

## LAC Minutes – Final

Friday, 10/06/2017, CLIMB 306, 1:00 to 3:00

### Attendance:

Voting Members		Voting Members, cont.		Non-Voting Members	
Chris Brooks, Chair	x	Linda Paulson *		Kendra Cawley	x
Elizabeth Cole	X	Davina Ramirez	x	Sally Earll	x
Marc Goodman		Julianne Sandlin	x	Susan Wilson, Recorder	x
Allison Gross		Torie Scott	x		
Dana Harker		Thomas Songer	x		
Wayne Hooke		Nora Stevens, Vice Chair	x	<b>Today's Guests</b>	
Troy Jesse	X	Ann Su	x	None	
Jamee Kristen	X	Catherine Thomas			
Matt Levy	X	Ralf Youtz			
Hannah Love	x				

\*Circled the CLIMB parking lot a couple of times but could not find a parking space and, hence, could not attend.

### ACTION ITEMS

- Chris: Send members the pilot template and the peer review critique form
- Susan: Send members a copy of Comp/Lit's 2017 end-of-year report
- Davina: See if ESOL might be willing to beta test the new ARF/RRF template

### BUSINESS UPDATES

#### New and Returning Members

Chris welcomed Troy Jesse as a new member and welcomed back Jamee Kristen, who served on the LAC in 2013-2014. A round of introductions was made.

#### LAC Budget

Recent budget cuts were devastating to the LAC. The biggest annual expenditure is summer peer review, and because that coincides with the advent of the fiscal calendar, the current balance in the LAC account is in the red already. Peer Review 2018, which will come out of the 2018-19 budget, will need to be pared down significantly.

#### Multi-State Collaborative (MSC)

It is unknown at this time if PCC will participate in Year 4 of the MSC. There are a few areas of concern, cost being one of them. [Other issues came up later in the meeting.]

### LAC DISCUSSION

#### Role of the LAC in College-Wide Assessment

The overarching role of the LAC hasn't changed a whole lot since its inception, though the needs of the SACs have shifted somewhat. Today's LAC is tasked with:

- informing and guiding SACs about assessment expectations
- helping SACs to create rubrics
- deciding how Peer Review is handled, including
  - recruiting reviewers

- paying the reviewers
- determining the size of the review load

Chris has observed a positive growth curve for veteran peer reviewers. Sally, Jamee, and Ann suggested capitalizing on the expertise of the LAC by creating a core group of peer reviewers. If members cycled through on three-year, staggered terms, the group would always have seasoned reviewers.

### Gen Ed and Core Outcomes

If PCC is moving toward a pay-to-play model of assessment for LDC-DE courses on the General Education list, the categories of Arts & Letters; Social Science; and Science, Math & Computer Science would each assess to its own rubrics. Ann, Jamee, and Nora offered up pros and cons to this approach. One ‘pro’ is familiarity—if a discipline becomes immersed in the use and the assessment of its rubrics, then there may be less ambiguity when it comes to interpretation and application of them. On the other hand, there is value in assessing outside of one’s discipline, as it removes some of the bias and evaluation of the assignment itself.

In 2017-18, only Cultural Literacy and one other outcome will be scored internally. In the email that went out to the SACs, Chris said we had to bake in the expectation that each may have to do its own scoring if it chooses an outcome that isn’t selected for the internal project.

Chris reviewed the year-to-year tasks associated with college-wide assessment:  
[note: Susan assigned labels A, B, and C to keep them straight]

Year 1 = Year’s plan, assignment design, assessment A, artifact collection A, spring progress report

Year 2 = Year’s plan, data retrieval and analysis of A, possible pedagogical interventions using A’s data; new assessment B, artifact collection B; report out on A and B

Year 3 = Year’s plan, pedagogical interventions for A (if not done last year) or reassessment of A, possible reassessment of B or new assessment C, possible artifact collection C; report out on A and B and/or C

Kendra added that the benefit of the three-year plan was that Year 1’s load was lighter, but there was the expectation that the participating SACs still would initiate a second new or reassessment in Years 2 and 3 along with an analysis of the previous year’s data. She also spoke to the strict parameters of the MSC, which restrict colleges to no more than 10 artifacts per *instructor*. If one instructor teaches three or four sections, we can pull only 2 to 4 artifacts from each of his/her sections.

