

LAC Minutes – Ver2.0 (Final)

Friday, 10/5/2018

Attendance:

Voting Members		Voting Members, cont.		Today's Guests	
Chris Brooks, Vice-Chair	x	Torie Scott	x	Magda D'Angelis-Morris	x
Marc Goodman	x	Thomas Songer		Gayathri Iyer	x
Allison Gross		Nora Stevens, Chair	x	Juan Maldonado	x
Wayne Hooke	x	Jacki Williams	x	Jessica Martin	x
Troy Jesse	x			Sara Robertson	x
Jamee Kristen		Non-Voting Members		Delpha Thomas	x
Hannah Love		Kendra Cawley	x		
Linda Paulson	x	Sally Earll	x		
Davina Ramirez		Susan Wilson, recorder	x		
Julianne Sandlin	x				

ACTION ITEM

- Nora: Send members the link to the upcoming NWCCU webinar and to the Jillian Kinzie conference.

BUSINESS

Introductions and Potential New Members

Nora welcomed the group and asked for a round of introductions. Six guests were present: Magda D'Angelis-Morris (Dental Assisting), Gayathri Iyer (Computer Science), Juan Maldonado (Computer Applications & Web Technologies), Jessica Martin (Communication Studies), Sara Robertson (Library), and Delpha Thomas (English for Speakers of Other Languages).

In a move to have all assessment coaches be members of the Council, today was an onboarding session for Juan, Magda, and Sara. Juan and Magda (along with members Marc Goodman, Linda Paulson, and Jacki Williams) will serve as CTE coaches this year. Sara has long served as an assessment coach for LDC-DE. Delpha, Gayathri, and Jessica are involved in their SACs' assessment projects and came today to see what the LAC was all about. Nora hoped to formalize membership for those wishing to sign on, as long as funds exist to pay the part-time faculty members for their attendance. [Post-meeting notation: It's official; Delpha, Jessica, and Gayathri were voted in by email.]

NWCCU-Sponsored Events

The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities and Eastern Oregon University's Don Wolfe are hosting a webinar Friday, October 19, 1:00 to 2:00 Pacific Time, on *Successful Practices for Assessing Core Themes and Student Learning for Mission Fulfillment*. Nora proposed that LAC members could tune in from a single location on campus and discuss afterward. Interested parties should contact Nora.

On January 14 and 15, at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas, Jillian Kinzie will present *Assessment Essentials: Assuring Standards of Educational Effectiveness and Quality Improvement*. This one-day conference is relatively close and inexpensive, and Kendra has the funds to send a few folks. Nora will be happy to send out the link.

This Year's Working List

Last spring, the Council created a list of tasks deserving the LAC's attention in 2018-19. Nora quickly went down the list and gave a little background information on each.

1. Determine LAC's relationship to the Gen Ed process—what will be the LAC's role in the approval process when SACs seek to get their courses on the new Gen Ed lists?
2. Debate the Core Outcomes questions: Are there more than four? Discipline Subject Area Committees (DSACs) were formed last year and each decided on an outcome it could own and devised a rubric for scoring its student artifacts. They are:
 - ❖ Arts & Letters - Integrative Learning
 - ❖ Social Science - Critical Thinking
 - ❖ Math, Computer Science, and Science - Quantitative Reasoning
 - ❖ Interdisciplinary - Cultural Literacy
3. Look at aspirational outcomes and their relative importance beyond strict assessment.
4. Consider the issue of equity in outcomes and graduation rates.
5. Revisit how part-timers get paid and mentored in the assessment process.
6. Come up with a plan for reviewing and approving Gen Ed courses in a two-year span.

Also on last year's list was "setting up CTE assessment so it fits college outcomes." Much has transpired re CTE over the summer, so Nora had this as its own agenda item.

DISCUSSION

CTE's New Multi-Year Plan and System for Coaching

To ensure that CTE departments are regularly assessing all of their degree and certificate outcomes (it is important we use this terminology over 'program outcomes'), and adequately reporting these assessment activities, Kendra convened a group of five CTE faculty from across the district (four FT and one adjunct) to devise a new process. This resulted in:

- ❖ a new, customized Multi-Year Plan/Summary Data Reporting template
- ❖ a new form for describing the SAC's assessment process and providing data on one 'focal assessment project' at year's end
- ❖ a new system for 'intrusive' peer coaching

For context, Chris explained that the LAC spent a great deal of time last year reviewing and revising all of the assessment templates. The revamped forms originally were intended for both CTE and LDC-DE, and some members had volunteered to try out the draft forms for their SAC's end-of-year reports last June. The form piloted by some CTE members last spring has been replaced by two new forms. In the interest of keeping LAC as the official 'vetter' of all things related to assessment reporting, Kendra and the new CTE coaches were seeking the Council's blessing today on their new forms.

