-teaching would be different from team teaching. The instructor pool would come from all college divisions and disciplines. The subject matter would center around teaching of cultural literacy with a focus on critical thinking, reasoned argument and intellectual discourse. To implement such an innovative approach would require a greater commitment of resources because the time, energy and demands of the program would be greater than normal. The College accepted the challenge and committed resources in the form of release time for program coordinators and double loading for Liberal Studies courses. Should the college continue this level of support? This review has found that the vision, values and goals of Liberal Studies continues in the program today, as much as it existed in the beginning, despite turnover in personnel, reduction in release time and reducing program requirements from twelve to six. Program leaders maintain that the heart of the program is found in the interdisciplinary co-teaching nature of program instruction. That likely is true, but double loading is what makes that possible. Without College commitment to double loading there would not be sufficient instructor support to maintain the program. The fact that other disciplines see double loading as an equity problem is a result of the failure of College leaders to appropriately articulate the program district wide. The fact that some Liberal Studies instructors do not adequately employ the interdisciplinary co-teaching approach in their classes reflects a failure of Program leaders and supervisors.

In summary, the review of instructional delivery within Liberal Studies classes concludes:

The Liberal Studies Program has consistently taught classes with two or more instructors. Liberal Studies instructional teams typically are formed with instructors who have different academic credentials.

Some Liberal Studies instructional teams successfully teach the subject matter from different academic backgrounds, but this is not always the case. It is unknown overall how consistently this unique interdisciplinary co-teaching approach is employed across all Liberal Studies courses.

Liberal Studies instructors enjoy a significant professional benefit from teaching Liberal Studies classes, and students generally report enjoying interdisciplinary co-teaching; however, it was not possible to determine if students learned more and benefited more from the interdisciplinary co-teaching approach than from traditional instruction.

Interdisciplinary co-teaching is very different from the team teaching done in other disciplines and is at the heart of the Liberal Studies program. To maintain this unique instructional delivery the college must be willing to commit adequate resources.

IN-CLASS ASSESSMENT

Each course outline requires assessment measures and provides instructors with a wide variety of assessment options to choose from. The intent is that these assessment tools will be used to assess the learning outcomes; however, many instructors college-wide confuse this course outline assessment requirement with course grading criteria. Therefore they utilize various assessment measures to arrive at the course grade without always assessing the learning outcomes. This happens in Liberal Studies classes as well.

A review of in-class assessments utilized in connections classes revealed a wide variety of assessments such as journals, film responses, interviews, attendance and participation. However, the most common assessment tools were written papers (i.e. quick writes, essays, research papers, article critiques) and class presentations.

The assessment tools have been standardized in the Capstone Portfolio course and consist of the portfolio itself to include oral presentation and critique of other portfolios, reflective essays and short written responses to assignments.

The core Liberal Studies classes (HUM205 and Western Civilization) rely heavily on writing assignments (in-class essays, reflective essays, film response papers, document analysis papers, written reading critiques, research papers) and class presentations. Objective examinations have rarely been used during the last five years.

The 2003 North Central Accreditation visit determined assessment of student outcomes to be a weakness at Yavapai College. In response, the Yavapai College Assessment Coordinator, with assistance from the Faculty Student Outcomes Assessment Committee, prepared a college assessment plan that required program/discipline areas to write their own assessment plans. As a result of this, a Liberal Studies Assessment Team was formed with Debbie Roberts as the team leader. An assessment plan for Liberal Studies was written. The plan identified seven outcomes and set a schedule for assessment of outcomes in select connections classes, the Capstone Portfolio class and select sections of Western Civilization.

GENERAL EDUCATION

The Liberal Studies curriculum is central to helping students achieve general education student outcomes. Independent thinking, critical reading and thoughtful writing are skills that receive emphasis in every Liberal Studies course. Interdisciplinary instruction was to focus on the conceptual frameworks through which issues may be approached as well as the potential limitations of the fundamental models of understanding that have shaped thinking throughout the history of civilization. Thus the Liberal Studies Program is fundamental to general education goals at Yavapai College.

The Capstone Portfolio is designed to evaluate how well students have met the general education outcomes. At the conclusion of each school year, under the direction of the General Education Coordinator and in conjunction with the College Assessment Coordinator, a sampling of student portfolios from the various sections of LSC200 Capstone Portfolio was reviewed. In the 2004 review, 64 portfolios (approximately 1/3 of the total) were randomly selected from the previous three semesters. This examination concluded that students presented at least adequate evidence indicating that the outcomes had been achieved (see LSC Program Review Resource Notebook).

D. Program Faculty and Personnel

LIBERAL STUDIES FACULTY

Liberal Studies employs a large number of instructors. In the last five years more than 100 individuals have taught Liberal Studies courses at Yavapai College. Some teach primarily the core classes (e.g. Western Civilization and Technology and Human Values), and some teach only their specialty connections class, but a number teach across the variety of Liberal Studies classes.³

Over the last five years 25 instructors have provided instruction in the core classes---six on the Verde campus. Fifteen of these instructors (60%) are full-time employees of the college. However, a closer examination of these faculty reveals that nine of the 25 have retired or moved from the area. Seven others have taught only one semester or have not taught a core class in the last three years. This reveals that the teams currently providing instruction in the Liberal Studies core is a small nucleus of people on both campuses.

Ninety-three individuals have taught connections classes during the last five years—32 on the Verde campus. Fifty-two of the 93 (56%) are adjuncts. Forty-nine are specialized, teaching only one particular connections class; however, 19 have taught three or more connections classes.

The Capstone Portfolio class has 20 different instructors--- five (25%) are on the Verde Campus. Only four of the 20 are adjuncts. Most of these 20 instructors teach a Capstone section every semester.

The faculty data suggest an appropriate mix between full-time and adjunct instructors. The most striking thing about the faculty data, however, is the large number of instructors. The number suggests the program presents supervisory challenges in such areas as training, evaluation and retention.

The interdisciplinary program requirement necessitates program instructors come from a variety of academic disciplines. Finding two instructors with different backgrounds has not been easy. Table 4-1 indicates the academic division where instructors, over the past five years, have come from.

Table 4-1. Divisional Breakdown of LSC Instruction

Number of Full-time Instructors from Prescott Divisions (2000-2004) teaching LSC classes.							
Course	BUCs	COM	HPER	LibArts	Math/Sci	NUR	V/P
Capstone	2	4	0	3	0	0	0
Connections	4	6	1	11	5	1	0
West Civ/Hum205	0	4	0	7	1	0	0
TOTALS	6	14	1	21	6	1	0

On the Prescott campus, of the 49 full-time instructors who have taught Liberal Studies

³List of faculty who have taught the Liberal Studies core, Connections classes and the Capstone Portfolio can be found in Exhibit D of this document.

classes, 21 (44%) have come from the Liberal Arts division. The Communications division has provided the next highest number of instructors at 14 (22%). Three divisions provided minimal or no instructional support.

This teaching imbalance between divisions is even more noticeable when one examines the number of class sections taught. These data are shown in Table 4-2 which shows that 198

Table 4-2. Divisional Breakdown of LSC Instruction by Sections Taught

Liberal Studies Class Sections Taught by Instructors from Prescott Divisions (2000-2004)								
Course	BUCs	COM	HPER	LibArts	Math/Sci	NUR	V/P	Other*
Capstone	3	19	0	7	0	0	0	5
Connections	14	17	3	106	37	9	0	104
West Civ/Hum205	0	11	0	85	3	0	0	
TOTALS	17	47	3	198	40	9	0	109

* Adjunct instructors are involved in approximately 25% of the sections with the highest numbers in connections classes.

sections (63%) were taught by faculty from the Liberal Arts division. The Communications division was next teaching 47 sections (15%). Again, three divisions were hardly involved at all. The Liberal Studies program was not intended to be the province of a single academic division but was anticipated to be a broadly based program that would draw instructional support from all divisions. These data show however that on the Prescott campus one division carries the primary instructional load with some support from two other divisions. There is no, or only token support, from the remaining four divisions. Division Assistant Deans in other divisions argue that their primary responsibility is to serve instructional needs in their own division disciplines, so are reluctant to divert their full-timers to Liberal Studies courses. Consequently the instruction that comes from other divisions is almost entirely overload for them, not part of their normal load. It appears, therefore, that Liberal Studies is perceived college wide as a Liberal Arts division program, not as a college wide program, and that Liberal Arts should staff their program.

This challenge of finding instructors is a division issue on the Prescott campus, but for the Verde campus and the other college centers with fewer full-time faculty to draw from, the challenge of finding Liberal Studies instructors is particularly great.

SUPERVISION AND COORDINATION

The Liberal Studies program is supervised on the Prescott campus by the Liberal Arts Assistant Dean and on the Verde campus, by the Division I Assistant Dean. On each campus a faculty member is appointed to coordinate Liberal Studies offerings. On the Prescott campus four individuals have served as coordinators: Ken Meier, Steve Govedich, Kathryn Reisdorfer and Debbie Roberts. All coordinators have been members of the Liberal Arts Division. Coordinators received release time for this responsibility up until Fall 2002 when release time was discontinued for this position. In the 15 year history on the Verde campus, there have been two coordinators (Paul Ewing and Ginny Chanda), both from Division I. The coordinator has always received release time for the job. Coordinators report to their respective assistant dean.

Instructors in the program are recruited informally from the ranks of college faculty, by the assistant dean and/or program coordinator. When, due to retirement or resignation, an Liberal Studies instructor is lost, the coordinator will informally seek a replacement by talking with division assistant deans and spreading news of the vacancy by word of mouth. Instructors for the capstone portfolio and connections classes are recruited in a similar fashion. The coordinator or assistant dean will contact those who have taught the target courses in the past and invite them to teach with their team partner again. If a team partner is not available, the remaining team member, assistant dean or coordinator informally recruits a replacement. New instructors will be interviewed by the respective assistant dean and orally briefed on the values and rationale of the Liberal Studies program.

Each semester roughly 45 faculty teach in the Liberal Studies program on both campuses. In recent semesters 10 to 12 of these faculty are new to the course they are teaching. Since the Liberal Studies program is unique, it is important that new instructors understand the philosophy and vision behind the program. Historically, there has been no formal orientation for new instructors. There is no handbook or instructional guide to assist with this orientation process. Generally, new instructors are interviewed by the respective division assistant dean and matched with an experienced program instructor. The experienced instructor then carries the orientation responsibility in an on-the-job sort of way. As part of the Liberal Studies instructor survey conducted during Fall 2004, instructors were asked to describe the orientation they received regarding the nature, purpose, rationale and philosophy of the Liberal Studies program and the specific course they were to teach. One-third (10) of the respondents indicated their training came from informal meetings with the division dean or their co-instructor. One-third replied that they received no training or not much of an orientation. Seven comments suggested that the orientation was fairly comprehensive. From time to time program coordinators have sponsored campus-wide workshops (three were held district-wide in 2003-04), where old and new instructors have been invited to meet and share ideas, thoughts and challenges regarding the program. Two survey respondents specifically mentioned attending one of these workshops.

New instructors are formally evaluated during their first semester of instruction. Class evaluations by students are conducted as well. Instructors have pointed out, however, that class/instructor evaluation tools do not work well with team-taught courses as it is difficult, or impossible, to determine which student responses apply to which instructor and there are no questions aimed at evaluating the interdisciplinary nature of the instruction.

CREDENTIALS

Yavapai College does not have a separate Liberal Studies credential. Program originators felt that a historian should guide instruction in the Western Civilization core; consequently, three of the four Prescott campus coordinators have been historians. Until 2003, the Verde Liberal Studies program was also coordinated by a historian. With a historian providing the instructional foundation for Western Civilization, faculty from other disciplines were added to make the interdisciplinary mix of the program. The only credential requirement was that these instructors needed to be credentialed in their respective disciplines.

As reported previously, a review of Liberal Studies course offerings on both the Prescott and Verde campuses over the last five years reveals that when teaching teams are formed, instructors typically have been selected from different disciplinary backgrounds. On the Prescott campus, 87 % of the Liberal Studies courses had instructors credentialed from different academic

backgrounds. The highest percentage was the Capstone Portfolio classes (100%) and lowest was the Western Civilization classes (76%). On the Verde campus, 74 % of the courses had instructors from different academic backgrounds with the highest percentage coming in the Western Civilization/Hum205 classes (95%) and lowest in connections classes (62%). There are no formal guidelines for matching instructors. Supervisors simply use their best judgment in forming matches.

There were some instructor teams where both instructors were credentialed in the same area but one instructor was also credentialed in a second and different area. For example, on the Verde campus Connie Gilmore (credentialed in English, History and ABE) was frequently paired to teach with Ginny Chanda who had an English credential. On the Prescott campus Steve Govedich (credentialed in both psychology and sociology) was teamed with Dennis Abry whose credential area was psychology. Although teaming in such cases occurred infrequently, it did raise a question about whether the instructor with multiple credentials relied on the differing credentials in approaching the subject matter. Also this situation raised a question about whether an instructor with credentials from multiple disciplines could teach a Liberal Studies course solo. A few instructors argued that they could, and when this question was raised in a focus group interview with division assistant deans, some of the deans agreed if guest lectures and multi-media were employed. However, instructors who have a history of teaching Liberal Studies classes have argued that one instructor, regardless of how many different credentials he/she possesses, cannot provide the same interdisciplinary experience that two or more instructors provide.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL

Liberal Studies faculty, on both campuses, manage without aid from part-time workers, student employees or personal secretaries. At times clerical support is provided by the respective division administrative assistants.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Yavapai College faculty are encouraged to engage in on-going professional development. Annual performance goals emphasize yearly attention to professional development. Adjunct faculty are required to document three hours of professional development activity for each semester they teach. Faculty have four primary sources of funds for professional development: the division budget, faculty professional growth committee, Innovation College and the Office of Instruction.

Liberal Studies full-time faculty on both campuses have actively engaged in professional development. A sampling of some of that professional development follows:

One avenue for professional development employed by Paul Ewing (full-time history instructor on the Verde campus) is extensive professional reading including books, journals, newspapers, magazine articles, and websites.

