

LAC Minutes

Friday, 11/02/2012

Southeast, Tabor 142

Chat time: 12:45-1:00

Meeting: 1:00-2:30

Attendance:

Stedman Bailey	x	Gabe Hunter-Bernstein	x	Linda Paulson	x
Jessica Bernards		Pam Kessinger	x	JulieAnne Poncet	x
Kendra Cawley	x	Heather Lang	x	Lisa Rosenthal	x
Sally Earll	x	Katie Leonard-Floyd	x	Doug Smith	x
Shrilee Geiger	x	Christine Manning	x	Stephanie Yurasits	x
Sylvia Gray	x	Michele Marden	x		
Allison Gross	x	Laura Massey			
Anne Haberkern		Scott McBeth	x		
Wayne Hooke	x	Diane Moore	x		

Guests:

Suzanne Christopher, Degrees and Certificates Chair

Agenda is in bold type; Minutes are not.

I. Business

i. **Approve Minutes for 9/28/2012**

- Suggestion for change with minutes: More in-depth and include marking factual items as "Informational Record."
- There were some suggested changes to the minutes for 9/28/2012.
- All changes were approved.

ii. **Future Meetings**

a. **Location: CLIMB**

- Winter:
Friday, 1/25, 1:30 (chat time at 1:15)
Friday, 3/1, 1:30 (chat time at 1:15)
- Spring:
Friday, 4/12, 1:30 (chat time at 1:15)
Friday, 5/24, 1:30 (chat time at 1:15)
- There is a lot to discuss this year. Future meetings may need to be 2 hours long.

iii. **LAC nominations for CIC**

- Michele Marden, Shirlee Geiger, and Scott McBeth volunteered to serve on the Completion Investment Council (CIC). We should know sometime next week who will represent the LAC.

iv. **Update from Funding Subcommittee (Leader: Michele Marden)**

a. **LAC grant application for SACs due 11/9/2012 (best consideration for difficult outcomes)**

- We have some funding this year to give assessment grants. The pot is a bit smaller because we decided to fund coaching more. Best consideration will be given to SACs who have ideas for addressing their difficult outcomes.

- Vote: LAC approves all suggested new members! Michele will talk with the two FT temp about the issue of adjunct funding should their FT status change next year.
- c. **LAC Guidebook**
 - Under development
- d. **Normative Agreement**
 - Next meeting to finish the Normative Agreement is November 9, 2012; 1:30-3:00; SE Center, Mt Tabor, Room 142

II. LAC Discussion

i. **CCOGs, Curriculum Committee, and troublesome accreditation standard for accountability (4.A.3)**

- At the last accreditation visit, there was an indication that the college may have trouble meeting NWCCU's Standard 4.A.3 for course-level outcomes. This discussion goes beyond the LAC –the Curriculum Committee needs to be involved. To start the discussion, Wayne and Michele had an initial meeting with Jim Parks (Curriculum Committee Chair) and Sally Earll. It was decided that we needed more people in on the discussion. Second meeting participants were Jim Parks, Sally Earll, Ann Haberkern, Kendra Cawley, Susanne Christopher, Wayne Hooke, and Michele Marden. We decided that these discussions need to continue and we gave ourselves a name: EAC/LAC Phase II Workgroup. Some participants from this group will be meeting with the EAC leaders on Monday, 11/5.
- *Informational Record regarding Course Outcomes and Assessment of those Outcomes: At the second meeting of the EAC/LAC Phase II Workgroup, Michele and Wayne discovered that the idea of having CCOG assessment block oversight in the college (that we thought was a new idea) was considered “phase II” by Susanne Christopher (who was at PCC when the college began developing course outcomes on CCOGs). Susanne is here today as a guest to share the institutional history.
History: In the late 90's, PCC was given a recommendation by NWCCU that we needed course outcomes (and core outcomes). In order to get a handle on what this meant, Ruth Stiehl was hired as a consultant to help the college understand and develop outcomes. The Course Content Guide (CCG) was renamed to Course Outcome Guide (COG) around this time. The Curriculum Committee (a committee under the EAC) was the college's oversight for checking course outcomes. The roll-out for checking course outcomes was a gradual process and started in 2003. The Curriculum Committee struggled with losing the word “Content” for the Course Outcome Guide, and decided to put it back in to bring us to what we have now: Course Content Outcome Guide (CCOG). The roll-out included a period of time where courses were approved by Curriculum Committee without developed outcomes, but faculty members were warned about what would be needed in the future to have a course approved. There were also workshops where a course was approved if faculty members participated. The course outcomes developed from this workshop were not necessarily the best, but it was moving the college in the right direction. When Kendra chaired the Curriculum Committee there was a purple sheet of paper that was often given to faculty members if the outcomes for their course needed development. The expectation was that once all courses had developed outcomes, the next phase (phase II) would be another gradual process (over 3-5 years) where there would be college oversight for how the course outcomes would be assessed.
- The EAC/LAC Phase II Workgroup also discussed having the LAC be the college's oversight for assessment of course outcomes. For instance, to have a course approved, a

