LAC Minutes

Friday, 5/24/2013
CLIMB
Chat time: 1:15-1:30
Meeting: 1:30-3:30

Attendance:

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

Guests: None

Agenda is in bold type; Minutes are not.

I. **Business/Updates**
 i. **Who is time keeper today? ($\approx$ 30 seconds)**
 Wayne kindly used his obnoxious iPhone alarm. ☺
 ii. **LAC Behavior Agreement ($\approx$ 3 minutes)**
 Reminder about our agreed-upon behaviors to help ensure productive meeting.
 iii. **Who doesn't have guidebook?**
 Guidebook passed out.
 iv. **Three words that resonate the most with you today (no need to explain them) ($\approx$ 5 minutes)**
 A more relaxed "opener"!
 v. **Approve Minutes for 4/12/2013 ($\approx$ 5 minutes)**
 A couple changes. Minutes approved.
 vi. **"Retreat" (last meeting for the year): ($\approx$ 3 minutes)**
 - Friday, 6/7, 11:00- 3:00 (SY TCB 208) ***Note change of usual time/location

vii. Completion Investment Council (CIC) Update (CIC Rep: Shirlee Geiger) ($\approx$ 10 minutes)

- This year has been a year of study for the CIC – and has been wonderfully constructed and led (thanks to Sylvia Gray for her leadership!). Next phase will be recommendations for action.
- There is a shift nationally in the focus of community colleges. Previously, the main focus has been on access. Under the "access model," there are different ways to view "success" – all dependent on the reason for the being at the community college (examples: personal fulfillment, retirement, certification, summer classes to transfer, transfer degree, etc.). Now, there is more of a focus on "completion." Completion, and what success looks like, can be viewed as going against the "access" mission of community colleges.
  - CIC, like the LAC, is an evidence-based council. When we take a hard look at the data, we see that the access model has hurt many students. At PCC there are more students going into default and collections than graduating.
  - Deletion for Non-Payment, at first glance, appears to go against the community college "access" focus. However, the data shows that more students are now successful -- perhaps because their finances are less of a worry and they can focus on their college work.
  - Letting a student into a class they are unprepared for and likely to flunk is not access – it harms the student and decreases the likelihood that s/he will succeed in whatever his/her goal was.
- Title 3 Flair Grant (Stedman is involved) is a big part of the Prepare Stage of the Student Service's Panther Path (prepare, engage, commit, complete, thrive). If students understand the debt they are taking on, they may be more motivated in the classroom (and reach out to support services, if needed).
- Career Guidance (CG) data was shared with the CIC. It shows that students who take CG classes are having more success.
- See EAC minutes for more information (May 15, 2013): http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/eac/meeting.html

viii. EAC/LAC Phase II Workgroup Update ($\approx$ 5 minutes)

- Chris Chairsell has suggested that this next year be spent on two things:
  - reflecting on all that the has been accomplished with regard to assessment
  - carefully considering the "Best Thinking Document" from the EAC/LAC Phase II Workgroup for Standard 4.A.3.
- The work for Phase II has been motivated by the fear that we might get a recommendation on Standard 4.A.3 and find ourselves in a "hasten your progress" situation in 2-3 years. Acting quickly on a standard that will likely require significant changes would be very bad! Chris shared that the college is actually in a very good position to carefully consider the 13 items given in the document –we don't need to try to immediately act on the suggested changes given the "Best Thinking" document (this is a HUGE relief for Michele). It is best to spend a year looking at other colleges that have a similar faculty-led assessment process and have more internal conversations (including Curriculum, Degrees and Certificates, and EAC). So, this work will not go away --- we will spend a lot more time with it next year.

- Next year we will have a new district president and, perhaps, the development of a strategic plan. Chris doesn't want too many big changes in one year.
- If needed, Chris will "own" a ding from accreditation on Standard 4.A.3 (not the LAC). Taking a year to consider will allow us to do better work downstream. We could go into to overdrive and start trying to implement the 13 items from the "best thinking" document, but doing so may not preclude a recommendation. We need to make the changes that are meaningful to PCC and that fit PCC's culture.
    - It should be noted that this standard is difficult for most institutions of higher education. Visiting teams are our peers. They often focus on the things that their own institutions are struggling with when they visit. We were warned from the last visiting team about Standard 4.A.3, but teams change -- so we have no way of knowing what they might (or might not) focus on.
- We have to write to Standard 4.A.3 in Fall of 2014.
- 2013-2014: "Year of Reflection + Thoughtful Consideration on Standard 4.A.3" Perhaps there is a snapper way to describe the year? Send your suggestions to Michele!