Ginny Chanda (full-time English instructor on the Verde Campus) has used summer school and conferences as part of her professional development endeavors. She completed three week summer schools at Cambridge University, Cambridge, England including History Summer School in 1999, 2001, 2003 and Shakespeare Summer School in 1998, 2000, 2002, and 2004. Each program included two classes (42 contact hours) and a series of themed lectures (12-14 contact hours). She also attended Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies

Conference in 1999 and 2000; attended Richard III Society Convention in October 2003 and attended the ASU Writers Conference, March 2004.

Historical research is another professional development activity engaged in by Liberal Studies faculty. Dr. Kathryn Reisdorfer (full-time humanities instructor on the Prescott campus) was granted a sabbatical leave during Fall 2001 to conduct historical research of women in mining towns in the West. She has published many articles based on her research. She participated in a year long CCHA/NEH Library of Congress seminar and research project (June 2002-2003) and co-presented on that research at the Community College Humanities Association annual conference in Santa Fe, New Mexico in November 2003. She spent five weeks during the summer of 2003 doing historical research in Colorado, South Dakota, Nevada and California from which she has written several articles on opera houses in mining camps, one of which appears in the *Community College Humanities Review*.

Similarly, Debbie Roberts (full-time Liberal Studies and history instructor on the Prescott campus) participated as one of 20 educators nationwide in a summer research seminar in Washington, DC in July 2003. Her research subject was "Trans-Oceanic Exchanges." Following that research activity she was invited to present her findings in Washington at the American Historical Association's Annual Conference held the second week in January 2004. In February, Debbie was invited to present aspects of her research to the Yavapai Indian Tribe. The topic was "European Diseases & Their Impact on Native Americans."

It should be noted here that the most frequently cited advantage instructors mentioned when surveyed about their Liberal Studies teaching experience was that being involved in the program was itself a professional growth experience---the exceptional experience gained from teaching with a colleague, study and researching new ideas, teaching in front of colleagues, observing colleagues weekly in the classroom, and thus benefitting from observing alternative ways of instructing.

SERVICE CONTRIBUTIONS

Liberal Studies full-time faculty on both campuses have been involved in service activities. For several years Paul Ewing has participated in a state Gerontology Advisory Board dealing with elderly abuse. Dr. Kathryn Reisdorfer served as Yavapai College Faculty Association President for the 2002-2003 school year, on the faculty Senate (2004-05), and as a regular member of the college Curriculum Committee, Institutional Review Committee and Faculty SLOA Committee. During 2003-04 Debbie Roberts chaired the HUM/PHI Program Review. In early March 2004 she represented Yavapai College by hosting Northern Arizona History Day for high schools in the northern part of the state. Debbie also serves as the faculty advisor for the Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society at the college.

SUPPORT FROM OTHER AREAS

The Liberal Studies program depends upon support from a wide variety of college departments. The library, for example, has been extremely cooperative in assisting Western Civilization classes and instructors. Library personnel have volunteered to provide orientation and training sessions to students, continuously assisted students in research techniques for primary documents utilized in students' papers and presentations, and trained students in the utilization of library equipment and resources. Library personnel continuously work with the Western Civilization team in coordinating materials available for students, providing information about

valuable websites, and providing guidance regarding library materials. For example, on the Verde campus the Verde library purchased three videos/DVDs to be used in “Technology and Human Values” and two DVDs were purchased for the connections class: “Women Worldwide”. The Verde library has obtained all of the Shakespearean plays on VHS and DVD in support of the “Shakespeare on Film” connections class. The assistance provided by the Library personnel is regarded by Liberal Studies instructors as exceptional, contributing significantly to the success of the program.

Counseling/Advising has supported the Liberal Studies program by assisting students in placing them at appropriate levels to guarantee their success in the program. They are constantly developing ways in which Western Civilization students can succeed. The way is via a program which allows the instructors to notify Counseling/Advising immediately if a student encounters difficulty in a Western Civilization course. Marcia Byrd, from Verde campus Counseling/Advising, added that they provide information, descriptions, and explanations to students about the LSC classes and their importance to the student’s education. As an example, she referred to “numerous times I have shared one Nursing student’s observation that the AIDS connections class was the best taught course he had ever taken in his entire college career. . . and he had attended NAU and other schools.” She also mentioned that counselors respond to instructors’ requests to promote new or under-attended classes.

Admissions/Registration provides support to Liberal Studies by providing instructors with guidance in the implementation of new programs, such as on-line grade posting and addressing questions regarding withdrawal or incomplete grades. The Verde campus reported that Admissions/Registration posts informational flyers provided by instructors or students regarding classes and sections. An area where Admissions/Registration has been especially helpful is calling students who are placed on wait-lists and helping them move into Liberal Studies openings.

The Learning Center is instrumental to the success of Liberal Studies students through their many programs, but especially with tutoring services which provide students help with written assignments. The Learning Center also provides computers which students use extensively.

Information Technology Services (ITS) is extremely helpful to Liberal Studies instructors. ITS technicians have readily responded when problems surfaced with the “smart classroom” technology, but they have also always been available for guidance, advice or training when instructors were in need. Instructors utilize laptop computers, projectors, and DVDs, which are provided by ITS. Equipment is always provided on time and ITS staff willingly work with instructors in providing the equipment to meet the needs of each class. The guidance and service offered by ITS assists in making the Program a success.

As mentioned previously, Distributed Learning actively works with the Liberal Studies program. They have encouraged and facilitated developing two online courses. Several Connections classes are offered through the ITV system. Western Civilization sections frequently utilized the big ITV classroom. Distributed Learning continually provides training regarding new equipment and is extremely helpful in addressing any problems encountered in the classroom.

Institutional Research does not usually directly support individual instructors but rather whole programs. Their primary role is providing data and analysis, such as needed in this LSC Program Review. They facilitate the instructor evaluation process whereby students are surveyed regarding their courses and instructors.

Yavapai College's Office of Public Information provides support services for the Liberal Studies Program by promoting programs and activities located on both campuses and all college sites. Specifically, they promote new classes and late start classes and support the district's efforts to reach out to the Latino community through marketing, media relations and public relations outreach.

E. Physical Resources

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

On the Prescott Campus, in areas where most Liberal Studies courses were taught between 1999-2004, facilities and equipment were adequate. Three classrooms were regularly utilized: 03-251, 03-131, and 03-202. Both 03-251 and 03-131 provided computer and Internet access, which allowed instructors to present PowerPoint presentations and bring audio/visual resources into lectures. Classroom 03-251 also was equipped with an ELMO which allowed instructors to project artwork, charts, and graphs to supplement their lectures. The technology in 03-251 and 03-131 also was used by students for their class presentations. Instructors encountered difficulty when teaching in 03-202 because it did not have the “smart classroom” technology the other two classrooms possessed.

In regards to equipment, all classrooms had VCRs, but it has become more and more expedient to also have DVD players as VCRs are becoming less used. To show a film in 03-131 or 03-202, instructors were required to contact ITS and request a DVD player. Maps are indispensable in Western Civilization classrooms; yet, in two out of the three classrooms, no maps were available. History and geography are so interconnected in Western Civilization that it is difficult for students (who lack a general awareness of geography) to understand the geographical relationships between countries and the impact of the environment on the development of Western Civilization without the visual assistance of maps.

There are significant changes coming regarding classrooms in the future. As a result of the facilities master plan, building three will be remodeled during 2005 with the expectation that all Liberal Studies classrooms will have “smart classroom” technology equaling that provided previously by 3-251. These classrooms are expected to be available by Fall 2005. It is expected that maps, addressing the various historical periods will be made available in these classrooms. Instructors possess the ability to project overhead maps, but if instructors are using PowerPoint or the computer, they must disconnect from the presentation to display the map, then go back to their presentation. This change is cumbersome and time consuming. Having maps in the classroom would be more useful. It is beneficial visually for students to have the maps as the instructor is talking about the various historical areas.

On the Verde campus, the major Liberal Studies courses have been taught in I-122, one of the most spacious classrooms on campus. New, more comfortable chairs for student seating have recently replaced the previous set of most uncomfortable seating. However, noise from the adjacent classroom has occasionally been a problem, especially when classes there are taught by strong-voiced instructors. Classroom I-122, as well as other LSC-used classrooms, are accessible for disabled students, according to government regulations. However, chairs and tables are extremely crowded in I-122 making moving around with a wheelchair difficult. Liberal Studies faculty, like other faculty in the Social Sciences and Humanities, have had to resort to rather antiquated methods to aid student learning. However, ITS has made great strides recently in providing modern, state-of-the-art equipment including a classroom computer. Unfortunately, there is still no direct access to the Internet in the classroom. It is expected that this problem will be solved when a new building is completed in 2005. Computer-intensive courses, like Capstone Portfolio, have been adequately served in the English computer lab.

FACULTY OFFICES

On the Prescott campus, faculty who teach in Liberal Studies are scattered among various buildings on campus. Although offices are small and cramped, access to technology in offices is excellent. Instructors have access to computers, printers, and the Internet in their offices. These tools allow instructors to develop lectures and programs in various formats, which make class more interesting and thought-provoking. One technology component that could be included in faculty offices is a scanner. Some material is only available in book form. It is impossible to produce an overhead that accurately reflects a piece of art from a book, but with a scanner, the artwork can be scanned and placed into the instructor's PowerPoint presentation. Faculty access to the copy machine in the division office is also beneficial. In the future, as a result of the facilities master plan construction, most Liberal Arts faculty will be housed in the same general area which will facilitate coordination. Offices will be more uniform in size and slightly larger than at present.

On the Verde campus, the Liberal Studies operation has many of the dimensions of a mom and pop store. No permanent administrative help is offered other than that of the Division I office, which equally supports all faculty members belonging to the division. Offices currently are generally small but functional. FERPA concerns about student privacy are being met. The latter may become a point of serious concern in the new building (resulting from the facilities master plan construction), if faculty is located in open offices such as the case in the recently opened Northern Arizona Skill Center

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Full-time faculty who head discipline areas in the Liberal Arts Division on the Prescott campus are not budget managers. Budget manager responsibilities fall to the Assistant Dean who manages the budgets of ten discipline areas including Liberal Studies. Budget printouts break the division budget into discipline areas. With separate codes for items such as salary, performance incentive, travel, membership dues, supplies, etc, budget managers move funds between discipline areas as needs require.

The annual college budget building process begins in December each year. Budget managers (i.e. Division Assistant Deans) receive (from the Vice President of Finance and Facilities) a preliminary budget for the upcoming fiscal year. This preliminary budget basically is a rollover of the budget used for the current year with some adjustments. Budget managers have limited discretion to increase budget figures. Basically their review is to double check the work of the Finance Department. When that department determines that "new" monies are available, budget managers are involved in discussions that propose and prioritize funding initiatives.

On the Prescott campus, Liberal Studies instructors have expressed frustration about the lack of information regarding the budget process. Their sense has been that budgets are tight and there are limited resources; however, the reality is that each year monies are unspent in the overall division budget and the Assistant Dean turns those funds back to the general college fund in June. The Liberal Arts Assistant Dean is encouraged to be more forthright with faculty regarding the budget process and the availability of division funds.

Table 5-1 shows Liberal Studies program expenditures during the five year Program Review period.

Table 5-1. Liberal Studies Expenditures

Year	Prescott Campus			Verde Campus		
	Supplies	Subscriptions	Travel	Supplies	Subscriptions	Travel
1999-2000	\$1,468	\$287	\$1,302	\$ 470	0	\$180
2000-2001	\$1,813	\$ 98	\$ 871	\$ 276	0	0
2001-2002	\$1,557	\$246	0	\$1,055	0	0
2002-2003	\$1,749	\$374	\$ 988	\$ 973	0	0
2003-04	\$1,588	\$235	0	\$ 241	0	0

In the past, on the Prescott campus, the division chair (now assistant dean) freely used funds from the Liberal Studies budget line to support other division priorities. Therefore, the expenditures reported in the table for the Prescott campus do not accurately reflect Liberal Studies expenditures. The division chair did not carefully discriminate between discipline supply accounts. There should be a clear delineation of expenditures in the future.

F. Advisory Committee/Partnerships

None

G. General Outcomes

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTORS

In recent years (through Spring 2004), the college required course evaluations in every class offered by the college. Forms were distributed by the Office of Institutional Research to respective division assistant deans for dissemination to instructors. The evaluation form consisted of five to seven fixed response questions that provided an overall course satisfaction measure. A separate instructor evaluation was administered at the discretion of the assistant dean or the instructor. This evaluation also involved fixed responses (ten to twelve questions) but also provided an opportunity for written comments. Institutional Research distributed these evaluations in the same manner as the course evaluation. Faculty, however, did not feel these evaluations to be very useful. They didn't like two different evaluations and the fact that evaluations were sent out college-wide at the same time of the semester. Students were asked to complete the forms in every class they attended over a two week time period. The result was that students became bored with the repetition and often did not take the process seriously. Instructors reported the most valuable part of the evaluation to be the comments section of the instructor evaluation.

During spring 2004, the Instructional Council, with support from the Office of Institutional Research, conducted a review of the student evaluation process. As a result of this review, in the fall of 2004 a single evaluation instrument consisting of 17 questions was introduced (see table below). This new instrument is an improvement in the overall student evaluation process, however, it has some significant weaknesses when it comes to evaluating Liberal Studies classes. These weaknesses could be overcome if the following modifications were made in the instrument:

- Institutional Research averages student responses for each question and then determines an overall average for all Liberal Studies instructors on each question. This overall average would be more useful if it was computed just for the specific type of Liberal Studies class (i.e. core class, connections class or capstone class).
- The survey tool does not allow students to differentiate their responses for each of their two (or more) instructors.
- There are no questions allowing students to comment on the interdisciplinary nature of the classes.
- There are no questions soliciting student feedback on the Liberal Studies program generally.

During Fall semester 2004 the revised student evaluation instrument was used for the first time. Results were tabulated and averaged for the seventeen questions in the evaluation instrument (Prescott campus only) for Liberal Studies Classes. Table 7-1, presents these data.

