

LAC Minutes – FINAL

Friday, 12/7/2018 – CLIMB 202/203

Attendance:

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

ACTION ITEMS

- Nora: Request council approval to add new member (done)
- Chris: Convene meeting of the Gen Ed Timeline Review Team

INTRODUCTIONS (delayed until after initial discussion)

Nora asked for a round of introductions to benefit today's guest, Heather Lubay, from the Communication Studies/Journalism SAC. Heather is interested in joining the council.

Postscript: Heather was voted in by email after the meeting.

DISCUSSION

LAC membership on GEARS

As discussed at the Nov. 29 meeting of the EAC-LAC Integration Workgroup (ELIWG), an ad hoc committee has been proposed: the General Education Assessment Review Subcommittee. GEARS likely would be a subset of the Curriculum Committee (CC) and would be comprised of faculty from the LAC, from the CC, from Degrees and Certificates (DAC), from each of the four Discipline Subject Area Committees (DSAC), and from CTE. Faculty volunteers are sought to serve as voting members, and individuals who fall into more than one group or category are especially encouraged to join. Non-voting members, from the Curriculum Office and from Academic Affairs, would serve in a support role.

GEARS would determine the criteria for qualifying a course for Gen Ed and Cultural Literacy designation. What needs to be included in the signature assignment for each course? Does the assignment align to the intended rubric? The committee would be part of the course approval process, too, but its role in the maintenance phase later on is a big unknown.

The Gen Ed approval process originally was intended to begin in 2019-20 and to wrap by winter 2021. Student Services' plan to move fall registration to spring term poses a hiccup in the timeline, because courses destined for the Gen Ed list would need to be vetted in time to make it into the early edition of the fall schedule and the corresponding catalog.

Using its collective assessment expertise, Jamee noted that GEARS could streamline the course approval process by vetting the signature assignments up front. Those not meeting the pre-established criteria would bounce back to the originating SACs and not move to the CC docket.

Nora, Chris, Jamee, and Delpha previously expressed interest in serving on GEARS, and Jessica, Troy, plus Torie and Magda (after the meeting) all said they would be willing to serve, too. There might not be room for everyone on the committee, but having a great pool of candidates is desirable.

Process for reiterative updates of rubrics going forward

The rubric for Cultural Literacy, created and used last year for the first time, has gone through a few rounds of revisions. It, and the three Gen Ed rubrics being piloted by DSAC faculty this winter, are organically-created drafts that inevitably will need further revisions after they are applied to student artifacts in the internal scoring project this coming spring. What should that iterative process look like?

For openers, Wayne asked who owns the approval decision, and who approves core outcomes? Kendra said the new outcomes have been under the purview of the DSACs.

One inclination, as Chris described it, is to gather feedback on Outcome X, analyze that feedback, and see if something needs to be changed. The problem with that approach, as Kendra explained it, is that making substantial changes to the outcome or to its rubric after the first year would render any 're'assessment moot. She said we need to make the changes up front, like the faculty did in the kick-the-tires DSAC sessions last year. The DSACs debated and selected their outcomes first, then designed their rubrics, then came back to look at the rubrics with fresh eyes, and, finally, created their signature assignments.

At this juncture, Kendra gave an overview of the Gen Ed categories and how, because they're cemented in the AAOT degree, we cannot arbitrarily reorganize them. Jamee read the descriptors for each of the four new outcomes, and Kendra commented that the statements have been improving over time. The outcomes are purposely broad, as they must apply generally to all of the disciplines in their Gen Ed group, and because they are broad, the assessments won't yield information that will be of value to any single instructor or course. The aggregate results will, hopefully, reveal if students in Arts & Letters, in Social Sciences, and in Science/Math/CS are meeting their outcomes. In addition, the new system will allow CTE programs to know when and how Gen Ed will be covered.