On the screen, Nora broadcasted a blank version and a filled-in version of the new MYP. Thanks to some smooth coding on Marc's part, the form boasts pre-populated degree and certificate outcomes, thus eliminating the need for each SAC to type them in. It is the SAC's job to identify for each outcome: whether it is assessed via a TSA, in which course(s) it is assessed, the type of assessment being conducted, the method of scoring, and which year it will be assessed--over a two- or three-year cycle. That planning portion, shaded in green on the template, is to be completed in the fall. Academic Affairs will save all of the MYPs as submitted, but will return to each SAC a modified version that captures only the current year's outcomes. At the end of the year, the SACs will fill in the section at the far right, shaded in blue this time, indicating

benchmark attainment and other data as appropriate.

Susan delineated the reports each group will complete and their deadlines:

In November:

- ❖ CTE SACs will fill out and submit the green (planning) portion of their Multi-Year Plan
- ❖ LDC-DE SACs will fill out the planning portion of their Assessment or Reassessment Report Form

In June:

- ❖ CTE SACs will fill out and submit the blue (summary data) portion of their Multi-Year Plan, a report providing details on their chosen 'focal' outcome, and their regular TSAs (if they're a Perkins-funded program)—technically, the TSAs aren't due until July 31
- ❖ LDC-DE SACs will fill out the reporting portion of the Assessment or Reassessment Report Form

Linda advocated for an improved, published rubric that shows SACs what the peer reviewers will be looking for. Chris indicated that we made this available in the past at the web page, but there wasn't a lot of pomp and circumstance about it. Whatever we might create this year, he said it is important that it not be seen as a 'scoring' tool, because we moved away from that when we eliminated point values for the evaluation criteria. Kendra feels the new system adds some collegiality to the process, as the old system for assigning points may have appeared as if the LAC was being punitive when that wasn't the intention. Perhaps the CTE Coaches can work on an improved rubric, and anyone who has done peer review in the past (from either side of the house) can give input.

Kendra, Wayne, and Marc acknowledged the 'higher stakes' involved with CTE assessment. Students in CTE degrees and certificates have a limited timeframe in which to master the outcomes and, if they can't, then they likely won't be employable. It's only natural for a CTE SAC to want to show high attainment rates for their students, but they need to know it is okay to identify areas where their students have weaknesses and say, "there's room for improvement here."

On the CTE template draft, some corrections/additions are needed:

1. There is an orphaned parenthesis in the first part of question 4.
2. Delete the phrase "Attachments and appendices should be avoided" in question 4. Replace it with: "Please supply data in box below. Supplemental information or appendices can be sent as attachments." We do want to get across that raw data is expected and required, but "we want to avoid making decisions and assumptions on insufficient data," as Marc put it.
3. Benchmarks need to be defined. They are: 1. The desired level of performance (e.g., Level 2 on a rubric), and, 2. The percentage of students you wish to achieve that level (e.g., "we want at least 80% of the students to score at Level 2 or higher").

Chris noted that the CTE coaches are now serving as a de facto subcommittee. That's a good thing, as the Council as a whole will be in the loop on CTE reporting going forward.

Back to This Year's Tasks

Nora wanted to devote the rest of the meeting to the list of tasks on the board (see the top of page 2), and asked what the group saw as its priorities.

The template discussion provided a segueway to the task of “**Consider the issue of equity in outcomes and graduation rates.**” Wayne said we need to build equity in outcomes into our forms. We need to ask SACs to identify benchmarks for demographics such as gender and ethnicity. We cannot afford to continually assess ‘blindly’ and not match results to demographics and study them for trends. Kendra agrees, but admitted that IE doesn’t have the bandwidth to provide this data on a grand scale.

Wayne asked if the SACs have a mechanism for gathering data from point classes. Kendra said they do not, but CTE often offers only a few sections of their key assessment courses and their cohort sizes are manageable. Plus, many degrees and certificates share outcomes, or a single class (i.e., a capstone) covers multiple outcomes, making assessment less onerous.

Chris asked what we will do with college-wide data when we have it. Kendra said we eventually will need to identify achievement gaps in the college-wide assessments. Marc suggested this be a topic of discussion for the data team meeting. Kendra knows that one of Katy’s goals is to disaggregate the data by big risk factors. This will become part of program review down the road and will bleed over into assessment. This prompted a brief discussion as to the perils of data and whether they might lead accidental or intentional discrimination. Magda said she would view student performance data as an opportunity to refine her course materials to be more inclusive. Kendra shared how Auto Collision Repair’s method of reporting student results revealed that a cluster of students had been struggling with a particular outcome, and when they dug deeper, they realized that the students were non-native English speakers who were challenged by terminology. Realizing this, the faculty were able to make posters showing the different tools with their names next to them. This small accommodation helped bridge the communication gap and the same students performed better during the next assessment. Marc is concerned that data could be misused or misunderstood if taken out of context. Kendra suggested the solution, then, is to strive for an ‘awareness of equity’ rather than mandating the regurgitation of data for data’s sake.

