

## LAC Minutes – Final

Friday, 1/24/2020

### Attendance:

Voting Members		Voting Members, cont.		Non-Voting Members	
Elizabeth Brewster, LAT		Heather Lubay, JOUR Inactive		Kendra Cawley, Acad Aff	
Chris Brooks, HST	x	Jessica Martin, COMM		Susan Wilson, Acad Aff	x
Josh Cary, BIT		Linda Paulson, MSD			
Magda D'Angelis-Morris, DA	x	Usha Ramanujam, BA	x		
Mandy Ellertson, HUM		Davina Ramirez, ESOL	x	<b>Today's Guests</b>	
Marc Goodman, CIS	x	Rekha Rao, CIS			
Farin Hajarizadeh, BIT	x	Sara Robertson, LIB		None	
Wayne Hooke, PSY	x	Julianne Sandlin, ART	x		
G. D. Iyer, CS		Jim Sauvé, WR			
Joyce Kaplan, BI	x	Thomas Songer, MTH			
Rachelle Katter, HE	x	Nora Stevens, BI & HIM - Chair	x		
Jamee Kristen, SOC		Delpha Thomas, ESOL - Vice-Chair	x		
Hannah Love, PHL		Jacki Williams, EMS	x		

### ACTION ITEM

- Nora and Delpha – Share concerns re Communication outcome with Kendra prior to March 13

### UPDATES & DISCUSSION

#### GEARS

The Biology SAC initiated the course review process for GEARS with a bit of trepidation, but Nora said a productive review of CCOGs resulted.

Chris described how the first GEARS' review meeting went from a committee member's perspective, with Delpha, Magda, Marc, and Susan adding their observations. CCOGs and signature assignments were reviewed from ATH, HE, and disciplines under the newly formed RING SAC (Race, Indigenous Nations & Gender). Some of the assignments needed minor tweaks, but 21 of the 23 course proposals were fully- or conditionally-approved at the meeting. The remaining two needed substantial changes and their authors will have a chance to resubmit their proposals later this term.

GEARS' approval is not a one-shot deal. Some leniency is necessary, because these earliest contributing SACs had no mentoring to speak of and no exemplar templates to follow. Delpha said the committee was asked to get the word out that the review meetings are "not that bad." Each SAC is allotted 20 to 45 minutes, depending how many course proposals it is bringing forward. On January 10, the time was split between Curriculum Committee-type review and signature assignment critique.

Rachelle, who helped with the Health Studies review and was present on the 10th, said her SAC benefited from the 'backward design' approach to its assignments. A lingering worry is what will happen down the road if instructors deviate from an approved assignment. Chris said this concern came up at the GEARS' strategy meeting in December. He and others would like to see an ongoing review process in place once the initial approvals wrap in 2021.

On a related note, Nora and Delpha will be holding several assignment design workshops this term. The first will occur at the Anderson Conference next Friday (January 31). A second will follow on February 6, from 1 to 2:30 in the Sylvania TLC. Southeast will have its turn on February 25 from 1 to 2:30. Cascade and Rock Creek's TLC sessions are TBA.

Chris suggested the LAC should be coordinating the college-wide assessment of artifacts generated by the signature assignments (SA). With Jamee stepping down from her role as DSAC facilitator, it seems a good time to transition the larger task of SA assessment to the LAC. Academic Affairs currently shepherds this annual assessment project.

### Cultural Literacy – Round Three

As mentioned in October, when Nora shared the disappointing results from last spring's assessment of Cultural Literacy (CL), the overhauled rubric was found to be ineffective for scoring and was abandoned. Kendra has convened a new and broader committee of faculty to revisit the Outcome and to construct a better rubric.

This is not going to be easy. For context, Delpha explained that Cultural Literacy is baked into the state-owned AAOT and the ASOT/B. *[According to the CCWD web page, Oregon's objective is this: "As a result of taking a designated Cultural Literacy course, learners would be able to: Identify and analyze complex practices, values, and beliefs and the culturally and historically defined meanings of difference."]* While the state intentionally made it broad in scope, the term Cultural Literacy has evolved at PCC to embody diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice. One camp of faculty believe every CL course should include these components while another camp says their courses do not lend themselves to these elements. Julianne, like Delpha, is on the new committee, and she said the group spent the fall term ranking all of the rubric elements in terms of their importance. The 'social justice' pieces garnered a few votes, but the more general CL themes had a larger following.

Delpha predicts the committee's progress will be slow. It is difficult to think globally when many faculty believe their course enrollments and student FTE are dependent on a course having the CL designation. Additionally, Dr. Ho has asked the committee to apply the Take 5 process in its deliberations and that requires a level of deconstruction that is new and time-consuming.

When the Gen Ed DSACs were formed, they were asked what they had in common and from there were able to organically create rubrics that served all the associated disciplines. That strategy might backfire for CL, because building it around faculty interpretation might take it too far afield from what the state intended.

Chris noted the EAC discussed the possibility of making Cultural Literacy a requirement for all of PCC's degrees. Would this add credits to every degree or would students be able to double-dip and take a Gen Ed class that also counts as CL? As an advocate for breadth and variety in course choice, he hopes the new CL list, when it is created, doesn't reduce a student's options.