Jamee commented that there is some overlap between dimensions on the Social Science rubric and that will need to be addressed. The Arts and Letters rubric is posing some challenges in assignment design, even for the faculty who went through the training. The Science/Math/CS rubric looks good so far.

Chris suggested tying the outcomes/rubrics review process to the seven-year accreditation cycle. Assuming we assess only two of the outcomes per year, that would allow time to assess each outcome, tweak instruction, reassess each outcome against the same rubrics as before, and propose changes to the outcomes and/or rubrics by year seven.

When Jessica asked if Communication will remain a core outcome, Jamee said Written Communication likely will become a fifth outcome. Rather than a standalone outcome with

its own DSAC, however, it is hoped that Written Communication could be assessed using some of the same artifacts generated by the other four DSACs.

Timeline

Circling back to the Gen Ed timeline, when do we want all of the Gen Ed courses to get through the EAC approval phase? Originally, the plan was to have everything in place by the seventh-year accreditation visit in spring 2022, but that may or may not serve those working on the Guided Pathways initiative. Guided Pathways, along with the state's Core Transfer Maps (CTMs) and Major Transfer Maps (MTMs), are built on the concept of seamless transferability, and if we don't know which courses will ultimately count as Gen Ed at PCC, it will stall progress on the creation of guided pathways.

Chris suggested a smaller group look at the timeline again and bring its ideas back to ELIWG. By a show of hands, Chris, Kendra, Jamee, G.D., Nora, and Hannah offered to serve on this ad hoc Gen Ed Timeline Review team.

Assignment parameters and forms for Gen Ed courses

The signature assignment requirement is a new one and it may pose the biggest challenge in the approval process. The ideal scenario is for faculty across the district to understand the elements of assignment design up front so SACs can create and submit workable assignments that get approved on the first round. Some SACs may need to submit multiple assignments.

Delpha shared a Creative Commons handout she crafted for the ESOL SAC, entitled *Recipe for Arts & Letters Integrative Learning "Signature" Assignments*. Through fill-in-the-blank prompts, the guide shows instructors how to clearly indicate purpose and tasks in their assignments (transparency) while aligning them to the Integrative Learning rubric. She created the handout after attending Jamee's assignment design charrette for Arts & Letters this fall and borrowed some of the general principles from Online Learning's *What Works Well?* handbook. Wayne likes Delpha's model and thinks it could be shared with other SACs; they could fill in the variables as appropriate to their respective disciplines. Sally concurred, saying she's often asked for guides and examples. She suggested there be a clickable link at the Curriculum web page where faculty could see real samples of what others have created.

When the DSAC participants submitted their assignments after the charrettes, Jamee asked them to identify the prompts within the assignments and to specify the rubric dimension to which each applied. Kendra thinks this model of required mapping is an excellent idea for the SACs' Gen Ed submissions.

Chris expects there will be faculty who won't use a template or formula for their assignments (or they will go the route of portfolios or some other means of assessment, Kendra offered). How will we address cases like these in the approval process? Wayne said our best offense is to direct them to the CCOG to make sure they know what to teach in order to meet the outcome. This led to some comments about what makes a good CCOG. Even if outcomes are lean, detailed instructional notes on a CCOG can make a huge difference. WR, MTH, and CH's prescriptive CCOGs were recognized as great models. Jamee recognizes that some faculty fear they will be forced to use something, and G.D. said she has observed that many faculty simply are not aware of the work that is being done. While all this is true, Jamee said she has been pleasantly surprised by the enthusiasm coming out of the assignment design charrettes. Faculty have largely been eager to rework their assignments based on the input from peers. This

enthusiasm has carried over to the SACs. As proof, Jamee said Sociology is voluntarily meeting winter term for more assignment design.

The importance of assignment design cannot be overstated, and Jamee noted that the 3-year accreditation evaluators spoke to the need for funding of assignment design.

Adjournment

The discussions came to a natural conclusion at 2:50, so Nora adjourned the meeting at that time. The council meets again on January 11.