Table 7-1. Student Evaluation Results

Evaluation Question	Ave
1. The course learning outcomes were clearly explained.	4.3
2. Course assignments/activities were clearly defined and were helpful.	4.1
3. The course grading criteria was clearly defined.	4.3
4. Course assignments and tests were returned in a timely manner.	4.5
5. Instructor provided helpful assistance/explanations and answers to questions.	4.5
6. The instructor provided assistance when requested.	4.5
7. The instructor was enthusiastic, encouraging and positive.	4.5
8. The instructor demonstrated expertise in the subject area.	4.5
9. The scheduled meeting times for the course were adhered to.	4.7
10. Course materials (e.g., text, films, handouts) were relevant.	4.4
11. Tests, projects, and assignments were relevant to the learning outcomes.	4.4
12. Course instruction was effective.	4.3
13. I achieved what I expected in this class.	4.2
14. Classroom facility and equipment were appropriate.	4.3
15. I would recommend this course to others.	4.1
16. I would recommend this instructor to others.	4.4
17. How much time per week did you put into this class?	5.3 hrs

Scale: 1= Strongly Disagree. 2= Disagree. 3= Somewhat agree. 4= Agree. 5= Strongly Agree.

The information in this table reveals that average scores for all questions are between agree and strongly agree. The highest averages were for instructor behaviors (i.e. returning papers in a timely manner, providing helpful assistance, being positive and keeping to scheduled class times). The lowest question average dealt with clarity of assignments and recommending the course to others. In addition, Liberal Studies classes have a reputation for having a heavier work load than many other college areas. These classes, being general education classes, are required of all degree seeking students and therefore are not directly related to student interest. These two factors are considered important in the lower averages to the “recommend this class” question.

GRADES

Tables 7-2 and 7-3 provide five-year grade distribution data (year 1999-2000 thru 2003-2004) concerning grade distribution for Liberal Studies courses on the Prescott campus. These data reveal that 79% of credit seeking students received a passing letter grade of C or better. The most frequently awarded letter grade was A (46% of the time). Withdrawals averaged just under 18%, while 1% were D's and 2% were F's. The general trend over the five year period has been toward awarding more A's and fewer C's and withdrawals. The high grade distribution suggests that either the caliber of students taking Liberal Studies classes is exceptional or instructor grading procedures are generous.

Table 7-2. Prescott Grade Distribution Summary

Year	A	B	C	D	F	W	Total
1999-00	423 (39%)	297 (27%)	134 (12%)	15 (1%)	14 (1%)	206 (19%)	1089
2000-01	463 (44%)	237 (22%)	104 (10%)	15 (1%)	17 (2%)	225 (21%)	1061
2001-02	564 (50%)	250 (22%)	76 (7%)	14 (1%)	22 (2%)	192 (17%)	1118
2002-03	611 (49%)	284 (23%)	105 (8%)	16 (1%)	36 (3%)	204 (16%)	1256
2003-04	647 (46%)	336 (24%)	133 (9%)	22 (2%)	47 (3%)	217 (15%)	1402
Totals	2708 (46%)	1404 (24%)	552 (9%)	82 (1%)	136 (2%)	1044 (18%)	5926

Liberal Studies courses have considerable variety (i.e. one credit Connections classes as compared with three credit Western Civilization courses), and this variety raised a question as to whether there were differences in grades assigned in the different courses. Table 7-3 presents summary data for the five year period for each of the four different types of Liberal Studies courses. Detailed five year data for each type of Liberal Studies class is found in Exhibit E.

Table 7-3. Prescott Campus 5 Year Grade Distribution Summary*

Course	A	B	C	D	F	W	Total
LSC 200 Capstone	313 (53%)	138 (23%)	39 (7%)	3 (.5%)	11 (2%)	86 (15%)	590
Connections	1994(48%)	934 (22%)	346 (8%)	61 (<2%)	94 (>2%)	749 (18%)	4,178
HUM 205	330 (39%)	269 (32%)	92 (11%)	9 (1%)	14 (>1%)	136 (16%)	850
West Civilization	106 (30%)	110 (31%)	65 (18%)	6 (<2%)	7 (2%)	61 (17%)	355

* Note: The college has other grading categories [i.e. X (Drop), P (In-progress), V (Enrichment)] that are not included in this table due to being irrelevant or very small numbers.

These data reveal “passing” grade differences between some Liberal Studies courses. There were not important differences in terms of withdrawals, D and F grades assigned. The one credit courses (Capstone and Connections) tended to assign a higher percentage of A grades (9% to 23%) than were assigned in the three credit Liberal Studies classes, whereas the three credit

classes gave higher percentages of B grades (9% to 11%) and C grades (3% to 11%). A comparison between Western Civilization and HUM205 grades showed the greatest differences in percent of A grades assigned (30% to 39%) and C grades assigned (18% to 11%), with Western Civilization assigning a lower percentage of A grades and higher percentage of C grades.

Tables 7-4 thru 7-5 provide five-year data concerning grade distribution for courses on the Verde campus. Over the past five years, 84% of credit seeking students received a passing letter grade of C or better. The most frequently awarded letter grade was A (56% of grades assigned), while D's and F's amounted to 1% each of grades assigned. Fifteen percent of students registered withdrew before the semester ended. These data show a slight difference between campuses in terms of grades awarded, with the Verde Campus assigning a higher percentage of A grades and having a lower percentage of withdrawals. The high grade distribution on both campuses suggests that either the caliber of students is exceptional or instructor grading procedures are generous.

Table 7-4. Verde Grade Distribution Summary

Year	A	B	C	D	F	W	Total
1999-00	159 (54%)	73 (25%)	15 (5%)	4	0	46 (15%)	297
2000-01	150 (54%)	57 (20%)	15 (5%)	2	1	55 (20%)	280
2001-02	182 (58%)	63 (20%)	17 (5%)	2	1	50 (16%)	315
2002-03	183 (57%)	78 (24%)	14 (4%)	1	5	42 (13%)	323
2003-04	178 (56%)	67 (21%)	26 (8%)	0	5	42 (13%)	318
Totals	852 (56%)	338 (22%)	87 (6%)	9 (<1%)	12 (<1%)	235 (15%)	1533

As with Prescott, the Verde campus Liberal Studies courses were examined to see if there were differences in grades assigned in the different courses. Table 7-5 presents these summary data.

Table 7-5. Verde Campus 5 Year Grade Distribution Summary*

Course	A	B	C	D	F	W	Total
LSC200 Capstone	103 (66%)	26 (17%)	2 (1%)	--	1	24 (15%)	156
LSC 101 Connections	668 (59%)	224 (20%)	53 (5%)	2	7 (.6%)	171 (15%)	1125
HUM 205	43 (19%)	72 (31%)	38 (17%)	6 (3%)	3 (1%)	33 (14%)	229
West Civilization	55 (52%)	27 (26%)	6 (6%)	--	--	16 (16%)	104

* Note: The college has other grading categories [i.e. X (Drop), P (In-progress), V (Enrichment)] that are not included in this table due to being irrelevant or very small numbers.

The most striking difference in these data is the HUM 205 grades compared with the other three types of courses for nearly every grading category, but especially the lower percentage of A grades and higher percentage of C grades. These HUM 205 data in the Verde showed a lower percentage of A grades than were assigned in the Prescott campus Western Civilization classes (19% to 30%).

RETENTION

The student retention rate for Liberal Studies classes on both the Prescott and Verde campuses has consistently averaged in the mid-eighties each of the last five years. The low point on the Verde campus was 78% during Fall 2000. The low point on the Prescott campus was 76%, also for Fall 2000. An overall retention rate in the eighties is considered to be very good; however, when 99% of the grades given are passing grades and more than half the grades are "A," it is expected that retention would be high.

H. Student Outcomes Assessment

ORGANIZATION

Early in 2003 Yavapai College wrote a college wide assignment plan that called for program assessment. In September 2003 a program assessment team was formed dealing with Liberal Studies, humanities and philosophy. Later it was determined that Liberal Studies constituted a program area separate from humanities and philosophy. Therefore, in September 2004, a Liberal Studies Assessment team was formed with the charge to develop an assessment plan for Liberal Studies. Team membership consisted of Debbie Roberts as team leader, Paul Ewing from the Verde campus and Kathryn Reisdorfer from the Prescott campus. All team members are full-time faculty and teach the core Liberal Studies courses. Supervision of the team was assigned to the Liberal Arts Division Assistant Dean.

The team met during Fall 2004, agreeing upon program outcomes, setting a timetable for assessment that would begin during Spring 2005, and creating a rubric for scoring student work.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLAN

The assessment team selected seven program level student learning outcomes for the Liberal Studies core courses. Each core class (HUM205, and Western Civilization) will be required to incorporate these outcomes in their respective course outlines. Connections courses and the Capstone course were required to select and assess one or more of these outcomes. The Liberal Studies program outcomes are:

- articulate an integrated understanding of diverse values systems;
- employ integrity, courage, curiosity, and empathy in research, analysis, and reporting;
- identify areas of universal concern and employ diverse approaches to the analyses of these concerns;
- summarize and analyze alternative conceptual frameworks through which one can approach various issues;
- analyze the evolution of issues;
- articulate the relationship between historical events and ideas in the context of the physical, social, cultural, political, and economic environments; and,
- scrutinize and synthesize different theories or different branches of knowledge.

ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Two courses were assessed during Spring 2004 on the Verde campus. The Western Civilization class assessed program outcome #2: employ integrity, courage, curiosity, and empathy in research, analysis, and reporting. Eight papers were assessed using five different indicators of the outcome. On a 100 point scale the scores were 64, 67, 75, 77, 81, 89, 91 and 92. All scores were judged to be at least adequate performance, but four were considered to be strong performance. The other course assessed was a Connections class: LSC101AL: Shakespeare on Film, using the same outcome and indicators. Twelve papers were assessed with all papers showing strong evidence of outcome achievement.

Two outcomes were selected for assessment during Spring 2005 in sections one and two of Western Civilization (LSC201), on the Prescott campus. The results follow:

Course Outcomes (from approved course outline)	A Assessment tools	B Number students*	C Ave Grade
3. Identify area of universal concern and employ diverse approaches to the analyses of these concerns.	6	8	3.58
6. Articulate the relationship between historical events and ideas in the context of the physical, social, cultural, political, and economic environments.	4	8	3.25

* Number reflects only those assessed The Plan called for assessing every third student.

A. Assessment Method or Tool (numbers from the list which follows)

B. Number of students assessed.

C. Average grade of all completers. (Papers were scored as follows: 1= Weak or no evidence. 2= Adequate evidence. 3= Strong evidence. 4= Excellent evidence.)

Assessment Methods/Tools (Insert only the number in “column A.”)

- | | | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Quizzes | 5. Portfolio | 9. Class Presentation | 13. Field Trip Response |
| 2. Exams (oral/written) | 6. In-class Essay | 10. Group Project | 14. Class Participation |
| 3. Pre and Post Tests | 7. Journal | 11. Homework | 15. Experiments |
| 4. Papers | 8. Film/video Response | 12. Interviews/survey | 16. Demonstrations |
| 17. (Other)_____ | 18. (Other)_____ | 19. (Other)_____ | |

These assessment results revealed that students were completing the outcomes with a high degree of success. With regard to outcome #3 it was discovered that reinforcing the written word with powerful art work engaged students in a deeper and more probing analysis. For outcome #6 a conclusion reached was that teaching history through the use of primary documents and the structure of student initiated research to create context and interpretation for those documents provided deeper understanding into the historical period and record. These data reaffirmed and supported the teaching style employed and assessments used.

I. Strengths and Concerns

STRENGTHS

Program Curriculum. The Liberal Studies curriculum is unique. Its primary focus is not “content” but on issues and themes and approaching these from differing disciplinary perspectives. This allows students to focus more on the intellectual skills of critical examination (thinking, reading, writing).

Interdisciplinary “Co-teaching” Instruction. The course outline for each Liberal Studies course begins with words like; “Interdisciplinary approach to . . .”, “An interdisciplinary course focusing on . . .”, or “An interdisciplinary exploration of . . .”. The word “interdisciplinary” means two instructors who are certified in different academic areas who approach the course subject matter from their differing intellectual frameworks. Both instructors prepare for and attend every class period. Instructors may alternate presentations but often they interact together in front of class allowing students to compare and contrast the topic at hand from the differing perspectives of the instructors. This delivery method engages students in critical examination of ideas, issues and themes. This approach is very different from team teaching and thus is uncommon. The degree to which instructors are successful with this interdisciplinary co-teaching approach represents a program strength.

Budget Support. Throughout the history of the Program the college has supported the Liberal Studies Program generously by double loading classes and providing a budget that has more than adequately addressed Program supply needs.

Program Growth. Liberal Studies enrollment figures district wide show a 35% increase between 1999 and 2004. An example of that is that on the Prescott campus for 2003-04, 31 Connections sections were offered with an average enrollment of 25.5 students each. Five sections of HUM205 were offered with an average of 26.6 students per section. In 2003-04 the Program generated 71 FTSE between the two campuses.

Faculty Professional Growth. The experience of observing instructors, from different disciplines, teach and to share ideas and teaching techniques with them has been described, almost universally by those who have taught in the Program, as an enriching professional growth experience.

Support Services. The service provided to Liberal Studies by many college support areas is a definite strength. This is especially the case with the library, learning center, testing center, ITS, distance learning (i.e. Blackboard training and support), reproduction services and access to professional development resources.

Program Flexibility. The addition of HUM205 (as an option to Western Civilization) showed that the Program could be flexible and adjust to special needs. This modification in the program was favorably received by the technology disciplines as better serving technology students.

Student Retention. Student retention rates, on both campuses, has consistently averaged in the mid-eighties each of the last five years. This retention record is regarded as excellent.

CONCERNS

Program Guidelines and Supervision. There is no standardized/official Program literature that outlines Liberal Studies Program history, goals, values, and methods. There is no formal orientation or mentoring system for new program instructors. There is no system in place for regular and systematic oversight of the Program.

Liberal Studies Core Faculty. In contrast with the early days of the Liberal Studies Program, the current teaching team for core Liberal Studies classes is small, and, on the Prescott campus, comes primarily from the Liberal Arts division. In order for the Program to continue to credibly meet the interdisciplinary claim there should be broader instructional support from other divisions across the college academic community.

Lack of uniformity in implementation of the Interdisciplinary Instruction. There is considerable instructor turnover among Liberal Studies faculty on the Prescott campus. This turnover challenges program supervisors to recruit, orient, train and mentor new faculty into interdisciplinary instruction. As a result, the interdisciplinary instructional methodology is not uniformly implemented district wide.