Usha was intrigued by this discussion, as her SAC believes CL themes are appropriate in so many of its business courses. She asked how they might adopt CL as an outcome. Susan says they can make it a program outcome for any of their AAS degrees by taking it before the Degrees and Certificates Committee, or they can make it a course-level

outcome by adding it to individual CCOGs and submitting the revised documents to the Curriculum Committee.

### Annual Program Review

When Usha made a comment about learning assessment as it applies to the program review process, Chris explained that PCC is switching to a two-stage annual system of review starting next year. One year, all SACs will be asked to analyze demographic and performance data (Part A), and the following year (Part B), they will do less data analysis and provide more information on resources needed. Part B always will coincide with the deans' biennial budget planning process.

Many of the questions from the five-year review will go away, including the existing assessment-related ones. In their place will be one custom question posed by peer reviewers who have read and critiqued the SACs' assessment reports. SACs will be asked to respond to their custom questions as part of their annual program review. The LAC is not quite sure how these responses will be tracked and/or recorded. Nora suggested that SACs could email the LAC a copy of their responses. Susan thinks she or her successor could easily extract the responses and zip them into a single file. As a peer reviewer himself, Marc said he would be willing to read and respond to the entries submitted by the SACs whose reports he reviews. No decisions were made.

### Communication as an Outcome

Nora explained what led to Kendra's upcoming Communication summit. For years, Communication was one of PCC's six Core Outcomes and it was regularly assessed as per NWCCU expectations. Then, in 2018, three newly formed Discipline Study Area Committees (one for each of Arts & Letters; Science, Math & Computer Science; and Social Science) were asked to identify a common outcome that each could own and to create a rubric by which student achievement could be measured. A&L chose Integrative Learning and devised a rubric that centered on student self-reflection. The Science/Math/CS group chose Quantitative Reasoning. The Social Science DSAC adopted Social Inquiry and Analysis. Communication, while valued by each DSAC, did not rise to the top for any of the groups.

Because Communication is a suggested outcome in the new NWCCU accreditation standards, Kendra is hesitant to let it go. A fear of the unknown is at play. Will the accreditors approve a Gen Ed-only assessment model? Will they expect to see Communication continue as an outcome? If we adopt it as an institutional outcome, we need to assess it, and that needs to happen in a class that students are required to take, explained Wayne. Making it an 'add-on' to any of the General Education courses isn't feasible, because it would require faculty to embed in their classes yet another signature assignment, and some already are looking at two (one for Gen Ed and one for Cultural Literacy). Assessment of Communication is admittedly clunky. Susan brought up the notion of ePortfolios, something that has been on Kendra's and her wish list for a few years now. If they ever become a reality, they will automate the artifact collection process considerably. Other logistics, such as how to assess all the different forms of communication, would need to be addressed.

From 2015 through 2018, PCC assessed Communication using the AAC&U LEAP VALUE rubric for Written Communication (WC). In those cases, the assignments that generated the student artifacts were designed with the VALUE rubric in mind. In 2019, Kendra and a team of college-wide scorers experimented with assessing writing-across-the-curriculum (WAC) by applying a modified version of the VALUE rubric to essays

generated from the DSAC signature assignments. The original rubric has been criticized by the Writing faculty as putting non-white and second-language learners at a disadvantage. Susan said last year's scores could use some work but they weren't a total loss. As one of the scoring trainers at PCC and a national scorer for Written Communication, she believes assessing WAC can work with the right rubric.

This brings us to the present. On March 13, Kendra is holding what she calls a Communication Convening. Her invitation to SAC chairs said: "*The purpose of the summit is to "flesh out a key inventory of essential knowledge, skills, and abilities that are implicit (or maybe not) in the Communication Outcome. What do we believe students should be able to do as a result of completing a degree at PCC? And, where in their academic journey will they acquire these abilities?]*" Each SAC may send one attendee to take part in this first-of-its-kind collegewide discussion.

Prior to the March meeting, Chris proposed sending Kendra a list of the LAC's concerns. One is the assumption that not having Communication as an outcome creates an accreditation 'gap.' We might be creating a lot of unnecessary work for ourselves. If, however, Communication is to become a requirement, the committee sees three possibilities:

- Pick a common class in which to house it (if not WR 121, then what about COMM 111?)
- Let all degrees teach it in their own way
- Require all departments to assess it every three or so years (in the same way all the SACs were expected to assess Critical Thinking back in 2009-10)

### Guided Pathways

With the completion of Phase 1, Chris said his role on the Guided Pathways (GP) committee has ended. The charter team established a process for making program maps and defined the pathways using collegewide input. There are six pathways, a number that is fairly standard across the country. There was a push to add career language, but that can come later. A new team will pick up where the first left off, and Chris suspects their work largely will be shaped by President Mitsui's plans for reorganization of the college. Those plans should be announced in the next week or so.

Chris was asked if GP will replace assessment at the SAC level, and whether it is considered a program or a means of advising students. Chris said GP is an advising pathway for sure, as it is intended as a bridge between 'like programs' so that students don't swirl endlessly. As for what assessment will look like with GP, Chris couldn't say. Nora observed that assessment, as we know it, could go away if PCC adopts ePortfolios.

Magda asked if anyone is looking at the big picture. There are multiple initiatives underway, yet all seem to be connected somehow. She worries that the silo-effect might prohibit all the players from seeing common themes and goals. Chris said Katy is that big-picture person and she does a good job of putting it all together.

### Adjournment

Nora adjourned the meeting at 2:29 p.m.