What about SACs that have few Gen Ed courses or no Gen Ed courses (CTE)? Until we implement a new Gen Ed system, Kendra explained that we will maintain the status quo: LDC-DE SACs will continue assessing the core outcomes and CTE SACs will continue assessing their degree and certificate outcomes (which, currently, are aligned to the core outcomes). When we flip over to the new model, LDC courses on the Gen Ed list

would have built-in content and assignments, and instructors would submit artifacts to a college-wide assessment committee on demand. In that model, the SACs would be responsible for doing only data analysis on the college-scored artifacts. As long as the college has the institutional (aka core) outcomes covered, the LDC-DE SACs would be free to administer and evaluate, on their own, separate SAC-specific formative assessments. The CTE SACs would continue assessing their degree and certificate outcomes, but those would no longer have to align to the core.

The new model is SAC-agnostic, meaning it targets *students* not individual courses. Academic Affairs identifies who is eligible (students in the ‘early’ phase of their PCC career, and those who are closer to graduation—known as ‘late’), and seeks artifacts for the targeted students in whatever Gen Ed classes they are taking that term. Kendra made a pitch for portfolios, saying they would work well for this kind of assessment. We could ‘collect’ them at any time from a central drive and review them at intervals to measure progress.

### The Expectations of the NWCCU

At this juncture, Kendra shared relevant information about NWCCU. PCC is in Year 3 of its 7-year accreditation cycle. Year 7 will require a report on indicators of ‘mission fulfillment (MF).’ Where PCC always has thought of MF as having met all the facets of its mission statement, NWCCU’s looks at MF in terms of whether students are meeting the institution’s student learning outcomes, which, at PCC, are the Core Outcomes. [After the meeting, Chris forwarded a link Kendra provided to the web page that houses a summary of NWCCU’s Demonstration Project]. We want to get to a point where LDC-DE and CTE are doing something meaningful at the SAC level and where the institution is collecting meaningful big-picture results.

### Revisiting the LAC Budget

Circling back, Chris reiterated that the LAC budget has been slashed and we need to reduce peer reviewers by 50%. The committee gave a resounding ‘yes’ when he asked, “Shall we build an expert cohort now?” Quite a few of the members present said they would be interested in serving as college-wide scorers.

As for the internal scoring project, Kendra believes the college can afford to score 150 artifacts next round per each of two outcomes, with 9 to 10 scorers. As in years past, a certain percentage of the artifacts would be double scored. [Editor’s note: During the proofing stage, a recalculation was made. With 14 internal scorers total (7 per outcome), we could single score 300 artifacts and double score another 150. The caseload of 32 artifacts per scorer is slightly lower than last year’s.]

### Outreach to SAC Chairs

As part of the LAC’s new initiative, Chris told the audience at September’s SAC Chairs & Friends that the council will invite SACs to an LAC meeting this year. Chris doesn’t think the chairs will be lining up at the door, so he anticipates dedicating 45 minutes to SAC visitors at one meeting each term. The first invitation, to the November meeting, will go out to SAC chairs soon via email, and Chris will ask them to forward it to their

assessment leads. Respondents will have an opportunity to tell us what is working and what isn't. Chris hopes to build in time for Q&A. The visits will give SACs a chance to see who we are and to dispel any shadowy image they have of the LAC. Ann asked if the email could include a prompt as to "what would you like to talk about?" Chris could forward the SACs' responses to the members so we know what's on their mind.

Last spring the council also talked about creating informational and promotional videos. Chris can conceptualize a video on "What is Assessment?" but as soon as process is added, the video becomes obsolete very quickly. Jamee suggested creating a handout instead. It could be updated each year and posted at the LAC web page, and center on "What we are doing this year." Sending it to the chairs early in September would work well for SACs who use their meeting during in-service week to plan the year's assessment activities. In addition, Ann suggested producing an F.A.Q. or short slideshow to post at the web page for year-round access. If we do campus-based outreach, another idea that came up last year, Davina said the handout/slideshow/FAQs would be tangible resources to offer the SACs.