Liberal Studies Curriculum. Over the years the Liberal Studies curriculum has expanded; however, not all that expansion has furthered Liberal Studies purposes; for example, LSC102, LSC200, and LSC 251. With regard to Connections classes there are problems with course proliferation, course integrity, course duplication, cumbersome prefix listing and the uniformity of the interdisciplinary instruction. Each Western Civilization course requires students to be in class for four hours per week for three credits, while HUM205, that meets the same three credit requirement, only requires students to be in class three hours per week. Matters such as these are Program curriculum issues that are a concern.

Course Outline/Syllabi. In 2001, the Liberal Arts Division Assistant Dean began an initiative to update course outlines and bring them into compliance with curriculum committee requirements. That initiative has not yet been completed in the Liberal Studies program. This review found 12 of 16 sampled course outlines in need of revision. It also found 21% of syllabi out of compliance with course outline requirements.

Outcomes Assessment. Each Liberal Studies course has learning outcomes identified and each course syllabus lists grading criteria; however, often there is a lack of consistency between the two. Although all Liberal Studies instructors are able to come up with a grade for each student not all the course learning outcomes are adequately assessed and very few instructors are able to give each student an assessment score for each outcome. The Program is not able to demonstrate that the unique interdisciplinary co-teaching approach results in more student learning than traditional instruction approaches.

Articulation. The articulation of Yavapai College Liberal Studies courses to the three Arizona State Universities works fine when these courses are taken as part of the Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC) block. Problems for students arise when they do not complete the AGEC block before transferring to the universities. When this happens students tend to have transfer problems with Connections classes, the Capstone portfolio and sometimes HUM 205.

Student Access. Outside the Prescott campus, academic schedulers have difficulty offering Liberal Studies courses, making it difficult for students in those areas to complete the six Liberal Studies credits for a degree. The difficulty comes primarily from the interdisciplinary requirement of needing two instructors of different academic backgrounds for each class. There is not an instructor pool to draw on, nor experienced Liberal Studies co-teachers, in outlying areas. Also, there is the expense of paying two full time instructors to teach one course, when enrollment numbers do not come close to the twenty-four minimum required on the Prescott campus.

Online Delivery. Liberal Studies courses are not generally available online. Of nearly fifty Liberal Studies courses only two have been available online, LSC200 and LSC101AN. Student access concerns could be at least partially addressed if more Liberal Studies courses were available online. The obstacle to online delivery is that online is an instructional delivery method that does not align well with the unique interdisciplinary “co-teaching” approach central to the Liberal Studies program.

Student Evaluations. The present Yavapai College system for evaluating Liberal Studies instructors and courses does not allow for adequate differentiation in student responses when there are two or more instructors working with a class. Also there are no questions allowing students to comment on the interdisciplinary nature of the classes, nor questions allowing student feedback on the Program generally.

Grading. The most frequent grade assigned in Liberal Studies courses is an “A,” with as high as 58% of enrolled students receiving a final grade of “A.” On the other hand, “D” and “F” grades are rarely given and “C” grades only given 10% or less, of the time. Community colleges are not known to attract the highest quality of college bound students. The consistent awarding of such high grades and few low grades raises some hard questions.

Program Differences Across Campuses. There are differences in average class size between the Prescott and Verde campuses that result in heavier teaching loads for Prescott faculty. This difference may be due in part to the campuses employing different rules for reaching “go/no go” decisions. There are grading differences between the two campuses with the Verde tending to give a higher percentage of “A” grades (by about 10%) and lower percentage of “C”, “D” and “F” grades. Also, the Verde campus has a faculty member who receives reassigned time to coordinate the Liberal Studies Program there where no one on the Prescott side gets such reassigned time even though the number of courses offered is greater and the number of instructors to coordinate is greater.

J. Recommendations

It is recommended that the following modification be made in the Liberal Studies Program:

1. **Appoint a District Liberal Studies Coordinator.** The differences that exist in the Program between campuses reveals the need for closer coordination. This would especially be the case if campuses were to share instructors and begin offering courses using ITV technology. Appointing a Liberal Studies coordinator with district-wide responsibilities and appropriate re-assigned time for duties would go a long way to unifying and solidifying the Program among campuses.
2. **Establish a District-wide Liberal Studies Committee.** This committee would assist Liberal Studies coordinators and assistant deans on both campuses in dealing with liberal studies issues. The committee would play a key role in curriculum review and development, particularly with regard to Connections classes. The committee would also play a role in recruitment, training and mentoring of instructors.
3. **Develop a Liberal Studies Handbook.** Lack of written material on the Liberal Studies Program has been a weakness. A handbook that provides Program history, mission, values, goals and methods would be an important resource for instructors, coordinators and assistant deans.
4. **Update Course Outlines and Syllabi.** Course outlines were found to be in need of updating to comply with curriculum guidelines and to incorporate Program outcomes. Some syllabi did not reflect a clear connection with the key course outline elements, particularly with regard to the connection of the learning outcomes to course content and assessing the learning outcomes.
5. **Improve Student Evaluations.** The present college student evaluation system is inadequate for Liberal Studies. It is recommended that a more relevant evaluation tool, or process, be developed.
6. **Modify Liberal Studies Curriculum.** Over the years the Liberal Studies curriculum has expanded; however, not all that expansion has furthered Liberal Studies purposes. Courses like LSC102, LSC200 and LSC 251 and certain Connections classes should be deleted from the Liberal Studies curriculum. The remaining curriculum should be revised, where appropriate, to address student needs. In addition expanding liberal studies courses to an online format will be explored.
7. **Increase access to Liberal Studies courses district wide and broaden the Liberal Studies Core instructional base.** The faculty who teach the core Liberal Studies courses of Technology and Human Values and Western Civilization are few and come primarily from the same division. Greater use of the ITV system for Liberal Studies courses will enable locations with small enrollments to be linked with other locations

maximizing instructor expertise while extending student access in outlying areas. In addition expanding Liberal Studies courses online will also increase student access to remote district locations.

8. **Develop greater uniformity in interdisciplinary instruction across courses.** The interdisciplinary co-teaching approach is the hallmark of the Liberal Studies Program; however, there is inconsistency in implementation of this approach across Liberal Studies courses. It is recommended that procedures be developed to provide for greater uniformity in application of the interdisciplinary co-teaching approach across courses.

K. Action Plan

OBJECTIVES of this action plan are:

1. Secure appointment of faculty member who will coordinate the Liberal Studies Program district-wide.

- A. Action Plan Activities: Prepare faculty reassigned time request, outlining the duties and responsibilities expected of the Liberal Studies coordinator, including justification for the position, and submit request to the Deans of Instruction and Chief Academic Officer. Following request approval an experienced and willing faculty member will be identified by the Assistant Deans and approved by the Deans of Instruction.
- B. Responsibility: The Division Assistant Dean for Liberal Arts on the Prescott campus in collaboration with the Verde campus Division I Assistant Dean.
- C. TimeLine: Request will be prepared and presented to the Deans of Instruction by August 1, 2005. Appointment of faculty member will be made by September 20, 2005
- D. Resource Allocation: Reassigned time in the amount of 6 load hours for the first year. The reassigned time amount to be reviewed each year thereafter.
- E. Assessment: Will be included in the end of year report, June 1, 2006.

2. Establish a district-wide Liberal Studies Committee.

- A. Action Plan Activities: Select five to eight faculty to serve as members of this committee.
- B. Responsibility: Division Assistant Dean for Liberal Arts on the Prescott campus, and the Verde campus Division I Assistant Dean.
- C. TimeLine: Committee formed and first meeting held by September 2, 2005.
- D. Resource Allocation: No additional resources will be required.
- E. Assessment. Report will be made at end of the year, June 1, 2006.

3. Develop a Liberal Studies Handbook.

- A. Action Plan Activities: A practical Handbook giving the history, values, goals and guidelines for the Liberal Studies Program will be written to provide guidance to the Liberal Studies Program Coordinator, the Liberal Studies Committee and faculty who teach Liberal Studies courses.
- B. Responsibility: Division Assistant Dean for Liberal Arts on the Prescott campus in collaboration with Verde campus Division I Assistant Dean and subsequent review by the Liberal Studies Coordinator and the Liberal Studies Committee.
- C. TimeLine: Draft of Handbook prepared for first meeting of the Liberal Studies Committee.
- D. Resource Allocation: No additional resources will be required.
- E. Assessment: Report will be made at end of the year, June 1, 2006.

4. Revise and update Liberal Studies course outlines and syllabi.

- A. Action Plan Activities: Full-time faculty in Liberal Studies will revise course outlines and course syllabi as they prepare to teach select Liberal Studies courses.
- B. Responsibility: Full-time Liberal Studies faculty on both campuses.

- C. TimeLine: August 2005 to May 15, 2006.
- D. Resource Allocation: No additional resources required.
- E. Assessment: Report will be made at end of the year, June 1, 2006.

5. Create a student evaluation instrument and evaluation process that will be relevant to the Liberal Studies Program.

- A. Action Plan Activities: The Liberal Studies Committee, in conjunction with staff from Institutional Research, will create a student evaluation instrument and evaluation process that will be relevant to the Liberal Studies Program.
- B. Responsibility: Liberal Studies Coordinator, Liberal Studies Committee, Director of Institutional Research, Division Assistant Dean for Liberal Arts.
- C. TimeLine: February 1, 2006
- D. Resource Allocation: No additional resources required.
- E. Assessment: Report will be made at end of the year, June 1, 2006.

6. Modify the Liberal Studies Curriculum as outlined in the program review document.

- A. Action Plan Activities: Appropriate curriculum materials will be submitted to the College Curriculum Committee to delete LSC102 and LSC251 from the college course bank, to remove LSC200 as a Liberal Studies requirement and to change the Liberal Studies requirements as they are listed in the college catalogue. Each LSC101 Connections class will be reviewed, according to guidelines provided in the Liberal Studies Handbook, and evaluated with a recommendation to delete, revise, or maintain. The college curriculum committee review process will then be employed. Also all Liberal Studies courses will be reviewed to determine which might be most appropriate for expanding to an online format.
- B. Responsibility: Liberal Arts Division Assistant Dean, Liberal Studies Coordinator and Liberal Studies Committee.
- C. TimeLine: August 2005 through May 15, 2006
- D. Resource Allocation: No additional resources required.
- E. Assessment: Report will be made at end of the year, June 1, 2006.

7. Increase access to Liberal Studies courses district wide and broaden the Liberal Studies Core instructional base.

- A. Action Plan Activities: During the schedule building process priority will be placed on utilizing the ITV system to link Liberal Studies offerings between campuses and centers. This will maximize the instructor base as well as increase student access. In addition design experts in ITS in conjunction with instructors experienced in online instruction will work with Liberal Studies faculty to expanding Liberal Studies courses online.
- B. Responsibility: Plan will be prepared by the Liberal Studies Coordinator with assistance by the Liberal Studies Committee and Assistant Deans (Verde campus Division I and Liberal Arts on the Prescott campus).
- C. TimeLine: August 2005 through February 1, 2006
- D. Resource Allocation: No additional resources required.
- E. Assessment: Report will be made at end of the year, June 1, 2006.

8. Insure greater uniformity in interdisciplinary “co-teaching” across Liberal Studies courses.

- A. Action Plan Activities: Each Liberal Studies instructor will be oriented to the Liberal Studies Program and provided with the Liberal Studies Handbook. Program supervisors and the Liberal Studies Coordinator will monitor Liberal Studies courses/instructors each semester and provide mentoring and training in Liberal Studies instructional techniques and methods.
- B. Responsibility: Liberal Studies Coordinator and supervising Assistant Deans.
- C. TimeLine: August 2005 through May 15, 2006.
- D. Resource Allocation: No additional resources required.
- E. Assessment: Report will be made at end of the year, June 1, 2006.

L. Addendum

The Liberal Studies Program Review was completed and submitted for administrative review on June 1, 2005. On July 28, 2005 the Program Review chair, Jim Hinton, and committee member Debbie Roberts, were invited to formally present the review to the administration. Present for this review were Paul Kessel, college interim Chief Academic Officer; Barbara Wing, Dean of Instruction and Curriculum, Prescott Campus; Tom Schumacher, Dean of Instruction, Verde Campus; and Diane Mazmanian, Sr. Research Analysis with Institutional Research. During the review, reservations were expressed by Paul and Barbara regarding the first two recommendations, however, recommendation seven concerned them the most. They were not comfortable with the action plan proposal for broadening the instructor base for the Liberal Studies program. They preferred to address the shrinking number of Liberal Studies instructors by forming teams between campuses (Prescott and Verde) and teach Liberal Studies courses through interactive television. They also felt, in order to address student access concerns, that Liberal Studies courses needed to go on-line even though the Program Review outlined concern that on-line instruction might compromise the interdisciplinary mode of delivery. Further, the administration was concerned about the cost of the Program. Since every Liberal Studies course must have two instructors to meet the interdisciplinary requirement, it meant that the Program expense was twice what it would be with only one instructor per class. This was especially troublesome when Liberal Studies sections were taught, particularly on the Verde campus, with fairly small numbers. Mr. Kessel directed that the recommendations and corresponding action plans be revised to reflect the discussion that took place at the review. He also indicated that when those revisions were made the program review would be formally presented to Academic Student Issues Group(ASIG).

Recommendation six was revised to include considering taking the curriculum on-line. Changes to the original recommendation are in bold.

6. Modify Liberal Studies Curriculum. Over the years the Liberal Studies curriculum has expanded; however, not all that expansion has furthered Liberal Studies purposes. Courses like LSC102, LSC200 and LSC 251 and certain Connections classes should be deleted from the Liberal Studies curriculum. The remaining curriculum should be revised, where appropriate, to address student needs. **In addition, expanding Liberal Studies courses to an online format will be explored.**

The action plan to correspond to this recommendation was likewise revised. Changes are in bold.

6. Modify the Liberal Studies Curriculum as outlined in the program review document.
 - A. Action Plan Activities: Appropriate curriculum materials will be submitted to the College Curriculum Committee to delete LSC102 and LSC251 from the college course bank, to remove LSC200 as a Liberal Studies requirement and to change the Liberal Studies requirements as they are listed in the college catalog. Each LSC101 Connections class will be reviewed,

according to guidelines provided in the Liberal Studies Handbook, and evaluated with a recommendation to delete, revise, or maintain. The College Curriculum Committee review process will then be employed. **Also all Liberal Studies courses will be reviewed to determine which might be most appropriate for expanding to an online format.**

- B. Responsibility: Liberal Arts Division Assistant Dean, Liberal Studies Coordinator and Liberal Studies Committee.
- C. Time Line: August 2005 through May 15, 2006.
- D. Resource Allocation: No additional resources required.
- E. Assessment: Report will be made June 1, 2006.