ix. LAC Updates (≈ 15 minutes for all)

- **Faculty Development: Gabe**
    - Gabe has been offered a position at PCC that pulls him away from LAC work. He will remain on the council, but won't be able to chair the Faculty Development Subcommittee next year or be a coach. Lisa Rosenthal will be replacing Gabe as chair of the Faculty Development Subcommittee. Lisa's background in education and years with the LAC makes her an excellent replacement for Gabe. Michele is so so angry that Gabe's new job is pulling him away from LAC work…. but is THRILLED to have Lisa chair the committee!
    - The current plan for next year for Faculty Development Subcommittee:
        - Have targeted SAC assessment sessions where a SACs needs are addressed. Example: Gabe did this for Health SAC with LAC mini-grant – focus was formative assessment.
        - Embed assessment in presentations/workshops held by other groups whenever possible. Example: Michele, Wayne, and Christine did this for a SPARC workshop (SPARC is PCC's sustainability council).
        - Perhaps different college groups can work in tandem to support each other – especially given that recourses are shrinking. Example: Bryan Hull (PCC's Internationalization Initiative) has called a lunch of various groups just for this conversation. Sally, as the Collaboration Subcommittee leader, will be attending.
    - Gabe will still be teaching his Saturday Instructional Effectiveness classes (they will begin repeating)
    - Please send feedback to Gabe on the LAC D2L "ass badge" course by next Friday (5/31).
- **Membership: Linda**
    - No news today

- **Conduit: Allison/Shirlee**

- o A topic will be picked for each quarter next year. There will be one blog post per month related to the topic for that quarter. One presentation per quarter will be created and then taken on the road (at the campus's TLC).
  - Suggestion for TLC scheduling: Get in the schedule as soon as possible and pick a day/time. If this is done, people will start to expect the presentation (which will increase attendance).
  - If you have suggestions for topics for the committee's consideration, please send them to Allison.
  - LAC members are encouraged to write a blog. Contact Allison or Shirlee to find out about the expectations and begin the collaboration!
  - o Conduit Subcommittee is also developing outcomes by which to evaluate themselves!
- **Collaboration: Sally**
  - o Colleagues are contacting the LAC to see how we might collaborate and support each other (SPARC, Service Learning, Internationalization). If you know of any groups who might be interested in discussing options, please ask them to contact Sally.
  - o Reminder: LAC SAC Assessment Reports are due June 21! PALs are ready and willing to come in and help facilitate SAC discussion on assessment results. This can be helpful for the SACs to look more deeply and differently at their data.
    - A call out for PALs: It was wonderful when they came in and worked with the Math SAC!
  - o Critical Friends Groups has a new name: Professional Learning Communities. It was felt that the "critical" part of CFG's was being misunderstood by faculty. The hope is to amp up groups next year (Chris Chairsell paid for many PCC faculty to be trained as CFG facilitators). This collaboration is not just about learning assessment. It is also about the classroom and what is working and what isn't (it is also intended to be a safe environment).
    - CFG's have been advertised at Fall inservice, to email list serves, and on the LAC website.
    - If you are interested, please contact Sally.
- **Coaches: Wayne**
  - o Coaching has been sporadic – many SACs are not taking advantage of their coach.
  - o There is some evidence that coaches may not be giving consistent information to their SACs. The plan is to devote more time next year to training and supporting coaches with a focus on technical expertise and proficiency.
  - o Suggestion: Coaches should be on the LAC.
    - We have decided not to add more LAC members this year. This could be reconsidered.
    - Discussions in LAC meetings are not focused on the LAC SAC Assessment Report or process; however, it might be helpful to have an overview.
    - Coaches should be a part of peer review, whenever possible, since this is directly connected.

- We could encourage coaches to attend LAC meetings as a guest.
    - o Wayne and Kendra attended a session at American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) about a college that also used coaches and "professionalized" the role. Coaches had significant support: training and retreats. Creating this very knowledgeable group of people was very helpful for the college – helped spread the kool-aid.
    - o Chris Chairsell is impressed by our coaches – and expressed this recently. She said that some SACs have mentioned how helpful coaches were during Program Review. Chris wants to see more coach involvement with SACs (Wayne and I will be meeting with her to discuss this more).
- **Funding: Michele**
    - o At this time, it appears that we have funding for next year.
    - o We are putting more money into Summer Peer Review which will hopefully improve the quality of the feedback to the SACs – it gets a bit better every year!
- **Other updates?**
    - o Call-out to the three LAC members who have attended assessment conferences this year: Lisa, Priscilla, and Sally. Lisa gave a wonderful TLC presentation on 5/24 at CA. Priscilla is in the process of creating a document from her conference (and will likely be sharing briefly at our last meeting of the year – there were sessions that may be helpful for the work for Standard 4.A.3) and Sally has things in the works too. The time taken to disseminate information from assessment conferences is SO appreciated!!!

