

LAC Meeting Agenda

Friday, 4/12/2013

CLIMB

Chat time: 1:15-1:30

Meeting: 1:30-3:30

I. Business/Updates

- i. Who is time keeper today? (\approx 30 seconds)
- ii. Introductions and quick "pulse" of assessment *in your area*. (\approx 8 minutes)
 - (1) Do you think that full-time faculty members know about the yearly assessment report?
1 – none to few 3 – about half 5 - all
 - (2) Do you think that adjunct faculty members know about the yearly assessment report?
1 – none to few 3 – about half 5 - all
 - (3) For those faculty members who are deeply involved in assessment work, what is your take on the overall "temperature" of these faculty members?
1 – meaningless administrative dribble that is ruining teaching
3 – helpful, but on fence if it is worth the effort (time might best be spent on other things)
5 – so valuable that it doesn't matter that it is required
- iii. LAC Behavior Agreement (\approx 3 minutes)
- iv. Approve Minutes for 3/1/2013 (\approx 10 minutes)
- v. Next meetings: (\approx 2 minutes)
 - Friday, 5/24, 1:30- 3:30 (chat time at 1:15) at CLIMB
 - Friday, 6/7, 10:30- 2:30 (possibly at Sylvania) ***Note change of time/location
- vi. CIC Update (CIC Rep: Shirlee Geiger; Shirlee sent notes) (\approx 5 minutes)
- vii. Other updates (\approx 10 minutes)
 - Gabe
 - Linda
 - Pam/Michele
 - Others?

II. LAC Discussion

- i. Public posting of LAC Reports: Good or bad idea? (\approx 5 minutes)
- ii. This year's goal: Institutionalization of LAC into PCC (discuss in our Standing Subcommittees) (Michele \approx 3 minutes; Move/Discussion time \approx 20 minutes)
 - Where are we at? [How is Subcommittee doing with Institutionalization?]
 - What needs to be shared with new president to maintain our faculty-led assessment model?
- iii. Update on EAC/LAC Phase II Workgroup (Michele \approx 6 minutes; Group time \approx 12 minutes)
- iv. Clicker Activity Results (from prior meeting) (Michele \approx 3 minutes; Data Review/Discussion \approx Stop at 3:25)
 - Discussion Goal (see sheet)
 - Look at handout "Traditional Practice vs Outcomes-Based Practice"
 - Review results and break up into small discussion groups

III. HW for next meeting Degree Qualification Profile (DQP) (\approx 3 minutes)

- OR Grant (converse about DQP)
- Read through before next meeting. What like? Don't like? What is missing? PCC Core Outcomes vs DQP?

IV. Celebration

Discussion after Clicker Activity Results are reviewed

Assigned roles: Volunteer for three tasks

1. Monitor time so each question is discussed (stop at 3:25)
2. Someone takes notes (big paper or normal paper) of barriers and keeps conversation moving. If needed, imagine the “perfect scenario” for how this SAC work could take place. Turn notes into Michele.
3. Someone takes notes (big paper or normal paper) of ideas for how faculty members are doing this work or how they might start doing it. Include the SAC with the ideas (just so I can see if the SAC is CTE/LDC, small/large). Turn notes into Michele.

Discussion:

Are conversations happening in your SAC that are focused on how faculty members are ensuring that students attain course-level outcomes (ideally moving to consistency --- students attain at a same level no matter the instructor)?

1. If so, what is working?
2. If not, how might these conversations start in your SAC with full time and adjunct faculty?

Possible considerations:

- Would only faculty teaching the course be discussing OR the whole SAC OR faculty teaching the pre/post course if sequential?
 - If faculty are resistant to assessment, how could the importance of this work be shared in a non-threatening manner? Who would be trying to “share”? Could LAC help with this – if so, how?
 - When/How would the conversations happen? Face-to-face or electronically? At SAC meeting or other meeting?
3. For faculty members who can make face-to-face meetings, how can they be involved and/or kept informed?

HANDOUT (changes made for elctron send out)

Results of EAC/LAC Phase II Workgroup “best thinking” as of 4/10/2013 for NWCCU Standard 4.A.3

[Collaborative work since September between members of Curriculum, Degrees and Certificates, Learning Assessment Council with consultation with Ron Baker (prior big dude in NWCCU)]

NWCCU Standard 4.A.3: The institution documents, through an effective, regular, and comprehensive system of assessment of student achievement, that students who complete its educational courses, programs, and degrees, wherever offered and however delivered, achieve identified course, program, and degree learning outcomes. Faculty with teaching responsibilities are responsible for evaluating student achievement of clearly identified learning outcomes.

Course-level Outcomes

- 1) (Keep) 3-6 outcomes
- 2) (Keep) Outcome intent as “use/purpose of content” vs “list of 100 factoids”
- 3) (Change) Upon successful completion of X, students will have demonstrated the ability to
<outcomes>
- 4) (Change) Should be assessable
- 5) (Change) For SACs who are concerned that course will lose “higher purpose” and become minimalist or watered down, there will be an optional area on CCOG for “aspirational goals.” These are NOT expected to be assessed by faculty. Successful students may or may not attain them.
- 6) (Change) If a SAC has an “out there” outcome, they will need to either
 - o assess it by proxy somehow and require all students to meet it to pass the course
 - o turn it into an “aspirational goal.”
- 7) (Change) Students must show attainment in all of the outcomes to pass the course. It is up to the SAC to agree upon the “level” of attainment.
- 8) (Change) Get off of the “terminology bus” --- If a SAC wants word “demonstrate” or “understand” in an outcome, curriculum will ask appropriate questions about “use/purpose of content” vs “list of 100 factoids” to make sure the language is appropriate.

Core Outcomes Wording

- 9) (Change) Instead of “Graduates should... <core outcomes>” have “Students who have met degree outcomes have successfully met expectations of core outcome assessment at the course or degree level.”

Core Outcomes as the basis of the outcomes of transfer/general studies degrees

- 10) (Process Change) The course to core outcome mapping will need to be strengthened. It needs to be made clear that “level” on the matrix is the level at which students are assessed to pass the course (not the level at which the course is “pitched”).
- 11) (Change) General Education courses will need to be assess at least 4 core outcomes at the 3 or 4 level on the matrix (ie, there are course outcomes mapped to a at least 4 core outcomes and students are assessed at level 3 or 4 for the related course outcome)

Core Outcomes for CTE programs

12) (Changeish) CTE Degrees must met all Core Outcomes.

13) (Change) If a core outcome is not covered in the mapping from CTE Degree Outcomes to the Core Outcomes, the CTE program has the option to require students take a General Education course that covers the missing outcome(s) at least level 3.