Recommendation seven was revised and broadened. Changes are in bold.

- 7. **Increase access to Liberal Studies courses district wide and broaden the Liberal Studies Core instructional base.** The faculty who teach the core Liberal Studies courses of Technology and Human Values and Western Civilization are few and come primarily from the same division. **Greater use of the ITV system for Liberal Studies courses will enable locations with small enrollments to be linked with other locations maximizing instructor expertise while extending student access in outlying areas. In addition, expanding Liberal Studies courses online will increase student access in remote district locations.**

The action plan to implement this recommendation was revised. Changes are in bold.

- 7. **Increase access to Liberal Studies courses district wide and broaden the Liberal Studies Core instructional base.**
 - A. Action Plan Activities. **During the schedule building process, priority will be placed on utilizing the ITV system to link Liberal Studies offerings between campuses and centers. This will maximize the instructor base as well as increase student access. In addition, design experts in ITS, in conjunction with instructors experienced in online instruction, will work with Liberal Studies faculty to expand Liberal Studies courses online.**
 - B. Responsibility: Plan will be prepared by the Liberal Studies Coordinator with assistance by the Liberal Studies Committee and Assistant Deans (Verde campus Division I and Liberal Arts on the Prescott campus).
 - C. Time Line: August 2005 through February 1, 2006
 - D. Resource Allocation: No additional resources required.
 - E. Assessment: Report will be made by June 1, 2006.

These changes in the Program Review were submitted on August 1, 2005 to Paul Kessel for response and scheduling of a review by the Academic and Student Services Information Group (ASIG). The arrival of a new college president and resulting changes in administrative assignments delayed administrative action. In order to meet curriculum deadlines, Barbara Wing (Dean of Instruction and Curriculum) approved moving forward with aspects of recommendation

six that involved deleting certain courses that were no longer considered relevant to Liberal Studies (i.e. LSC102, LSC200 and LSC251). Consequently, the appropriate curriculum paper work was submitted. The most significant of these changes was removal of the Capstone Portfolio (LSC200) from the Program. This change would be effective in the Fall, 2006.

On September 23, 2005 the college general education coordinator, Kathryn Reisdorfer, conducted a meeting of interested faculty to report on general education initiatives state wide and developments within the college. At the meeting it was announced that changes at the state level were being made to the AGEC as it applied to the Associate of Science degree. These changes necessitated that Yavapai College revise how it divided up AGEC credits toward that degree. The decision was to reduce the number of Liberal Studies credits in that degree. This action was similar to a plea made earlier in the year by occupational areas (i.e. Nursing, Agriculture, Criminal Justice and Fire Science) to reduce Liberal Studies requirements for their degrees. They wanted room in their degrees for more content courses. At this general education meeting there was considerable faculty opposition to Liberal Studies Connections classes and interest in creating and inserting new courses (e.g. health and fitness, computer literacy) in place of Liberal Studies requirements.

In light of these developments and lack of a response from the administration, the chair of the Program Review expressed concerns to Barbara Wing, who now was Dean of the Prescott Campus. That communication follows:

The Liberal Studies Program was introduced at Yavapai College in the Fall of 1988. It was an exciting innovation for the college in the Liberal Arts tradition. Interdisciplinary instruction was the hallmark of the Program---cultural literacy would be taught from a variety of perspectives. Students would learn to value diverse methodological and philosophical approaches while becoming increasingly curious about the world and developing empathy for the diversity of the human condition. The Program offered students an opportunity to make connections between real world happenings and their own lives. It gave students and instructors a rare opportunity to wrestle with relevant, volatile issues about which intelligent people can disagree. This was a wonderful educational venture for Yavapai College. It introduced an innovative instructional methodology that was built into a new General Education structure at the college.

The sixteen years that followed have provided opportunity to experiment, modify and assess the Program. That time has enabled the Program to gain exposure throughout the state and, to a degree, throughout the nation. As such, the Liberal Studies Program has become regarded as one of the crown jewels of education at Yavapai College. The program characteristics, previously listed, are championed as benefits of the Program.

This is a wonderful picture; however, reality often presents challenges to theory. The reality is that the Program today is not as envisioned and implemented in 1988. Today, reservations about the program abound. I am troubled by many of these reservations. For example:

1. Attrition in LSC Requirements. Internal and external pressures over the years have necessitated Program requirement reductions. As a result some question

whether a Program, reduced by half, can truly accomplish the lofty goals of the original Program. Some see the curriculum and outcome changes that have moved course content away from cultural literacy, as abandoning the original Program vision. The LSC Program, over the years has been used as a “catch all” for people’s new ideas and designs (i.e. Capstone, Cultural Diversity, Business Degree Portfolio, proliferation of connections classes). Now there is a new proposal to create one or more PE/Health courses to take up LSC requirements. These developments have clouded rather than enhanced the Program.

2. New calls to reduce or replace LSC Requirements. Disciplines within the Applied Science Degree have petitioned to replace LSC requirements with discipline related requirements. The General Education Articulation body has made changes in the Associate of Science Degree that requires reduction in LSC requirements.

3. Difficulties implementing the LSC Program District-wide. The need to provide Liberal Studies courses in remote district locations have been frustrated by the difficulty of finding two instructors with differing academic backgrounds—an interdisciplinary requirement. At the same time proposals to deliver Liberal Studies courses online to reach remote district locations have been objected to by Program faculty on the basis that online delivery compromises the synergy of the interdisciplinary instruction.

4. Cost and Equity Questions. Liberal Studies courses, with two instructors each, are twice as expensive as regular classes. Faculty in other college divisions protest the inequality of their being paid at .7 load for their lab classes when two instructors are fully loaded to teach one Liberal Studies class. Liberal Studies instructors counter that the preparation for and unique instructional style required for interdisciplinary courses justifies the cost of the program. They suggest that they would not teach for half load pay. When the LSC200 Capstone course was cut back to one instructor the pool of volunteering instructors dried up. I have been unable to fill the Capstone sections for Spring 06.

5. The LSC Program Review identified serious and significant internal problems with the LSC program, such as:

- a. Transferability issues for some students with LSC courses.
- b. Failure of academic divisions, other than Liberal Arts, to provide instructors for the program, threaten to compromise the interdisciplinary instructional base.
- c. High turnover rate of LSC instructors.
- d. Lack of a systematic orienting, mentoring, and evaluating process for new LSC faculty which has resulted in inconsistency in implementing the dynamics of interdisciplinary instruction.
- e. Lack of a systematic process for monitoring and updating LSC curriculum.
- f. Lack of district wide coordination of LSC.
- g. Failure of Program instructors to consistently implement the lofty expectations of the interdisciplinary approach in LSC classes.
- h. Inability to document that the interdisciplinary approach benefits

students in measurable ways over typical classroom instruction.

6. Challenges with the Program Review Recommendations. To address at least some of the weaknesses identified above, the Program Review proposed a number of recommendations. I have reservations about our ability to fulfill some of these recommendations. Four, in particular, are especially concerning to me. They are:

a. Recommendation #1 calls for appointing a District Liberal Studies Coordinator. The intent of the Program Review Committee was that this position would be compensated in significant ways—i.e. release time and/or stipend. From our earlier meetings regarding this review I have detected lack of administrative enthusiasm for this position—certainly hesitancy to commit significant resources to the position. Even with appropriate resources I have doubts that there would be faculty interested in the job.

b. Recommendation #2 calls for establishing a District-wide LSC Committee. At present the number of faculty who teach, have taught, or are interested in LSC are few. Given all the other committee work people have I foresee a challenge getting an LSC committee together. This Fall our previous attempts have resulted in, at most, two people. Such a committee would require faculty from both campuses. Our past history has shown that it is very difficult to get faculty from both campuses to meet, even once a semester, let alone as often as this committee would need to meet over the next two years to handle the curriculum issues facing LSC.

c. Recommendation #3 calls for greater uniformity in interdisciplinary instruction across courses. Since the interdisciplinary focus of LSC courses is the cornerstone of the Program, it is important that all LSC instructors consistently teach that way. My personal feeling is that we have a long way to go to get this area up to par and the endeavor will take a monumental effort by a District Coordinator, LSC faculty, and the supervising Assistant Dean.

d. Recommendation #6 calls for modification of LSC curriculum. The biggest part of this job will be the review of all connections classes, culling out the inappropriate ones and getting the “few” approved ones on track to addressing LSC goals and values. Nearly as big a job will be the conversion over of Western Civilization to World History and reducing it to a two semester program. These are major tasks that will require manpower and time.

In light of the fact that the LSC Program Review is still in “limbo” and as these reservations fester in my mind, I am wondering if we shouldn’t move in a different direction with LSC. Jim

On November 9, 2005 an official administration response came in the following Memo from Barbara Wing to Jim Hinton.

The Liberal Studies Core (LSC) program review was submitted for administrative review in the early summer. Due to changes in administrative leadership, the review has been pending final acceptance. Recently Tom Schumacher and I spent time reviewing the program review recommendations and associated action plan in

an effort to bring closure to the full program review. You also submitted a follow-up document on 10/11/2005, in which you outlined a number of reservations related to the LSC program and internal problems with the LSC program. Since the purpose of a program review is to do a comprehensive assessment of the program and to determine if the program is achieving the expected outcomes and results, we are considering your follow-up memo to be an addendum to the formal program review document. Your candid and straightforward presentation of issues identified during the course of the program review emphasizes how important it is for us to do a thoughtful and comprehensive review of all programs. While it isn't easy to question what we have been doing, program review affords us an opportunity to apply the very skills that we articulate in our General Education Values Statement.

The program review points out several important issues with the LSC program including, but not limited to, the following:

- Concerns about whether the LSC program is presently meeting the real intent of the program, both in the courses being offered and the interdisciplinary instruction
- Limited access to LSC courses throughout the district
- No documentation to substantiate that the interdisciplinary approach has yielded better student learning outcomes
- High instructional costs and faculty-load equity associated with the current team-teaching configuration

While the recommendations and associated action plan of the program review seek to address these issues, it is surprising that after 16 years in operation that the LSC program review does not document stronger impact on student learning. The recommendations focus heavily on creating a structure with a faculty coordinator, a liberal studies committee, and a handbook. Over time the college previously supported a position of liberal studies coordinator and had a liberal studies committee. The position and the committee were folded into other assignments and committees over time as recommended by faculty.

The program review as presented does not provide documentation to continue the program as currently constructed and managed. Your follow-up message emphasizes numerous areas of concern. Due to the number of issues you and your committee have identified, we are remanding the program review back to the committee to address these issues and make recommendations about how or whether the LSC program should continue.

Since LSC is part of all degree programs at Yavapai College, we will need to have a complete plan in place by November 1, 2006. The full implementation of this plan will be with the 2007-2008 academic year. This plan will need to include any changes in degree requirements, alignment with the state Arizona General Education Curriculum for transfer degrees, and all associated curriculum development (e.g. new courses, course

modifications, course deletions, prefix changes). The occupational program areas must be included in the configuration of the general education requirements for the Associate of Applied Science degrees.

An interim report from the LSC program review committee must be submitted on or before February 1, 2006. This report is to include the proposed curricular direction, a timeline for implementation, and accountability measures.

Tom and I are available to meet with you and the LSC program review committee at any time. We'd like to thank you and the committee for your thoughtful and critical work.

In response to the Barbara Wing Memo, during the week of November 14-18, 2005, Jim Hinton met with: Debbie Roberts, Steve Sparks, Tania Sheldahl, Kathryn Reisdorfer and parties from the Verde campus who were involved in the Liberal Studies Program: Terence Pratt, Division I Assistant Dean; Ginny Chanda, Liberal Studies Coordinator on the Verde campus, and Paul Ewing, former Liberal Studies Coordinator on the Verde campus.

From these meetings three points of view emerged. The Verde campus participants disagreed with some of the program review recommendations saying that the concerns they aimed to address were not problems at the Verde campus. They called for more data gathering and analysis of the issues raised in the Barbara Wing memo. Some Prescott campus participants felt the concerns raised in the Program Review and subsequent Memos were so significant as to necessitate ending the Program and moving the college in a different direction. Some wanted to retain the Program but they could see that without administrative support for key recommendations in the Review it would not be possible to address the concerns raised in the Review. From these discussions the following recommendations are proposed:⁴

1. The Liberal Studies Program be discontinued at the end of the 2006-07 school year.
The basis for this recommendation rests with the concerns documented in the Liberal Studies Program Review document and concerns that surfaced since May.
2. A district wide work group be formed to re-evaluate the General Education requirements at Yavapai College and propose new General Education requirements to go into effect with the 2007-08 school year.

⁴ The committee was divided regarding these recommendations. The Prescott members (Jim Hinton, Steve Sparks, Tania Sheldahl, Debbie Roberts and Kathryn Reisdorfer) supported the recommendations. The Verde participants (Ginny Chanda, Paul Ewing and Terence Pratt) did not.