- SAC would submit to the Curriculum Committee for course outcomes and to the LAC for assessment of those course outcomes. The EAC/LAC Phase II Workgroup felt that this would be too difficult for faculty members – and it could get messy (what if Curriculum approved outcomes that LAC then said could not be assessed?). Course approval should remain solely with the Curriculum Committee. However, if we are to have college oversight of assessment of the course outcomes to meet NWCCU's standard 4.A.3, the LAC needs to support the Curriculum Committee. The LAC would develop what this would look like (criteria for the assessment block on the CCOG) and also help with educating faculty (help run workshops, for instance). This is a huge task for all involved (there are approximately 2400 courses at PCC and all would need to be reviewed).
- It is critical that this is a slow 3-5 year process. Fortunately, we have some time before our next accreditation visit to develop this. Michele's fear: If we don't do anything, we may find ourselves in another "hasten your progress" by NWCCU. This change is too big to rush – we need to start considering options that make sense for PCC now and start slowly moving forward.
 - The EAC/LAC Phase II Workgroup had 4 main points from last meeting (see handout). One was to have course outcomes mapped to the core outcomes (when possible). Another was to have an assessment for all course outcomes. The assessment needs to be more specific than "quiz/test/project/essay." One consideration for the assessment block would be to ensure that the assessment task matched the course outcome. Example: If the course outcome is to write a paragraph, the assessment should involve evaluating a paragraph, not a multiple-choice exam.
 - EM has described how they have outcomes aligned to the course outcomes and the way they will assess those.
 - Goals for today (see handout). "Have an understanding of the following" is marked out because have an "understanding of" is often considered by assessment gurus as bad outcome for learning! The "be able to explain and discuss" is more pointed.
 - Higher education is experiencing pressures related to credit for prior learning and technology advances (Massive Open Online Courses – MOOCs). Having a robust assessment process could help us navigate these pressures.
 - Does it make sense to continue with the Ruth Stiehl "out there" model?
 - Focus of "what we want the student to do out there" has been helpful to PCC. Instead of a list of 100 skills, faculty had to consider how the course was beneficial to the student – the ultimate purpose. However, there are some outcomes that will be difficult (or impossible) to measure with the "out there" focus. In addition, some SACs are frustrated by this "out there" focus – it fits CTE better than LDC.
 - Assessment gurus at conferences are promoting more competency-based outcomes that are measureable.
 - Perhaps it is time to re-evaluate how we define course outcomes --keep what is good from Ruth Steihl model, but allow for more flexibility.
 - Concern: Adjunct faculty members are often not told about the CCOGs. SACs may spend a lot of time developing course outcomes and assessments for those outcomes, but unless adjunct faculty members are informed, CCOG will be a worthless piece of paper.
 - It is true that for this to be meaningful all faculty members teaching a course would need to pay attention to the outcomes and how they are to be assessed. Currently some FT faculty think of the CCOG as the thing that has to be done to satisfy Curriculum Committee to get the course approved. There would need to be an expectation that the CCOGs be valued by all faculty members.
 - It is amazing sometimes what a single piece of paper can do. The annual LAC report is a piece of paper, but it has pushed faculty members to think about their

programs/disciplines in a different way and is moving the college forward with quality assessment.

- Question to the LAC: Does the LAC agree that SAC's align course outcomes to core outcomes (when possible) and how they are going to assess them? Yes – with LOTS more discussion!

ii. Student Evaluation of the Instructor and College Experience (ie, online instructor evals)

- There appears to be confusion between administration and the union for the purpose of Instructor Evaluation. Even how it is referenced is different: Instructor Evaluation vs Student Evaluation. Shirlee, Christine, and Michele met with Ed Degrauw to discuss our concerns about SACs using these evaluations as SAC-level assessment. Basically, we worry that SACs may use this tool to replace other ways to assess at the SAC-level. If data were disaggregated, job insecure faculty who sometime are not even aware of program/discipline-level assessment may receive lower marks as compared to job-secure faculty. Currently the student response numbers are so low that it would not give good data anyway and there are strict requirements for aggregating data which further complicate the issue.
- There were more questions than answers from this meeting and subsequent email correspondence. Suggestion: We create a task-force to look more closely at this issue.
- Task-force was created.