

LAC Minutes – Final

Friday, 4/13/2018, CLIMB 203

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	x	Julianne Sandlin	x		
Wayne Hooke		Torie Scott	x	Today's Guest	
Troy Jesse	x	Thomas Songer		Jacki Williams	x
Jamee Kristen		Nora Stevens, Vice Chair			
Matt Levy	x	Ann Su	x		
Hannah Love					

ACTION ITEMS (none)

- (All) Send Chris names of potential CTE council members
- (Chris) Update and send templates to the SACs that wish to pilot them

BUSINESS UPDATES

Introductions

A round of introductions was made for the benefit of guest Jacki Williams, EMS-Cascade. Jacki coordinates the assessments for her SAC and has long been involved with peer review. She is interested in joining the council.

Recruitment of New Members

Jacki's timing couldn't be better. The current roster of LDC members is balanced, but more CTE representation is needed. Full-time faculty would be ideal, but the council will consider part-time members as funding allows; Chris asked folks to send him names of potential candidates.

Expert Peer Reviewers

Chris asked for a show of hands as to who would like to serve in the first cohort of expert peer reviewers. Ann, Julianne, Beth, Marc, Dana, and Jacki volunteered, and Linda and Susan went on the list as maybes. Hannah and Jamee had expressed their interest to Chris prior to the meeting. If additional reviewers are needed, Marc recommended Bonnie Altus from HIM; he has teamed with her on peer reviews in the past.

DISCUSSION

Administrative Access to Peer Review Reports

It was discussed and agreed at a prior meeting that PCC administrators could have access to peer review feedback starting with the 2018 reports, based on the LAC's decision to remove point scores from the feedback forms. That decision was made after the school year started and hasn't been widely shared. Today, Chris asked how best to relay this new protocol to faculty. He received these suggestions from Ann, Dana, Matt, and Sally:

- Include it in an email along with a description of all changes made to Peer Review this year
- Relate it to the Gen Ed change
- Frame it in a positive light
- Reinforce the original intent of peer review, which hasn't changed
- Explain how the deans want to be more proactive
- Send it in an email that serves as both a reminder of when year-end reports are due and as an explanation of "here's what will happen with your feedback report..."

There was some confusion as to which managers have an interest in assessment and the reporting of same. Susan explained that the VP of Academic Affairs, the Dean of Academic Affairs, the DOIs, and managers of various service/support departments are the *primary* audience for the instructional program reviews and these reports include a fairly comprehensive section on assessment. When an administrative response to a program review expresses concerns about a SAC's assessment activities as reported in its program review, some administrative liaisons (in most cases, a division dean) may want more detail so as to help the SAC get on track with assessment. Seeing what the peer reviewers have recommended is a good starting point.

On a related note, Susan expressed concern about the distribution process. Feedback from all prior peer reviews currently is available to SAC members via login at the individual SAC pages at Spaces. The 2018 peer review feedback cannot be posted there without giving the administrators simultaneous access to all prior reports. Chris acknowledged that the 2018 feedback will need to be stored on a separate platform, and he said this bears further discussion and planning.

Peer Review and LAC's Awards for Exemplary Assessment Reports

Jacki mentioned the role that the LAC awards for exemplary assessment reports play. In her experience, some managers question why a SAC *doesn't* win the award or *stops* winning the award, and that can be problematic.

Chris plans to continue giving the annual awards, and pointed out that, in 2017, the LAC moved away from basing them on points earned during the peer review process in favor of using voluntary commendations made by the reviewers themselves. After a brief discussion, in which other members said the college needs to do a better job at commending *all* efforts, not just those of a chosen few, Chris said he could easily add a section on the feedback form where the reviewers would identify what each SAC did well in terms of assessment. Those comments could be extracted and posted as a way of highlighting innovative and 'best' assessment practices at PCC. We are, as Mariah Cisse in Professional and Organizational Development calls us, a "learning organization," and Ann noted that making this positive feedback available to the masses would be a nice way to educate faculty about what their colleagues are doing.