Exhibit A

Liberal Studies Program Demographics

PRESCOTT WESTERN CIVILIZATION DEMOGRAPHICS										
Sections: 1										
SEX	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL	
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %

PRESCOTT WESTERN CIVILIZATION DEMOGRAPHICS										
Sections: 1										
Female	225	64.5%	186	54.4%	180	60.2%	242	64.9%	247	58.0%
Male	120	34.4%	156	45.6%	119	39.8%	131	35.1%	179	42.0%
Not Reported	4	1.1%								
Total	349	100.0%	342	100.0%	299	100.0%	373	100.0%	426	100.0%
ETHNIC										
	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL	
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %
Non-Resident Alien					1	0.3%				
Black, non-Hispanic	1	0.3%	3	0.9%	2	0.7%	6	1.6%	9	2.1%
Native American	17	4.9%	15	4.4%	12	4.0%	15	4.0%	21	4.9%
Asian	5	1.4%	3	0.9%	10	3.3%	7	1.9%	7	1.6%
Hispanic	17	4.9%	21	6.1%	21	7.0%	28	7.5%	23	5.4%
White	259	74.2%	256	74.9%	213	71.2%	269	72.1%	312	73.2%
Other	43	12.3%	42	12.3%	40	13.4%	48	12.9%	54	12.7%
Not Reported	7	2.0%	2	0.6%						
Total	349	100.0%	342	100.0%	299	100.0%	373	100.0%	426	100.0%
RESIDENCE										
	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL	
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %
Yavapai County	256	73.4%	260	76.0%	225	75.3%	286	76.7%	320	75.1%
Other AZ County	71	20.3%	64	18.7%	49	16.4%	51	13.7%	62	14.6%
Out of State	20	5.7%	14	4.1%	15	5.0%	29	7.8%	37	8.7%
Out of Country	2	0.6%	4	1.2%	8	2.7%	7	1.9%	3	0.7%
Not Reported					2	0.7%			4	0.9%
Total	349	100.0%	342	100.0%	299	100.0%	373	100.0%	426	100.0%

PRESCOTT WESTERN CIVILIZATION DEMOGRAPHICS

RETURN STATUS	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL	
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %
Continuing	268	76.8%	250	73.1%	232	77.6%	302	81.0%	324	76.1%
Returning	22	6.3%	33	9.6%	28	9.4%	28	7.5%	38	8.9%
New	59	16.9%	59	17.3%	39	13.0%	43	11.5%	64	15.0%
Total	349	100.0%	342	100.0%	299	100.0%	373	100.0%	426	100.0%
LOAD	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL	
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %
Part-Time	123	35.2%	127	37.1%	116	38.8%	157	42.1%	189	44.4%
Full-Time	226	64.8%	215	62.9%	183	61.2%	216	57.9%	237	55.6%
Total	349	100.0%	342	100.0%	299	100.0%	373	100.0%	426	100.0%
AGE	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL	
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %
Under 20	66	18.9%	120	35.1%	89	29.8%	114	30.6%	126	29.6%
20 to 24	165	47.3%	109	31.9%	121	40.5%	133	35.7%	145	34.0%
25 to 29	28	8.0%	30	8.8%	33	11.0%	39	10.5%	36	8.5%
30 to 39	44	12.6%	30	8.8%	23	7.7%	35	9.4%	36	8.5%
40 to 49	31	8.9%	33	9.6%	19	6.4%	29	7.8%	52	12.2%
50 to 59	10	2.9%	11	3.2%	12	4.0%	14	3.8%	17	4.0%
60 and over	5	1.4%	9	2.6%	2	0.7%	9	2.4%	13	3.1%
Not Reported									1	0.2%
Total	349	100.0%	342	100.0%	299	100.0%	373	100.0%	426	100.0%

PRESCOTT HUM205 DEMOGRAPHICS

Sections: 1

SEX	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL		2004 FA
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count
Female	34	56.7%	39	63.9%	34	61.8%	49	58.3%	31	50.0%	32
Male	26	43.3%	22	36.1%	21	38.2%	35	41.7%	31	50.0%	24
Not Reported											
Total	60	100.0%	61	100.0%	55	100.0%	84	100.0%	62	100.0%	56

ETHNIC	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL		2004 FA
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count
Non-Resident Alien					1	1.8%					
Black, non-Hispanic			1	1.6%			2	2.4%	3	4.8%	
Native American	1	1.7%			2	3.6%			3	4.8%	2
Asian	1	1.7%			1	1.8%	1	1.2%	1	1.6%	
Hispanic	3	5.0%	3	4.9%	4	7.3%	5	6.0%	3	4.8%	7
White	46	76.7%	49	80.3%	42	76.4%	59	70.2%	40	64.5%	41
Other	8	13.3%	7	11.5%	4	7.3%	17	20.2%	12	19.4%	6
Not Reported	1	1.7%	1	1.6%	1	1.8%					
Total	60	100.0%	61	100.0%	55	100.0%	84	100.0%	62	100.0%	56

RESIDENCE	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL		2004 FA
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count
Yavapai County	47	78.3%	52	85.2%	38	69.1%	62	73.8%	47	75.8%	42
Other AZ County	10	16.7%	9	14.8%	13	23.6%	11	13.1%	13	21.0%	11
Out of State	1	1.7%			1	1.8%	10	11.9%	2	3.2%	2
Out of Country	2	3.3%			3	5.5%	1	1.2%			1
Not Reported											
Total	60	100.0%	61	100.0%	55	100.0%	84	100.0%	62	100.0%	56

RETURN STATUS	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL		2004 FA
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count
Continuing	53	88.3%	53	86.9%	51	92.7%	74	88.1%	54	87.1%	53
Returning	5	8.3%	4	6.6%	2	3.6%	3	3.6%	4	6.5%	2
New	2	3.3%	4	6.6%	2	3.6%	7	8.3%	4	6.5%	1
Total	60	100.0%	61	100.0%	55	100.0%	84	100.0%	62	100.0%	56

LOAD	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL		2004 FALL	
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %
Part-Time	12	20.0%	22	36.1%	15	27.3%	20	23.8%	19	30.6%	19	30.6%
Full-Time	48	80.0%	39	63.9%	40	72.7%	64	76.2%	43	69.4%	37	58.3%
Total	60	100.0%	61	100.0%	55	100.0%	84	100.0%	62	100.0%	56	93.3%

AGE	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL		2004 FALL	
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %
Under 20	7	11.7%	17	27.9%	17	30.9%	26	31.0%	10	16.1%	17	30.4%
20 to 24	33	55.0%	20	32.8%	24	43.6%	36	42.9%	31	50.0%	20	35.7%
25 to 29	9	15.0%	5	8.2%	6	10.9%	10	11.9%	5	8.1%	7	12.5%
30 to 39	8	13.3%	9	14.8%	2	3.6%	8	9.5%	9	14.5%	8	14.3%
40 to 49	1	1.7%	7	11.5%	3	5.5%	3	3.6%	6	9.7%	4	7.1%
50 to 59	2	3.3%	3	4.9%	2	3.6%	1	1.2%	1	1.6%		
60 and over					1	1.8%						
Not Reported												
Total	60	100.0%	61	100.0%	55	100.0%	84	100.0%	62	100.0%	56	93.3%

VERDE LIBERAL STUDIES PROGRAM DEMOGRAPHICS												
Sections: 2												
SEX	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL		2004 FALL	
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %
Female	69	76.7%	48	64.9%	71	71.7%	104	75.9%	71	68.9%	69	68.7%
Male	21	23.3%	24	32.4%	28	28.3%	33	24.1%	32	31.1%	31	30.7%
Not Reported			2	2.7%								
Total	90	100.0%	74	100.0%	99	100.0%	137	100.0%	103	100.0%	100	97.1%
ETHNIC	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL		2004 FALL	
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %
Non-Resident Alien												
Black, non-Hispanic	1	1.1%										
Native American	2	2.2%	1	1.4%	5	5.1%	8	5.8%	2	1.9%	2	2.0%
Asian					1	1.0%	1	0.7%	1	1.0%	1	1.0%
Hispanic	5	5.6%	8	10.8%	9	9.1%	12	8.8%	10	9.7%	10	9.7%
White	79	87.8%	61	82.4%	79	79.8%	110	80.3%	82	79.6%	82	81.2%
Other	3	3.3%	4	5.4%	5	5.1%	6	4.4%	8	7.8%	7	6.9%
Not Reported												

VERDE LIBERAL STUDIES PROGRAM DEMOGRAPHICS

Sections: 2

Total	90	100.0%	74	100.0%	99	100.0%	137	100.0%	103	100.0%
RESIDENCE	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL	
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %
Yavapai County	86	95.6%	71	95.9%	92	92.9%	130	94.9%	96	93.2%
Other AZ County	2	2.2%	3	4.1%	4	4.0%	3	2.2%	2	1.9%
Out of State	1	1.1%			3	3.0%	3	2.2%	1	1.0%
Out of Country							1	0.7%		
Not Reported	1	1.1%							4	3.9%
Total	90	100.0%	74	100.0%	99	100.0%	137	100.0%	103	100.0%
RETURN STATUS	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL	
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %
Continuing	68	75.6%	49	66.2%	78	78.8%	89	65.0%	74	71.8%
Returning	12	13.3%	10	13.5%	13	13.1%	20	14.6%	18	17.5%
New	10	11.1%	15	20.3%	8	8.1%	28	20.4%	11	10.7%
Total	90	100.0%	74	100.0%	99	100.0%	137	100.0%	103	100.0%
LOAD	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL	
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %
Part-Time	42	46.7%	46	62.2%	54	54.5%	82	59.9%	51	49.5%
Full-Time	48	53.3%	28	37.8%	45	45.5%	55	40.1%	52	50.5%
Total	90	100.0%	74	100.0%	99	100.0%	137	100.0%	103	100.0%
AGE	1999 FALL		2000 FALL		2001 FALL		2002 FALL		2003 FALL	
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %
Under 20	13	14.4%	27	36.5%	23	23.2%	32	23.4%	24	23.3%
20 to 24	36	40.0%	17	23.0%	35	35.4%	31	22.6%	31	30.1%
25 to 29	17	18.9%	5	6.8%	9	9.1%	18	13.1%	14	13.6%
30 to 39	10	11.1%	7	9.5%	13	13.1%	23	16.8%	19	18.4%
40 to 49	9	10.0%	11	14.9%	14	14.1%	25	18.2%	12	11.7%
50 to 59	3	3.3%	1	1.4%	3	3.0%	5	3.6%	2	1.9%
60 and over	1	1.1%	6	8.1%	2	2.0%	3	2.2%	1	1.0%
Not Reported	1	1.1%								
Total	90	100.0%	74	100.0%	99	100.0%	137	100.0%	103	100.0%

Exhibit B

End of Year General Education Review of Capstone Portfolio

RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The capstone portfolio evaluation matrix operates on a four point system. Four points indicate that there is excellent evidence that an indicator has been achieved; three points show strong evidence; two points indicate adequate evidence; one point shows weak evidence; and a zero is assigned if there is no evidence.

In 2003, our reading of sixty-five student portfolios showed that students' presented adequate or higher evidence that they had achieved all of the desired outcomes (complete report attached). We were pleased to see that students are achieving the desired General Education Outcomes. We also acknowledged, however, that there were areas that needed improvement.

Those indicators least successfully met were:

1 b: Students will apply advanced mathematical and computational skills. Average 2.08

1 e: Students will articulate that closure is not always achieved in intellectual and social discourse.

Average: 2.03.

2e: Students will document and evaluate their participation in community. Average 2.32

3c: Students will appropriately critique all sources of knowledge. Average 2.17

4e: Students will collaborate in learning teams. Average 2.00

In our 2004 reading, we selected sixty-four portfolios (approximately one out of three portfolios completed) and examined the above-listed indicators. Once again we found that students presented at least adequate evidence indicating that the outcome had been achieved.

Results of the 2004 reading and comparison to the 2003 reading:

1 b: Students will apply advanced mathematical and computational skills. Average 1.88.

This is down from the 2.08 found the previous year. However, the results are close enough to indicate that our evaluation, in addition to students' performance, is consistent. It also shows that there is a great deal of room for improvement in this area.

1 e: Students will articulate that closure is not always achieved in intellectual and social discourse. Average: 2.35.

This is up from the 2.03 reported in 2003. Like the previous result, it indicates consistency in students' work and our evaluation of their work. Although the gain is not large, there is an indication that we are making improvements in these areas.

2e: Students will document and evaluate their participation in community. Average 2.37.

This is almost identical with the 2.32 reported in 2003.

3c: Students will appropriately critique all sources of knowledge. Average 2.03.

This is slightly lower than the 2.17 reported in 2003.

4e: Students will collaborate in learning teams. Average 2.24.

This is up fairly significantly from the 2.00 reported in 2003.

Exhibit C

Articulation of Liberal Studies Courses

Yavapai College

Course ■	ASU ■	NAU ■	UA ■
LSC 101 (1) <i>CONNECTIONS: CONTEMPORARY IS</i>	Elective Credit	HIS Departmental Elective also satisfies: Social and Political Worlds [SPW]	Elective Credit
LSC 102 (1) <i>CONNECTIONS: INTRODUCTORY POR</i>	Elective Credit	Elective Credit	Non Transferable
LSC 200 (1) <i>CONNECTIONS: CAPSTONE PORTFOL</i>	Elective Credit	Elective Credit also satisfies: Social and Political Worlds [SPW]	
LSC 201 (3) <i>WESTERN CIVILIZATION I</i>	Social and Behavioral Sciences (SB) also satisfies: Historical Awareness (H)	HIS 240 also satisfies: Social and Political Worlds [SPW]	HIST Departmental Elective
LSC 201 (3) and LSC 202 (3) and LSC 203 (3) <i>WESTERN CIVILIZATION I / WESTERN CIVILIZATION II / WESTERN C</i>		HIS 240 (3) also satisfies: Social and Political Worlds [SPW] --and-- HIS 241 (3) also satisfies: Social and Political Worlds [SPW] -- and-- HIS Departmental Elective (3)	
LSC 202 (3) <i>WESTERN CIVILIZATION II</i>	Social and Behavioral Sciences (SB) also satisfies: Historical Awareness (H)	HIS 240 also satisfies: HIS 241, Social and Political Worlds [SPW]	HIST Departmental Elective
LSC 203 (3) <i>WESTERN CIVILIZATION III</i>	Social and Behavioral Sciences (SB) also satisfies: Global Awareness (G), Historical Awareness (H)	HIS 241 also satisfies: Social and Political Worlds [SPW]	HIST Departmental Elective
LSC 205 (3) <i>TECHNOLOGY AND HUMAN VALUES</i>	Elective Credit	HIS Departmental Elective also satisfies: Aesthetic and Humanistic Inquiry [AHI]	Non Transferable
LSC 251 (3) <i>CULTURAL DIVERSITY</i>	ASB Departmental Elective also satisfies: SOC Departmental Elective, Cultural Diversity (C)	Elective Credit also satisfies: Cultural Understanding [CU]	SOC Departmental Elective
Course ■	ASU ■	NAU ■	UA ■
HUM 205 (3) <i>TECHNOLOGY AND HUMAN VALUES</i>	Elective Credit	HUM 371 also satisfies: Aesthetic and Humanistic Inquiry [AHI]	HUMS Departmental Elective

