

LAC Minutes – Final

Friday, 2/9/2018, CLIMB 306, 1:00 to 3:00

Attendance:

Voting Members		Voting Members, cont.		Non-Voting Members	
Chris Brooks, Chair	x	Beth Manhat	x	Kendra Cawley	
Marc Goodman	x	Linda Paulson	x	Sally Earll	x
Allison Gross		Davina Ramirez	x	Susan Wilson, recorder	x
Dana Harker		Julianne Sandlin			
Wayne Hooke		Torie Scott	x	Today's Guests	
Troy Jesse	x	Thomas Songer		none	
Jamee Kristen		Nora Stevens, Vice Chair	x		
Matt Levy	x	Ann Su			
Hannah Love					

ACTION Items

- Susan – Post the Assignment Design Workshop video to Google—make it login accessible
- Chris – Make proposed changes to the template drafts
- Chris – Create CTE versions of the templates

BUSINESS

2018 Peer Review

Chris would like to have a plan in place for Peer Review (PR) by spring term. For regular SAC assessments we will have an expert peer review panel comprised of LAC members and recruited faculty who have participated in PR before. With the switch to expert reviewers, Chris asked if we need to include coach review in the new model.

When he has served as a reviewer, Marc has found coach review helpful in terms of feedback on the PR reports and the coaches to be effective liaisons between the SACs and the reviewers.

She's not sure how much the new templates will impact the need for coach review, but Torie believes her input in the past has been useful in providing reviewers with context.

Nora suggested using each coach as a reviewer for a batch of reports not generated by their assigned SACs (pair them with non-coach reviewers), and using them in the dual role of traditional coach to take advantage of their knowledge and expertise.

Beth, Davina, and Linda also see benefits from using coaches in the PR process.

Assessment Reporting in General

Torie suggests framing assessment with an eye toward program review, so that SACs are planning, executing, and reporting their assessment projects in a way that prepares them for a the Assessment section of their quinquennial (5-year) self-study.

Beth said it would be helpful to create a log of each SAC's reporting trends to determine the effectiveness and relevance of their current reports. Originally, the Multi-Year Plan (MYP) was supposed to help with this. Chris observed that CTE SACs have had an easier time with the MYPs, but that the LDC-DE SACs have all but abandoned theirs. This was expected, because during the ongoing General Education/Outcomes inquiry (2015-16 to present), LDC-DE SACs were given permission to do only one assessment project per year and they could assess an exploratory outcome that wasn't part of their original MYP. Regarding Beth's suggestion, Chris

said it may be appropriate to add an executive summary section on the PR. Comments provided each year could be extracted and pasted into said log, thus informing future reviewers if the SACs are assessing the same thing over and over, or if they are reassessing and closing the loop.

Regarding the MYP, Marc went on record saying the current MYP is complex and likely misunderstood by many. He was filling out the form last fall for his SAC when he found he had multiple questions about the template. He set up a meeting with Susan (Wilson) and she was able to answer his questions, but without that meeting he would have filled out the form incorrectly. This must be happening in other SACs as well.

Coaches and the LAC

Chris wanted to revisit the issue of coaching and its connection to the LAC. Four of the current assessment coaches are not part of the LAC; they expressed an interest in coaching somewhere along the way and stepped in to help the LAC fulfill its coaching commitment.

In today's brief discussion, there seemed to be consensus among members that all coaches would benefit from being active members of the LAC. Matt suggested inviting the non-members to a future meeting to discuss this. Torie thinks it is fair to expect the non-member coaches to attend at least one meeting per term, and Sally agreed, saying they would benefit greatly from the timely discussions about forms, processes, upcoming conferences, etc. Nora asked if there are sufficient funds to cover LAC participation for coaches who are PT faculty, and Chris believes there are.

Chris would like to establish an ongoing point of communication between the LAC and its coaches—maybe something at the LAC web page.

Linda added that any policy change in regard to expectations of coaches needs to be documented in the LAC Handbook.

Annual Agendas

What do we need in place each fall? Chris wants to be proactive in developing a checklist of items that need to be prepared or updated each academic year. This is what the committee came up with...

By fall in-service:

- o Identify external 'drivers' that impact the yearly schedule
- o Update the templates for the Annual Plan, All-In Proposal, Multi-Year Plan, End-of-Year Report, CTE Summary Data Report
- o Determine due dates/deadlines for above forms
- o Establish deadlines for All-In artifact collection
- o Set up calendar of LAC meetings (use Google Calendar and send invitations to all members and coaches)
- o Line up coaches for the year
- o Prepare an overview of the year's expectations for assessment (for SAC chairs)
- o Create a "What do we do with Peer Review results?" resource sheet for SACs; include something about closing the loop (in language new chairs will understand)
- o Share concrete information on assessment (including forms, process, and due dates) in a breakout session at SAC Chairs & Friends

Video

The opening segment of December's Assignment Design workshop was taped in the hopes it might become the first of many training videos for PCC faculty. The resulting file is large (2.5GB) and takes quite a while to download. A colleague in Media Services offered to compress the file (to 600MB) for Susan. She arranged with Chris to show brief clips today of the before-and-after videos for comparison. Was the video quality sufficient on the compressed version?