II. LAC Discussion

i. Clicker Activity Results (from 1/25/2013 meeting) (≈ 45 minutes)

- **Review results** (see powerpoint)

There were some questions we felt needed re-wording – hopefully we can remember!
- o Question 1: Expected that LDC would have more trouble than CTE – was a little surprised by these results
- o Question 2: "Other" option included multiple answer choices. January discussion: Initial reaction might be A, but then might move to C. Add-in option: Discuss the difference with the colleague.
- o Question 3: "Other" option included multiple answer choices.
- o Question 4: Results here point to the need for more collaboration between colleagues!
- o Question 5/6: We don't quite remember why we voted on this slide twice (and the discussion was not captured in minutes). Possibility: There is no way of really knowing this outside of sequence courses. But for sequence courses, one will be looking to the reasonable expectations from the prior course (not the reasonable expectation for the course that was picked and defined for this activity). The slide needs to be reworded somehow to avoid this difficulty and get at the meaning: are students learning what we expect them to learn when they pass a class?
- o Review of "Michele's sad realization slide":
  Assessment has been a journey that has radically changed my view of teaching and grading. When I realized that that my reasonable expectation for

any course is not guaranteed based on how I was grading, I was very depressed. It put into question professionalism of teaching (or at least, of me as a professional by my colleagues).

Looking back, I was indirectly addressing this issue by increasing the weight of my tests/final (which likely increases test anxiety of my students), but this never was a satisfactory approach.

I used to agree with the statement "Students who make a C in math class really should take it over again." Math colleagues have said this at every place I have taught (high school and college). Is the reason for this because we are grading in a way that does not ensure that our students achieve our "reasonable expectations"? What does this mean for students? --- especially when the cost of education is so high. Students on financial aid won't be able to repeat a course they pass (like they would even try). What about students who enroll in the next class and fail? Given the fear and anxiety most students have for math, they most likely won't realize that they could pass a class and still not be prepared to move on--- instead they will believe that it is their fault.

The math SAC at PCC has starting putting in minimum requirements for the weight of the final exam. Is this perhaps due to the frustration we feel when students enter a class unprepared and we believe higher weight for the final exam will fix the problem?

Winter Quarter I experimented with a different way of grading to ensure that all passing students had achieved the reasonable expectations (per my definition). The attempt was largely good (but needs to be tweaked) and I need more conversations with my colleagues about reasonable expectations (they can't just be mine!) and we need to change our course outcomes so that our reasonable expectations are explicit.

- o Question 7: The most interesting slide!!! Expected that LDC would be higher than CTE – surprised that CTE had a majority for "yes."
- o Question 8: This was surprising to me (expected more no's). January discussion: The Reasonable Expectation may be given in the outcome, but not well.
- o Question 9: Change this to "Do you find the course outcomes given on the CCOG useful for assessment purposes?"
- o Question 10: Another very interesting slide!
- o Question 11: This was not a surprise (it was how the Reasonable Expectation was defined at the start of the activity). This was like a check to make sure that we picked it right!
- o Question 12: Interesting! Are there different ways at getting at knowledge? Perhaps it depends on what the expectation is?

- o Question 13: Interesting! The need for collaboration on student expectations is needed, and how we assess is also an important discussion.

- **Discussion Activity (small groups)** (see blue for activity)**:**
  (no notes turned in from the activity)

  1. a) Where is your SAC from 1-5?

     1: To your knowledge, faculty members are not discussing "reasonable expectations" for courses.
     3: Faculty members are in agreement on the "reasonable expectations" for a course and are now focused on developing consistency with student attainment for the "reasonable expectations."
     5: Faculty members are in agreement on the "reasonable expectations" for a course and faculty are evaluating students more or less consistently for the "reasonable expectations."

     b) If your SAC is discussing "reasonable expectations" and/or consistency in attainment for a course in any way, please share what is working. Recorder: Please note the SAC and if involved faculty include adjuncts or not.