Exhibit D

Liberal Studies Program Faculty 2000-2004

LSC Capstone Instructors 2000-2005

Instructor Name	Classification	Terminal Degree	Credentialed Teaching Area	Teaching History
Caton, Gerry	Full Time, Prescott BUCs Division	Master of Education, UofA, 1965	Psychology, Business, Counseling, Computing	S02, F02, S03, S04
Chanda, Ginny	Full Time, Verde	MA, University of Pennsylvania	English	F01,S02,F02,S03,S04
Collentine, Karina	Full Time, Prescott Liberal Arts	PhD, U of TX/Austin; MA 1991 in Foreign Lang.Ed from U of TX	Linguistics, Spanish	F01,F02,S03,F03,S04, F04
Ewing, Paul	Full Time, Verde	Univ of Toledo, MA (History) 1978	History	F01,S02,F02,S03, SU03, F03,F04
Fitzgerald, Jill	Full Time, Prescott Communications	M.A. Prescott College 1996	English, English Education	S04
Fuhst, Paula	Adjunct, Prescott Student Services	Masters in ED, UA'78	Counseling, French (exp.5/02)	S04, SU04, F04
Fuemmeler, Gennie	Full Time, Prescott Communications	Masters in ED, ASU	Reading	S02,SU02,S03,F03, S04
Gaffney, Kay	Full Time, Prescott Communications	MA in Reading Education, ASU'76	English, Reading	S04,SU04

Gilmore, Connie	Full Time, Verde	M.A. Colorado State. MS Univ of Wyoming	English, ABE, History, Lib Science	S03,S04,SU04,F04
Hammond, Carol	Full Time, Prescott Communications	MA in 6/72 from Univ of California	English, Comparative Litera	Every Semester since F00
Heyer, Chris	Adjunct, Verde	B.S. Univ of Missouri	Special in Computer Info System	S04, SU04, F04
Mickelson, Lee	Adjunct, Prescott	Ph.D. in Physics from UC Riverside, 1992	Physics (exp. 5/31/04), LSC	Su01,F01,S02,SU02, F02, S03,F03,S04
Quinley, John	Adjunct, Prescott Institutional Res	Ed.D. from NC State University	Psychology, ECE	SU03, F03
Reisdorfer, Kathryn	Full Time, Prescott Liberal Arts	PhD University of Minnesota	Humanities, History, Englis	F00,SP01,S04,F04
Roberts, Russ	Full Time, Prescott BUCs Division	MBA, Phoenix College	Business Administration, Computer Info Systems	S04,
Ruddell, Mike	Full Time, Prescott Liberal Arts	MS NAU '92, PhD from U of TN, Dec. '99	Anthropology, Geology	S03,S04
Sandberg, Barbara	Adjunct, Verde	EdD in Theatre, Columbia University 1974	Theatre, Mass Communicat	S03,F03
Terry, Doug	Adjunct, Prescott Student Services	M.A. Bridgewater State College,	Special in Psychology, Counseling	S04
Webb, Jim	Adjunct, Prescott	M.A. So Eastern Louisiana University 1996	Special in English	F04
Winney, Liz	Adjunct, Prescott Student Services	Masters in Ed from NAU, August '96	Bus. Admin., Educ. Ldrshp Human Development	SU04

Western Civ/HUM205 Instructors, 2000-2005

Instructor Name	Classification	Terminal Degree	Credentialed Teaching Area	Teaching History since 2000
Ashby, Roz	Full Time, Prescott Liberal Arts Fac	MA, UCLA 1971 Candidate in Philosophy in History	History	HUM205: S02, S03 (chino) LSC 201: F04 LSC 202: S04 LSC 203: S04, F04
Atonna, Peter	Adjunct, Chino	MA, Univ of Arizona	Civil Engineering	HUM 205: S03 (chino)
Bradbum-Ruster, Michael	Adjunct, Prescott	PhD, U. of CA at Berkeley 1995	Philosophy, Humanities, Sp	HUM 205: S02,F02,S03 LSC 201: F01 LSC 202: S02 LSC 203: S02
Chanda, Ginny	Full Time, Verde Div I Faculty	MA, U of PA	English	LSC 201: S01, F02, S04 LSC 202: S00, S02, F04 LSC 203: F00, S02, F03
Dove, Linda	Full Time, Prescott Eng/Comm Faculty	MA 1993 from U. of MD; Phd From U. of MD in 1997	English (exp. 5/31/02)	LSC 202: S02 LSC 203: F02
Ewing, Paul	Full Time, Prescott Div I Faculty	University of Toledo, M.A. (History)	History	HUM 205: S04, F04 LSC 201: F00, S01, F02,S03,S04 LSC 202: S02, S03, F04 LSC 203: F00, S01, S02, F02, F03
Gilmore, Connie	Full Time, Verde Div I Faculty	M.A. Colorado State. MS Univ of Wyoming	English, ABE, History, Library Science	HUM205: F02, S03,S04, F04
Giglio, Ernest	Adjunct, Prescott	Ph.D. in Social Sciences From Syracuse Univ.	LSC, POS	LSC 203: F04

Golden, John	Adjunct, Prescott	Washington University, MA (History) 1951	History and English	LSC 202: S01 LSC 203: SU01
Goldie, Victor	Adjunct, Verde	State Univ of NY (Albany), MA (English) Aug 1965	Special in English and District Specific in Hebrew	LSC 201: S00, S03 LSC 202: F00, S02 LSC 203: S01, F02
Govedich, Steve	Full Time, Prescott Lib Arts Faculty	M.A. in Psychology from CA State University, 1970	Psychology, Sociology	HUM205: S00,SU00,F00,F01,S02,SU02,F02, S03,SU03,SU04,F04 LSC 203: S03
Green, Diana	Adjunct, Prescott	Calif State Univ (Chico), MA (Social Science) 1991	Social Sciences	LSC 203: SU02
Johnson, John	Full Time, Prescott	California State Univ Long Beach, 1994	English	HUM205: S01, SU01, S02, F02, S03
Lester, Gary	Adjunct, Prescott Eng/Comm Faculty	Ph.D. in History from Florida State Univ In 1994	Journalism, History, Public Administration	LSC 201: F00, F01, F02, F03 LSC 202: S00, S01, S02, S03, S04 LSC 203: SU00, SU01, S02, SU02, SU03
Meier, Ken	Full Time, Prescott Liberal Arts Faculty	Univ of California at Irvine June 1975	History	LSC 201: F00 LSC 202: S00, S01
Norris, Francis	Adjunct, Verde	Univ of Hawaii, MA(History) 1992	History, district specific in Spanish and Philosophy	LSC 201: S00 LSC 202: S00
Nownes, Nick	Full Time, Prescott Eng/Comm Faculty		English	LSC 203: F02, S03
O'Donnell, John	Adjunct, Verde	NAU MA (English) 1975	Special in English	HUM 205: F02, F03
Perlmutter, Nina	Full Time, Prescott Liberal Arts Faculty	MS, Arizona State University	Philosophy	HUM 205: S01, F01, S02, F02, S03
Rawlings, Donn	Full Time, Prescott Eng/Com Faculty	PhD Univ of Washington	English	HUM 205: S01 LSC 203: S00, F00, S01
Reisdorfer, Kathryn	Full Time, Prescott Liberal Arts Faculty	PhD University of Minnesota	Humanities, History, English	HUM 205: S00, SU00, F00, S01, SU01, F01, F02, SU02, SU03, F03, S04, SU04, F04 LSC 203: S00, F00, S01, F02, S03
Roberts, Brent	Full Time, Prescott Math/Sci Faculty	MA Northern Arizona University	Mathematics	LSC 203: S00, F00, S01
Roberts, Debbie	Full Time, Prescott Liberal Arts Faculty	MA in '95 from Cal State Sacramento	History	HUM 205: F04 LSC 201: F02, F03, F04 LSC 202: S03, S04 LSC 203: F03, S04, F04
Ruddell, Mike	Full Time, Prescott	PhD, Univ of Tennessee 1999	Anthropology, Geology	LSC 201: F01, F02, F03 LSC 203: S02, SU02, SU03, F03
Wolf, Bill	Adjunct, Prescott	Ph.D in History from Ohio State University	History	HUM 205: F03, IS04, F04

Connections Instructors 2000-2005

Instructor Name	Classification	Terminal Degree	Credentialed Area	Courses Taught
Abbott, Ken	Full Time, Prescott Science Division	PhD U. of CA (Irvine) MA Cal State Fullerton 1969	Biolog Science, Health, Phy Ed and Recreation	101AD Evol/Creation
Abry, Dennis	Full Time, Prescott Liberal Arts	PhD, FSU (1998) MS Western Illinois U.	Psychology	101B Aids 101N Sports
Anderson, Vicki Jo	Adjunct, Verde	BYU BA(Sociology) 1971 George Wythe 1993 MA	Special in Sociology	101Q
Andre, Barbara	Adjunct, Verde	B.A., Lib. Studies/Soc and Beh Science, NAU in 2000	Sociology (exp. 5/31/07)	LSC101AK Child Care
Ashby, Roz	Full Time, Prescott Liberal Arts	MA, UCLA 1971 History 1973 U of CA	History	101AH, 101L 101H
Asplund, Ilsa	Adjunct, Prescott	BA Prescott College, 1987	Biology	101B Aids
Babinsky, Anne	Full Time, Prescott & Verde. Tchr Ed	Masters in Educ, 1975 State U. of NY	Basic Education, Early Childhood Ed, Psychology	101AK Child Care
Bartels, Dieter	Full Time, Verde	Cornell Univ 1977, MA and PhD in Anthropology	Anthropology	101M
Beatty, Patrick	Adjunct, Prescott	M.D.	Biological Sciences, Business, Medical Sci	101C Economics 101B Aids
Behn, Veronica	Adjunct, Prescott	M.A. Prescott College 2001	Geography	101AM Inter Exp

Bennett, Jamie	Full Time, Prescott Liberal Arts	MA ASU 1981	Geography, Psychology	101AM Inter Exp
Benoit, Jr. Edward	Adjunct, Verde	M.S. Nova Southeastern Univ Mental Hlth Counseling 1996	Psychology, Counseling	101K, Rock Music 101 P, Science & Pseudo
Bevers, Jeb	Full Time, Prescott	New Mexico State PhD 1998	Biology	101AO Extra-Terrestrials
Breitmeyer, Chris	Full Time, Verde	PhD, ASU, MS, ASU	Biology, Zoology	101I, Environ Crises
Bruch, Theresa	Adjunct, Verde	So. Utah State College, 1983, BA	Special in Communications	101Q
Byrd, Marcia	Adjunct, Verde	Lesley College, MA (Counseling/Psy) 1988	Spanish, Psychology, Counseling	1010
Caton, Gerry	Full Time, Prescott	Master of Education, UofA, 1965	Psychology, Business, Guidance Cnslng, Computing	101C Economics 200 Capstone
Carney, Mary	Adjunct, Prescott	MSW Adolph University 1982	Social Work, LSC101AJ	101AJ Dying
Chanda, Ginny	Full Time, Verde	MA, Univ of Pennsylvania	English	101N, AA, AL, 101T, Capstone
Collentine, Karina	Full Time, Prescott	PhD, U of TX/Austin; MA 1991 in Foreign Lang.Ed from U of TX	Linguistics, Spanish	101AG Lang 200 Capstone
Cosentino Jr., Michael	Adjunct, Verde	NAU MA, Teaching 1980 Eng as second Lang	English, English as second Language	101M, 101D, 101K
Cummings, Judy	Full Time, Prescott	MS 1984, San Jose State U.	Nursing	101AJ Dying
Davis, Barbara		NAU, MA 1992	Special PE, Engl as 2 nd Lg	101L, Woman World
Doss, Ginny	Adjunct, Prescott and Chino Valley	Masters of Social Work from ASU in 1997	Psychology, Social Work, Gerontology	101AJ,101AI, 101AF Issues in
Doyle, Steve	Full Time, Prescott	MA in GEO from U. of Victoria, May 20, 1992	Geography	101AO, 101AM, 101AH, 101E/F GC
Ewing, Paul	Full Time, Verde	M.A. University of Toledo, 1978 (History)	History	Capstone, 101AA, 101AN,101B,101T
Fenzi, Meg	Adjunct, Prescott	MS, Gerontology, U of A in 1998	Gerontology	101AJ Dying
Fisher, Annette	Full time Verde	Cal State Univ (Long Beach), 1992 MBA	Business, Bus Admin	101AL, 101AA
Friesen, Benjamin	Adjunct, Prescott	Prescott College BA 1999 in Ecological Psychology	Special in Psychology	101I, Envir Crises 101A,
Fuemmeler, Gen	Full Time, Prescott	Masters in ED, ASU	Reading	101AC Jesus, 200
Giesecke, Albert	Adjunct, Verde	UCLA 1969 MBA Finance USC 1965, MS Aero Engineer	Business Administration Special in Aerospace Enginee	101T Media
Gilmore, Connie	Full Time, Verde	M.A. Colorado State. MS Univ of Wyoming	English, ABE, History, Librar Science	Capstone, 101G, 101T
Glidden, Moses	Full Time, Prescott	MA in March '89, U. of OK	English	101AC Jesus
Golden, Barry	Full Time, Prescott	M.S. in Zoology from U. of Arkansas in 1969	Biology; Biological Sciences	101B Aids
Golden, John	Adjunct, Prescott	Washington Univ, MA 1951	History, English	101AC Cinematic Var
Goldie, Victor	Adjunct, Verde	State UnivNY(Stonybrook) 1991, M.L.S +30	Special Credential in English	101L, 101A, 101G, 101C, 101P, 101D, 101X, 101I, 101K
Goldie, Virginia	Adjunct, Verde	Masters in Liberal Studies	Liberal Studies, Art, Anthrope	101L,101C,101A,101G
Govedich, Steve	Full Time, Prescott	M.A. in Psychology from CA State University, 1970	Psychology, Sociology	101B,101R, 101Z, 101AD
Green, Diana	Adjunct, Verde	Cal State Univ (Chico) 1991 MA, Social Science	Social Sciences	101B Aids

