

LAC Minutes

Friday, 4/12/2013

CLIMB

Chat time: 1:15-1:30

Meeting: 1:30-3:30

Attendance:

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

Guests: None

Agenda is in bold type; Minutes are not.

I. Business/Updates

i. Who is time keeper today? (\approx 30 seconds)

Wayne

ii. Introductions and quick "pulse" of assessment *in your area*. (\approx 8 minutes)

A very non-statistical survey:

- Do you think that full-time faculty members know about the yearly assessment report?
1 – none to few 3 – about half 5 – all
Result: 4.25
- Do you think that adjunct faculty members know about the yearly assessment report?
1 – none to few 3 – about half 5 – all
Result: 2.71
- 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
Result: 2.93

iii. LAC Behavior Agreement (≈ 3 minutes)

- Question: Do we feel comfortable with them? Are we willing to call out someone?
 - Yes, there has been no need to do so.
 - We will “play” with it today – holding up the orange for fun to make it less “weird.”

iv. Approve Minutes for 3/1/2013 (≈ 10 minutes)

- Minutes approved pending check by Laura Massey for one area.

v. Next meetings: (≈ 2 minutes)

- **Friday, 5/24, 1:30- 3:30 (chat time at 1:15) at CLIMB**
- **Friday, 6/7, ~~10:30–2:30~~ (changed to 11-3 after meeting) (possibly at Sylvania) ***Note change of time/location**
 - Retreat with Curriculum and Degrees and Certificates
 - Lunch provided (Thanks Kendra!)
 - Purpose: Discuss Standard 4.A.3 with Curriculum and Degrees & Certificates – we will need to work together to lead the college in the changes needed to address Standard 4.A.3

vi. CIC Update (CIC Rep: Shirlee Geiger; Shirlee sent notes) (≈ 5 minutes)

From CIC's March Meeting:

CIC worked with PCC data on Math, which was presented by Laura Massey, Director of Institutional Effectiveness. The data was focused on first-time students. Here are a few observations:

- 88% of our incoming students who take the compass exam, place below 100-level.
- When broken down by gender, women in the developmental courses pass at a higher rate than men.
- When broken down by age, older students pass courses at a significantly higher rate.
- When the data is broken down by ethnic groups, some of the groups enter at significantly lower levels.
- International Students come in at significantly higher levels.

There are a number of initiatives in Oregon that impact and involve community colleges, including the Core to College Lumina grant; the College Readiness project; The “Smarter Balance” Consortium; and the Common Core Standards (K-12). In particular, our curriculum would need substantial changes to align with the Common Core Standards.

There will be presentations and discussion next month on what PCC is doing to address some of the issues regarding Math at PCC.

Discussion:

- Jessica presented at the last CIC on her work creating study skills program for pre-college students.
- Survey from Roots students: Before took math a large number of them thought it was “terrifying” – or some similar word. Afterward only 3% felt the same way.

vii. Other updates (≈ 10 minutes)

- Faculty Development Subcommittee (Gabe)
 - Please check “Ass Badge” D2L “course” and send comments and suggestions.
 - How to access the Desire2Learn “course”:
 - Login to MyPCC
 - Click Desire2Learn login on the left of the homepage
 - Under “My Courses” and “Distance Learning,” you will find the course. It is called “Assessment at PCC”
- Membership Subcommittee (Linda)
 - Per the bylaws, we strive to be balanced between campuses and CTE/LDC. We are unbalanced with campuses (Rock Creek is very low), but made a decision improve on CTE/LDC balance. Since we are losing only 1 member (unfortunately, a RC member) and membership is at capacity, we won’t invite new members for next year.
 - Per bylaws, membership is for 3 year terms (with 1 renewal). However, since we are a new council, we need to ensure that we have an exit strategy that doesn’t leave brand new members in charge without any experienced members to share history or perspective. In order to investigate how much of a problem this might be, please indicate when you joined the LAC on the paper going around the room.
- Others:
 - Pam/Michele: We had a Google Drive training before the meeting. Two people attended. There is a Google Drive document on how to use google docs. If you have suggestions for improving it, please add to it (or contact Pam or Michele).
 - Here is the link to the “training” document:
https://docs.google.com/a/pcc.edu/document/d/132YKa1sJkUG_P8KwtdGbXJaOb7QF_LtyD2BDODfnDSM/edit?usp=sharing

II. LAC Discussion

i. Public posting of LAC Reports: Good or bad idea? (≈ 5 minutes)

Issue: Faculty members are concerned about posting their SAC minutes publically. PCC is considering other options for internally posting of SAC minutes. Based on this conversation, the question was posed, “Should a SAC’s Assessment Report be posted publically or internally?” We are asking SACs to find areas of weakness in their discipline/program and write about it. Would posting publically make SACs less willing to dig deep in areas where students may not be successful (especially if it points to issues within the SAC)? Is there a liability (being sued)?