Chris said the Council needs to talk about the Gen Ed issue, which relates to two tasks: **Determine LAC’s relationship to the Gen Ed process—what will be the LAC’s role in the approval process when SACs seek to get their courses on the new Gen Ed lists?** and **Debate the Core Outcomes questions: Are there more than four?** Gen Ed has taken on a life of its own given how the DSACs came together, how they created four new rubrics, and how they agreed to pilot the rubrics this year. This great work has been championed by Kendra and Jamee outside of the LAC. Chris suggested that the Council deserves the opportunity to consider all of these activities and vote on them as a way to preserve the ‘faculty voice’ that is the LAC. Given the role of the DSACs, Wayne observed that they’re ‘doing part of LAC’s job’ and posed that the chairs should be LAC members. Kendra said Jamee really has been the de facto chair for all of the DSACs until now, and is, in fact, missing today’s meeting because of a DSAC work session. Kendra does like Wayne’s idea about having DSAC chairs, though.

As to the question about **Core Outcomes: Are there more than four?** Wayne said we

are missing Communication. Here, Kendra provided some context saying one reason for aligning the Core Outcomes with General Education is to ensure students get them. When the idea for DSACs was born, the plan was for each committee to 'own' two outcomes. It seemed reasonable that if Arts & Letters; Social Science; and Math, Computer Science, and Science each adopted two outcomes that Communication surely would have been among them. But, more outcomes means more logistical challenges. As it stands, many courses on the Arts & Letters and Social Science lists also are on the Cultural Literacy list. That means all instructors teaching the 'shared' courses would be responsible for having two assignments built in--one that aligns to its DSAC's own rubric, and another that aligns to the Cultural Literacy rubric. Adding another outcome, such as Communication, might mean yet another assignment. Chris likes the organic nature of the DSACs. Maybe we need a Communication DSAC where the members define what communication means to their respective areas.

The issue of workload concerns Chris. We cannot keep tacking on more work, more expectations on faculty. Kendra acknowledged that we are asking faculty to devote a big chunk of class time to teaching (outcomes) and assessing this year, but she pointed out that the DSACs said these concepts already were included in their courses.

Kendra has had conversations with Comp/Lit and Communication Studies faculty around Communication. Sally asked: Did the SACs feel like they could own the outcome? Comp/Lit no, but Communication Studies yes. Comp/Lit does use detailed rubrics for grading, Kendra noted, but is reluctant to adopt a common assignment or to mandate that all instructors align an assignment to a common rubric. Wayne threw in an idea that maybe we could include Communication as part of the regular artifacts we're collecting from the DSACs. In other words, assess a single artifact against its DSAC rubric and against a Communication rubric—time and funding permitting, of course.

Speaking of the four outcomes already embraced, Kendra posed a rhetorical question: Should we mandate Cultural Literacy for all PCC students even if the only degree that requires CL is the AAOT? Does it matter that the AAOT is not the ideal degree for students who are PSU-bound? She spoke briefly about a HECC initiative related to HB 2998, which will create foundational curricula in the form of a 30-credit award. The idea is for students to be able to take a protected block of 30 credits that the state universities will accept toward core requirements.

When it comes to determining the **LAC's relationship to the Gen Ed process**, Torie mentioned the EAC, CC, DAC, and even Advising, and asked how the LAC connects to these other realms. Chris admitted that it is messy and that changes are happening at the state level that make it more complicated. We do need a concrete way to stay connected with the DSACs and bring back their work to the LAC as it impacts assessment.

The task, **Come up with a plan for reviewing and approving Gen Ed courses in a two-year span** is on Kendra's mind, especially when it comes to establishing an ad hoc committee for approving all courses. Where will the committee's assessment expertise come from? Currently, Marc is the only LAC member on the Curriculum Committee.

Marc questioned the task, **Look at aspirational outcomes and their relative importance beyond strict assessment**. He noted that some SACs have embraced this optional new section on the CCOGs, but he asked if this really is a task for the LAC given that aspirational outcomes, by design, require no assessment.

Prepping for next NWCCU Visit

Marc asked Kendra what we need to do to get ready for the Year 7 visit. Kendra, who serves as an accreditation evaluator herself, said we primarily need to align Gen Ed with Core Outcomes. She explained what transpired at PCC's Mid-Cycle visit and gave an overview of the accreditation process in general. There are no formal recommendations in the Mid-Cycle and it seems to be totally separate from the Seven-Year Report. As an aside, she noted that NWCCU sent out a survey recently that asked, among other things, whether the Region should define the outcomes for its member institutions. The idea is rather unsettling.

Thank You to New Members & Guests

Chris thanked the new folks for coming and for their interest in the LAC.

Adjournment

Nora adjourned the meeting at 3:00.