### Template Development

Allison, who wasn't present today, led the subcommittee that developed a prototype Google assessment form last year. Her SAC, Comp/Lit, used the pilot template last spring for its end-of-year report. Chris and Nora provided the peer review and said it was good, but they don't know if they would see the same results with other SACs whose authors are not members of the LAC. The template is very open-ended, which could backfire with very brief responses or unnecessary tomes. Davina wasn't volunteering her SAC, but said she would investigate if it might be feasible to beta test the template with ESOL.

Since their inception, the templates evolved from being open-ended to very prescriptive, and Wayne's version (used since 2013) has numerous embedded links. The pilot template has no links, but only because the template subcommittee ran out of time; adding some user-friendly links is part of the plan. Chris will send the template and the current peer critique document to the members, and Susan offered to send them a copy of the public end-of-year report submitted by Comp/Lit. Chris asked the group to take a look at the template and critique form and to provide feedback on potential improvements.

### Peer Review Results and the Administration

Last year, the LAC voted to continue the policy of keeping peer review feedback for SAC (and coach) eyes only. Speaking on behalf of the DOIs and division deans (who serve as administrative liaisons to the SACs), Kendra said they would like to help the SACs that are struggling with or still dragging their feet with assessment. One way this is being addressed is through program review reporting template—the section on assessment is being revamped for 2018-19—but being able to see peer review feedback would tell the deans where exactly the SACs need help year to year. In the past, Kendra acknowledged the faculty's fear that the hammer would fall if the division deans saw their SACs' peer review feedback. She asked if the SACs have reached a point in assessment where "we find something wrong and we fix it" or if there is a tendency to hide flaws uncovered by

assessment? If the mindset is “we fix it,” then providing access to the peer feedback could move this forward.

One member expressed concern about the inequities that result when one dean is gung-ho and proactive and another totally ignores what its SACs are doing with assessment. What is a SAC’s recourse if their liaison approaches a “bad score” punitively? Would Kendra run interference? Another member suggested creating a helpful flowchart of communication channels.

Before taking her leave, Kendra said the deans want to be involved; they see that as part of their role. Again, the interventions would be tailored to the SACs that are struggling, a number that Susan says has greatly decreased in recent years. She is the person who converts all of the peer review feedback into PDFs and posts the documents at Spaces. She commented that a majority of SACs have mastered the learning curve on assessment, as evidenced by the number of SACs getting high marks on peer review. We have the evidence that SACs are getting better, Nora observed, so maybe the LAC can reach out to the folks who need help.

(The following discussion occurred after Kendra left.) In truth, some faculty still are afraid that negative peer feedback would be used as a stick. The problem with peer review to date is the grading part. Chris isn’t afraid that the faculty will misinterpret the scores, but that the administrators will. Matt was a peer reviewer this summer and he feels the process itself is good, but he doesn’t see value in assigning points, especially if so many of the SACs are getting high scores. Can we get rid of the scores and replace them with narrative feedback? Nora thinks the points are useful internally, especially for coaching. She suggested an alternative might be a “green light/yellow light/red light” approach. When the peers complete a review, they could check a box indicating the degree of interventions necessary. The lights themselves would not appear on the feedback document that the SAC sees. What would be helpful, Matt offered, is to include an Action Items section at the top of the peers’ critique form, so the SACs could readily see how their assessments could be improved. Ann, another 2017 peer reviewer, said it would be helpful to provide peers with constructive verbiage they can use in each section of the critique form. This would improve consistency in the feedback. Elizabeth agreed. As a coach, she found the peers’ feedback to be quite varied; sometimes overly harsh and sometimes impractical.

The deans’ push for accessible feedback has a lot to do with their accountability. The DOIs can take a pulse with program review, but the division deans are more accountable year to year at an operational level. There are no easy answers and much more discussion is needed going forward.

#### Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:00.