     2. Who should be in the conversation about outcomes and defining student attainment for the outcomes? If your group feels the answer SAC dependent, give a breakdown for who should do what.
     Considerations:
     a. Only faculty teaching the course? [Does "faculty" include pt?]
     b. The whole SAC?
     c. Does it matter if the course is stand-alone course vs sequence course?
     d. For pre-req courses, like Math and Writing, that are pre-reqs for courses outside the discipline, should faculty who are teaching the pre-req course discuss "reasonable expectations" with faculty outside their SAC who are teaching a post-req course?
     e. Does it matter if the course is taught by only one instructor?
     f. Advisory boards?
     g. Colleagues at other institutions?
     h. Other?

     3. For "reasonable expectations" what is the balance between consistency and "academic freedom and responsibility"?

Full-group Discussion:
Concern: One possible outcome of Standard 4.A.3 is that full-time faculty will become "managers" of part-time faculty dictating assessments. Should part-time be a part of the discussion of outcomes and assessments? This was a resounding "yes!" for at least one group.
- The part-time issue keeps coming up, but we don't address it.
  - o Perhaps we can create "best practices" for how the SAC will involve their part-time faculty in this work.

- o Compensation remains the troublesome issue – and it is just getting harder with the state funding cuts.
- o We need to be clear about compensation. This work should be embedded in the responsibilities of job secure faculty. It is more unclear for job-insecure faculty. If it is feasible to have compensation, it should support only adjunct faculty. This is a union bargaining issue.

ii. **Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)   (Remaining time -- Stop at 3:22)**
See Wayne's DQP Powerpoint. We will discuss this more at the last meeting of the year.
- DQP is like our core outcomes, but with a national focus. The intent is that any college could use the DQP outcomes as their outcomes. It turns the course and degree requirements into meaningful skills. It is important to note that the goal is not to have strict standardization – variation between colleges is expected, wanted, and allowed for in the DQP.
  - o Why are we looking at this?
  - o Oregon has a grant from Lumina to look closer at the DQP. It is basically a grant to have conversations about the DQP and report them back. The conversations could be how the DQP compares to the college's outcomes, if there were changes made due to those discussions, or a critical look at what is good and bad about the DQP.
  - o DQP is based on the European Union's Tuning Process (link: http://www.unideusto.org/tuningeu/)
- There are three degree levels (associates, bachelors, masters). The verbs for student attainment at each level are different.
- The question: How can DQP be useful for an institution, between institutions (horizontal alignment), and as students continue their education in a particular field (vertical alignment) while allowing for institutions to maintain their individuality?
- Many people feel that the associate's level descriptors are not rich enough in the DQP. It also misses the needs of CTE.
  - o At the last Oregon DQP meeting, a Lumina representative said that they are in the process of creating a CQP (Career Qualification Profile)
  - o The descriptors follow Bloom's taxonomy. So for associates level, many feel that the current wording is insulting to students – there is critical thinking at this level (not just knowledge acquisition).
  - o If DQP is intended to be "minimal expectations," is knowledge acquisition ok?
  - o Gabe has done work with the DQP. Bachelors level is defined better than associates.
- With the completion agenda, there is likely to be more finger-pointing. PSU could say, "don't blame us – PCC is not giving the students a proper foundation." PCC could point back to high schools (and on down it goes). DQP is an attempt to ensure students are developing on a path that has appropriate uniformity. Two students with the same degree from different institutions would have expected common elements for they "know and are able to do." This would be the DQP. The expectations would align with expectations for the next level of education—no matter if they transferred to a different institution for say master-level work.

- o Most CTE programs have feedback loops that help them adjust. We don't have good feedback loops on the LDC side – between employers and for vertical alignment between associates, bachelors and masters.
- Psychology faculty are looking at DQP.
- Should we continue this discussion at our next meeting? <yes!>

III. Last Meeting "Retreat" 6/7, 11-3:
   i. Chris Chairsell will likely visit
   ii. Standard 4.A.3 – delve in
   iii. Assessment Conference (Priscilla)
   iv. Lunch with Curriculum and Degrees & Certificates
   v. Student Services work with core outcomes (Heather Lang and Linda Reisser)
   vi. More with DQP

IV. Jessica bids her farewell. ☹ Thank you Jessica for all you have brought to the LAC! We hope you will return to LAC work in the future – do come visit next year with baby!

V. **Celebration**
LAC Whoop Whoop!