After watching the clips, the members offered these suggestions:

- Share videos via Google or YouTube, with appropriate privacy settings, for instantaneous viewing (Matt)
- (For future tapings) use a microphone and set the camera closer to the front of the room to improve the picture and better capture what is on the screen. Do minimal sound editing to get rid of the background hum. (Davina)
- Instead of taping the program live, use existing voice-over technology to narrate the slide show. (Troy)
 - Would definitely present a ‘cleaner’ and more professional format, but wouldn’t capture the questions from the audience (Marc)
 - Unless the videos were very short, the visual learner might tune out a faceless narrator; better to have a small picture of the live presenter in a corner of the screen and a high-resolution slide show in the center of the screen (Davina)
 - Voice-over technology wouldn’t be effective for a true workshop where faculty work on actual assignments and solicit critique from, and bounce ideas off, the facilitator and peers. Likewise, it’s Important to remember that assignment design can’t be (or shouldn’t be) done only via video – having some kind of trained facilitator in an in-person workshop is generally the best option, although videos can be a good resource (Nora)
- Have participants watch the slide show in advance and come to the workshop prepared to work on the assignment itself (Chris)
 - One approach would be to train the camera on the speaker, using the powerpoint in the video when necessary and switching between them with editing (Matt)
 - Consider using picture-in-picture – the speaker as a smaller video against the backdrop of the powerpoint (Nora)
 - This would be tricky, because faculty often find it difficult to assimilate to their own discipline an exercise that is being done in a totally different discipline—that’s why the assignment design workshop had separate breakouts for Cultural Literacy and Quantitative Literacy (Nora)

In the end, no decision was made about how to structure future workshops, but if they are taped, the group decided that posting a higher-quality video via a common platform is the best way to go. It eliminates the problem of sharing large files.

New Templates

Chris took the comments shared at the last meeting and incorporated them into the templates. Thomas Songer couldn’t attend today, but Chris acknowledged the considerable attention he had given the last drafts since the January meeting and said some of those suggestions were evident in the revised templates the committee would see today.

Starting with the annual plan (for LDC-DE), Chris scrolled through the document on screen and toggled between it and the much abbreviated new help guide.

Comments and suggestions:

Annual Plan

- Question 7 “In what term will you collect student work?” implies a single term. Let’s change it to ‘term(s)’ to encourage SACs to look at assessment as an ongoing endeavor. (Linda)
- Question 8 “Briefly describe the purpose of this project. In other words, what are you hoping to learn?” Should it ask instead, what is the SAC’s goal? (Linda)
- Question 9 “In general terms, describe the assessment project you plan to conduct, with a focus on outlining steps in the assessment process” is clunky. Consider adding coaching information here. (Marc)
- Question 9, Provide a link to a taxonomy of projects to illustrate all the possibilities (e.g., pre- and post-assessment, self-reflection paper, short-answer essays with prompts, etc.)

- (Davina) Could develop the taxonomy by going through prior year's reports to see what the various SACs used. (Marc)
- Question 10, Split the benchmark question into two parts to force SACs to describe both the level of performance desired, 10A, and the percentage of students they hope will achieve that level, 10B. (Marc)
 - Question 13 "If the results of the project indicate a need for additional pedagogical focus on the outcome in the future (i.e. during the reassessment year), what are possible steps the SAC might take to help students improve outcome achievement?" was added by Chris to fulfill a question category suggested by Thomas in order to show SACs that it is always an expectation that an initial assessment one year will lead to instructional tweaks and reassessment down the road. When some members questioned the use of the word 'pedagogical,' Chris said Kendra had posed the same question. He'll change it in the next round.
 - Overall – Maybe use exemplar report samples at the beginning. "Click here to see real examples from other SACs." (Matt)

End-of-Year (EOY) Report

- Question 4, pertaining to benchmarks, needs to replicate the two-part question proposed for the annual plan.
- Question 7, on SAC involvement – It might be better to ask for the percentage of PT faculty participating and to describe the barriers to ensuring participation from both PT and FT faculty. The SACs should be encouraged to identify all barriers, especially if lack of funding is among them. (Matt)
- Question 8 – Change the wording to align more closely with the language in the PR feedback checklist: "Were potential benefits to student learning identified as a result of this assessment project?" (Marc)
- Overall – Is it necessary to ask in the year-end report how the SACs plan/discuss/share elements of their assessments? Couldn't that be confined to the plan itself? (Marc)
- Overall – use anchors in the help guide, so when someone clicks the link, it takes them to the relevant part of the help guide. (Matt)
 - Chris mentioned the formatting limitations within Google Docs. The best he could offer is that the help guide itself is only 1+ page long, so it wouldn't take folks long to scroll through it to find the information desired.

Marc would like to pilot the EOY template for his SAC this spring. Davina (ESOL), Torie (LIB), and Linda (MSD) volunteered their SACs to pilot the template as well. Chris needs to work on CTE versions of the templates.

Peer Review Feedback Checklist

- Under SAC Participation/Coordination is the question "Are an adequate number and an appropriate composition (PT vs. FT, etc.) of faculty involved in the project?" – How does one judge what 'adequate' is? See suggestion to EOY's Question 7, and consider changing the PR Feedback Checklist question to "Did PT faculty participate, or was sufficient justification given for non-participation?"
- Under Assessment Process, the fourth question asks "Are benchmark attainment rates clearly defined and meaningfully reported (without averaging away meaning)?" Chris noted that the "averaging away" comment is a prompt for the peers.

Adjourn.