With expert peer reviewers in place, Dana said emphasis should be placed on giving positive and constructive feedback. Matt agreed, adding he would love to see a "Closing the Loop" award that acknowledges the SACs that are truly impacting student learning through assessment.

Templates

Before reviewing the latest versions of the Assessment Planning and Reporting forms, he acknowledged that Google Forms might not be the best medium for these, as Allison Gross recently pointed out that you can't start a form, save it, and go back to it later. Chris has no issue going back to Word, if necessary. In addition to making it easy to use for faculty, he said he wants something that's not too cumbersome when it comes to converting the reports to PDFs and posting them. The forms were reviewed quickly, with Chris making some changes on the spot and saving others for later. What follows is a summary of all of the changes suggested:

Annual Reassessment Plan

- Item 4 "What changes to teaching..." prompted Dana to ask if teaching was the best word here, and after a short deliberation, the members convinced her the question was straightforward and wouldn't provoke the confusion that "changes to instruction..." might.
- Items 12a and 12b Benchmarks, are improvements over the question they replaced, and it was recommended that 'benchmarks' be explained in more detail in the help doc.

Annual Reassessment Report

- Item 3 asked "Did the SAC implement a teaching strategy and did you make a change to the assessment process..." One member suggested separating these, and another recommended changing the wording. Chris amended the question to read "Did your SAC

implement a teaching strategy and/or curricular change to improve outcome achievement...”

- Item 4 asked “Please provide an executive summary of your results...” and Matt suggested striking the word ‘executive,’ as not everyone knows what that means.
- Item 5b “What percentage or frequency of students...” might confuse folks, so Chris will see that frequency is explained in the help doc.
- Chris will go back through and ensure that all of the questions that require responses are so indicated by a red asterisk.
- Item 6 on Data will need better instructions for attaching raw data. Expectations of the SACs also can be addressed in the help doc.
- Item 7 on Data Analysis was reworded at Dana’s suggestion to invite a narrative response instead of yes or no.
- Item 10 regarding Follow-up was modified on-site.

College-Wide Assessment

Chris will be meeting with Ann Cary (Curriculum Committee chair) and Eriks Puris (Degrees and Certificates Committee chair) next week to discuss how SACs will get their courses approved for Gen Ed if the EAC endorses the proposed framework for General Education.

Approving/Critiquing Assignments

Another unresolved issue is how to vet/approve the assignments to be used. Will we ask SACs to attach a sample assignment when they put in their course paperwork? The council members weren’t fond of this idea, as it makes more sense to use individuals most familiar with the rubric to assess the effectiveness of the assignments. Chris said this year’s scoring process *will* include an assignment critique element (to take place at the end—after scores have been submitted for the artifacts themselves). The scorers will know if the assignment ‘worked’ and will be in a position to give concrete feedback on its effectiveness or lack thereof.

How do we get feedback to the faculty? Marc suggested using a rubric for the critiques. It should have a four-point scale to eliminate any tendency to assign a ‘middle’ or neutral score.

Dana asked about a pre-professional development (advanced) process on assignment design, so faculty have the opportunity to tweak their assignment before it goes into use. It would be nice to have on-campus liaisons available for design consultation and general questions. Chris said very little is available via the TLC, though Ann said she went to one at Southeast that was decent. Ann suggested partnering with POD, as she feels the LAC should be involved in the actual training.

Matt suggested the creation of a repository for vetted assignments as a resource for faculty. Davina agreed, adding that she still is in favor of developing some sort of taxonomy that could be posted along with generic assignments so faculty could see what’s already available and learn of other possibilities. Here, Sally shared that the AAC&U’s web page has sample assignments that align with the LEAP VALUE rubrics.

The Advisory Committee’s Role in Assessment

CTE programs have advisory boards comprised of members from industry who guide the PCC faculty in all things related to program improvement. Marc asked what the advisory committee’s role in assessment is. Chris doesn’t have experience with these boards, but his initial take is that they establish *what* should be assessed. Some SACs have used their advisory members to assist with the evaluation of student artifacts. It sometimes works, but Linda pointed out that the subjective views of the individual professionals can create huge issues with inter-rater reliability.

Adjournment

Chris adjourned the meeting at 2:25.