Greenwood-Miller	Adjunct, Verde	BLA, Utah State University	Landscape Architecture	101E
Greenwood-Miller	Adjunct, Verde	MS, Northern Ariz University	Earth Science	101E
Gullett, Charly	Adjunct, Prescott	No Degree	District Specific in Gunsmithing	101R, Guns
Haynes, Keith	Full Time, Prescott	MA from U of A, 1990	English	101T Media
Higgins, Kirk	Adjunct, Prescott	A.A. in Music from YC; B.A. Hist, NAU in 1980	1) Music; Guitar 2) History	101K Rock Music
Hillman, Angie	Adjunct, Verde			101X Women's History
Iverson, Paul	Adjunct, Verde	No Record	Special in Chemical Engineering	101I, Envir Crises
Kimball, Bill	Adjunct, Prescott	No degrees	None	101A Sense of Place
Johnson, Johnny	Full Time, Prescott	MA Cal State University (Long Beach) 1994	English	101T, 101R, 101A, 101I
Lamotte, Victoria	Adjunct, Prescott	BA Cabrillo 1976	Special in Child Development and Psychology	101AK Child
Lawhead, L	Adjunct, Prescott	Masters in ED from NAU, '93	Basic Education (exp. 5/06)	101AK Child
Lester, Gary	Adjunct, Prescott	Ph.D. in History from Florida State University 1994	Journalism, History, Public Administration	101AN, 101K, 101AH,
Lovell, Terry	Full Time, Prescott	PhD Business, Greenwich U. Hawaii 8/03, MBA, ASU '85	Bus. Admin, Management, Pol Sci., Sociology, Social Science	101AH Global 101C Economics
Matsumoto, Faye	Full Time, Prescott	MS Cal State Fullerton, MS 1979	Physical Education	101N Sports
McClenahan, Dorian	Adjunct, Prescott	Embry-Riddle 1996, MS in Space Studies	Special credential in Aeronautics	101Z, The Space Prgm
Meier, Ken	Full Time, Prescott	MA Univer of Calif (Irvine) 1975	History	101B Aids, 101C 101R Guns,
Mickelson, Lee	Adjunct, Prescott	Ph.D. in Physics from UC Riverside, 1992	Physics (exp. 5/31/04), LSC	101AC Jesus Capstone
Miller, Russ	Adjunct, Prescott	Cal State (LA), MA Fine/Applied Art 1982, Fuller Theological Seminary MA 1979 Theology	Special in Religious Studies And Fine Arts/Art	101E Grand Canyon
Miner, Patricia	Adjunct, Verde	Wayne State Univ 1992 MSW, Oakland Univer BA 1988 Psy	Special in Psychology and Social Work	101X Women's History
Mitchell-Green, Bonnie	Adjunct, Verde	PhD, Univ Texas, 1994, Soc BYU 1982 MA Latin Am Std	Education Admin, Pol Sci, Spanish, Sociology, Soc Sci	101AG Lang, 101I 1010 Culture
Moore, Bob	Adjunct, Prescott	MA Northern Ariz Univ	Applied Sociology	101 Z, Space
Moore, Howard	Adjunct, Verde	NAU BS(Physics/Astronomy)	Special in Physics	101Z, Space Prog
Nownes, Nick	Full Time Prescott	PhD English, Univ of Nebraska	English	101 T, Media
Nugent, Scott	Adjunct, Prescott	BA UofArizona 2000	Religious Studies	101AJ Dying, 101L
Parkes, Warren	Adjunct, Prescott	BA Uof Arizona 1993 (History)	District Specific in Astronomy	101Z, The Space Prgm
Perlmutter, Nina	Full Time, Prescott	MS, Arizona State University	Philosophy	101A, and AE, 101AD, 101E GC,
Pratt, Terrence	Full Time, Verde	Mississippi State University 1992 MA	English	101K, 101C, 101N, 101G, 101AA
Phillips, Sally	Adjunct, Verde			101Q Com Service/Ldrsp
Quinley, John	Adjunct, Prescott	Ed.D, from NC State Univ. Higher Education Admin	Psychology, ECE	101AN Capstone
Rader, Karen	Adjunct, Prescott	BSN and MSN from Indiana University	Nursing	101AJ Dying
Radner, Sherry	Adjunct, Verde	Columbia Univ, 1986 MA ART	Special in Art	101X, Women's Hist

Rawlings, Donn	Full Time, Prescott	PhD Univ of Washington	English	101AE 101E, 101A
Reinhart, Bryan	Adjunct, Verde	No Degrees	Special in Mass Communicati	101H, Sci/Fict
Reisdorfer, Kathryn	Full Time, Prescott	PhD University of Minnesota	Humanities, History, English	101N,101AE 101L,capstone,
Robbins, Bettie	Adjunct, Prescott	M.S. in Social Work & Gerontology from ASU	Social Work, Gerontology	101AI Aging 101 AF Issues
Roberts, Brent	Full Time, Prescott	MA Northern Arizona University	Mathematics	101A Place,101EF GC, and AD
Roberts, Debbie	Full Time, Prescott	MA in '95 from Cal State Sacramento	History	101L, AH,and H
Rooth, Stew	Full Time, Prescott	Ed.D from ASU in Educational Administration	Business, Economics	101RGuns, 101C Economics
Ruddell, Mike	Full Time, Prescott	MS NAU '92, PhD from U of TN, Dec. '99	Anthropology, Geology	101AH,101L, 101AD, Capstone
Russell, Randy	Full Time, Prescott	PhD Oklahoma State Univ	Economics	101C Economics
Sandberg, Barbara	Adjunct, Verde	Columbia Univ, Ed.D (Theatre)	Theatre and Communications	101AA, The City
Saunders, Elizabeth	Adjunct, Verde	ASU 1993 BA	Special Cred in Art, Graphic A	101X, 101L
Sasmor, Jeannette	Full Time, Prescott	Univ of So. Florida MBA 1989 Columbia Univ 1968 M.ED	Nursing, Business, Bus Admi	101AI, Creative Aging
Sasmor, James	Adjunct, Verde	PHD Calif Western Univ, Bus Ad	Special Cert in Health Science	101AI Creative Aging
Simpson, Laura	Adjunct, Prescott	M.E., Elementary Ed. from NAU	P.E. (Needs certification for other areas)	101AI Creative Aging
Sparks, Steve	Full Time, Prescott	PHD San Diego State/UC Davis	Biological Science	101AD Evolution
Strassburg, Collette	Adjunct, Prescott	MA in English/Journalism From Adams State College	English, Journalism, LSC	101T Media
Terranova, Donna	Adjunct, Prescott	MA in Marriage & Family Therapy, Alliant Univ.	Psychology, LSC	101AI Creative Aging
Way-Schramm, Karly	Full Time, Verde	PhD American Univ 1997, Soc MA Goddard College 1990 Psy	Psychology, Sociology	101L, Women World
Webb, Jim	Full Time, Prescott	MA Southeastern Louisiana University, 1996	Special in English	101T Media,101AD Evolution
Weber, Todd	Adjunct, Prescott	None	Southwest Studies Technolog	101AN Lewis & Clk
Weiss, Don	Adjunct, Prescott	Degree in Music Engineering, Fanshawe College in Ontario May 1980	Music	101K Rock Music
Williams, Jodie	Adjunct, Prescott	MS from ASU, 1992	Nursing	101AI Cr Aging 101AF Aging
Instructor Name	Classification	Terminal Degree	Credentialed Teaching Area	Courses Taught

Exhibit E

Liberal Studies Program Grading Data

LSC Program Review: Grades Tables

Table 1. Prescott Connections Classes Grade Distribution Summary*

Year	A	B	C	D	F	W	Total
1999-2000	332 (41%)	211(26%)	96(12%)	12 (1%)	9 (1%)	157 (19%)	817
2000-01	351 (45%)	169 (22%)	69 (9%)	12(1.5%)	10(1.3%)	174 (22%)	785
2001-02	419 (54%)	143 (19%)	49 (6%)	11(1.4%)	14(1.8%)	135 (18%)	771
2002-03	424 (50%)	181 (21%)	65(7.6%)	9 (1%)	32(3.7%)	142 (17%)	853
2003-04	468 (49%)	230 (24%)	67 (7%)	17(1.8%)	29 (3%)	141 (15%)	952
Totals	1994 (48%)	934 (22%)	346 (8%)	61(1.5%)	94(2.2%)	749 (18%)	4,178

* Note: The college has other grading categories [i.e. X (Drop), P (In-progress), V (Enrichment)] that are not included in this table due to being irrelevant or very small numbers.

Table 2. Prescott Capstone Classes Grade Distribution Summary*

Year	A	B	C	D	F	W	Total
1999-2000	—	—	—	---	—	---	-----
2000-01	22 (61%)	4 (11%)	0	1 (3%)	3 (8%)	6 (17%)	36
2001-02	61 (44%)	37 (27%)	5 (3.6%)	1 (.7%)	5 (.4%)	29 (21%)	138
2002-03	97 (52%)	46 (25%)	14 (7.6%)	1 (.5%)	1 (.5%)	26 (14%)	185
2003-04	133 (58%)	51 (22%)	20 (8.6%)	0	2 (.9%)	25 (11%)	231
Totals	313 (53%)	138 (23%)	39 (6.6%)	3 (.5%)	11 (2%)	86 (15%)	590

* Note: The college has other grading categories [i.e. X (Drop), P (In-progress), V (Enrichment)] that are not included in this table due to being irrelevant or very small numbers.

Table 3. Prescott Western Civilization Classes Grade Distribution Summary*

Year	A	B	C	D	F	W	Total
1999-2000	23 (26%)	27 (31%)	18 (21)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	17 (20%)	87
2000-01	20 (33%)	15 (25%)	13 (21%)	0	0	13 (21%)	61
2001-02	33 (35%)	31 (33%)	11 (12%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	16 (17%)	94
2002-03	16 (31%)	20 (39%)	7 (14%)	3 (6%)	0	5 (10%)	51
2003-04	14 (23%)	17 (27%)	16 (26%)	1 (1.6%)	4 (6.4%)	10 (16%)	62
Totals	106 (30%)	110 (31%)	65 (18%)	6 (1.7%)	7 (2%)	61 (17%)	355

* Note: The college has other grading categories [i.e. X (Drop), P (In-progress), V (Enrichment)] that are not included in this table due to being irrelevant or very small numbers.

LSC Program Review, Grading Tables, p2

Table 4. Prescott HUM205 Classes Grade Distribution Summary*

Year	A	B	C	D	F	W	Total
1999-2000	67 (42%)	47 (30%)	17 (11%)	3 (2%)	6 (4%)	19 (12%)	159
2000-01	63 (33%)	68 (36%)	22 (12%)	2 (1%)	3 (1.6%)	33 (17%)	191
2001-02	62 (39%)	50 (31%)	16 (10%)	2 (1%)	1 (.6%)	30 (19%)	161
2002-03	63 (36%)	58 (33%)	23 (13%)	2 (1%)	1 (.5%)	30 (17%)	161
2003-04	75 (46%)	46 (28%)	14(8.6%)	0	3 (2%)	24 (15%)	162
Totals	330 (39%)	269 (32%)	92 (11%)	9 (1%)	14(1.6%)	136 (16%)	850

* Note: The college has other grading categories [i.e. X (Drop), P (In-progress), V (Enrichment)] that are not included in this table due to being irrelevant or very small numbers.

Table 5. Verde Connections Classes Grade Distribution Summary*

Year	A	B	C	D	F	W	Total
1999-2000	142 (61%)	49 (21%)	6 (3%)	1	0	36 (15%)	234
2000-01	132 (60%)	38 (17%)	7 (3%)	--	--	43 (20%)	220
2001-02	137 (59%)	45 (19%)	12 (5%)	1	--	36 (16%)	2331
2002-03	132 (61%)	45 (21%)	8 (4%)	--	3 (1%)	28 (13%)	216
2003-04	125 (56%)	47 (21%)	20 (9%)	--	4 (2%)	28 (13%)	224

Totals	668 (59%)	224 (20%)	53(4.7%)	2	7 (.6%)	171 (15%)	1125
--------	-----------	-----------	----------	---	---------	-----------	------

* Note: The college has other grading categories [i.e. X (Drop), P (In-progress), V (Enrichment)] that are not included in this table due to being irrelevant or very small numbers.

Table 6. Verde Capstone Classes Grade Distribution Summary*

Year	A	B	C	D	F	W	Total
1999-2000	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2000-01	8 (47%)	4 (24%)	1 (6%)	--	1 (6%)	3 (18%)	17
2001-02	33 (75%)	1 (2%)	--	--	--	10 (23%)	44
2002-03	22 (58%)	13 (34%)	--	--	--	3 (8%)	38
2003-04	40 (70%)	8 (14%)	1 (2%)	--	--	8 (14%)	57
Totals	103 (66%)	26 (17%)	2 (1%)	--	1	24 (15%)	156

LSC Program Review, Grading Tables, p3

Table 7. Verde Western Civilization Classes Grade Distribution Summary*

Year	A	B	C	D	F	W	Total
1999-2000	14 (20%)	25 (36%)	12 (17%)	2 (3%)	--	6 (9%)	70
2000-01	2 (6%)	15 (42%)	4 (11%)	2 (6%)	--	8 (22%)	36
2001-02	8 (22%)	9 (25%)	6 (17%)	--	--	5 (14%)	37
2002-03	16 (32%)	11 (22%)	8 (16%)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	7 (14%)	50
2003-04	3 (8%)	12 (33%)	8 (22%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	6 (17%)	36
Totals	43 (19%)	72 (31%)	38 (17%)	6 (3%)	3 (1%)	33 (14%)	229

* Note: The college has other grading categories [i.e. X (Drop), P (In-progress), V (Enrichment)] that are not included in this table due to being irrelevant or very small numbers.

Table 8. Verde HUM205 Classes Grade Distribution Summary*

Year	A	B	C	D	F	W	Total
1999-2000	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2000-01	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2001-02	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2002-03	31 (53%)	16 (28%)	2 (3%)	--	--	9 (16%)	58
2003-04	24 (52%)	11 (24%)	4 (9%)	--	--	7 (15%)	46

Totals	55 (52%)	27 (26%)	6 (6%)	--	--	16 (16%)	104
--------	----------	----------	--------	----	----	----------	-----

* Note: The college has other grading categories [i.e. X (Drop), P (In-progress), V (Enrichment)] that are not included in this table due to being irrelevant or very small numbers.