Discussion:

- Warning: Never put anything out there that could show up in Willamette Week! It is best to have SAC Assessment Reports posted internally.
- Student sued college for millions for getting a D in a course which prevented the student’s acceptance in a program. She won.
- Would reports be seen by outsiders who don’t understand the results or the purpose?

- Some of the assessment data looks bad. Sometimes it shows how students are not achieving the outcomes that the SACs have for the program and/or the courses.
- Some courses have really high failure rates – which may be due to the life issues the students are facing. This is a factor that may be lost in the reporting of “numbers.”
- Who really looks at assessment reports? [Conference session on websites: The presenter went out trolling to see what was publically available. Sometimes educators or those who write to accreditation standards see what other institutions have done.]
- Having them public makes it easier for accreditation teams.
- The college should be transparent and accountable -- reports should stay public.
- We shouldn't be overly cautious for fear of being sued. Reports are but one element of the college's work. The quality of the curriculum is evident. If a lawsuit is filed, then reconsider.
- The reports show that SACs are carefully analyzing their curriculum and student learning. They also show how the SAC is addressing any deficiencies found.
- Reports are a snapshot of a work in progress – they are for benefit of internal stakeholders.
- Keeping reports public is a sign that we are proud of the assessment we are doing. Some colleges do have theirs internally. It begs the question, “Are they hiding something?”
- Vote:
 Quorum is 12 (50% voting members +1). 14 Voting Members present.
 Put behind firewall: 3
 Keep as is: 8
 Abstain: 3

SAC LAC Assessment Reports will remain public. This issue might resurface...

- ii. **This year's goal: Institutionalization of LAC into PCC (discuss in our Standing Subcommittees):**
 (Michele ≈ 3 minutes; Move/Discussion time ≈ 20 minutes)

“Definition” of Institutionalization: Embed quality assessment and LAC support/guidance into PCC's culture and structure.

Discussion:

Standing Committees meet and discussed the questions below. No report out to group (due to time). LAC Leaders took notes and will discuss later.

- Where are we at and where are we going? [How is subcommittee doing with Institutionalization?]
- What needs to be shared with new president to maintain our faculty-led assessment model?

Five Standing Subcommittees:

- Collaboration (Sally): Stedman, Shirlee, Scott
- Conduit (Allison and Shirlee): Sandie, Katie, Priscilla, Diane, Linda, Lisa
- Faculty Development (Gabe): Jessica, Shirlee, Sherie, Christine, Michele, JulieAnne, Julie, Lisa, Doug

- Membership (Linda): Christine, Michele, Scott, Diane, Lisa
- Funding (Michele): Kendra, Wayne, Pam, Scott, JulieAnne (this committee will not do this activity)
- “Left overs”: Join together and answer questions at higher level.

iii. Update on EAC/LAC Phase II Workgroup (Michele ≈ 6 minutes; Group time ≈ 12 minutes)

EAC/LAC Phase II Workgroup has created a “working” document for how the various puzzle pieces fit together to address Standard 4.A.3.

Discussion:

Handout passed out and we read through it. Note: Handout passed out was not the approved EAC/LAC Phase II Workgroup version. The version that went out the EAC was the EAC/LAC Phase II Workgroup approved version. This was emailed to LAC members on April 18, 2013.

Main differences:

- Background information was added so it could be more of a "stand alone document."
- Numbers 4-7 on the old version were reworded and combined.
- Number 8 on the new version is missing on the handout passed out (a big oops by me!)

The updated version sent to the EAC will accompany the minutes to avoid having multiple versions of a similar document publically posted (which might cause confusion).

We will discuss these changes more. If you have feedback, please email Michele.

iv. Clicker Activity Results (from prior meeting) (Michele ≈ 3 minutes; Data Review/Discussion ≈ 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

Discussion: This has been postponed (again). Michele promises we WILL do it next time!!!

III. HW for next meeting Degree Qualification Profile (DQP) (≈ 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

Great discussions today! We celebrate now! ☺