

LAC Minutes (Approved)

Friday, 9/27/2013

CLIMB 306

Chat time: 1:15-1:30

Meeting: 1:30-3:30



Attendance:

Kendra Cawley		Wayne Hooke	x	Linda Paulson	
Sandie Curren		Gabe Hunter-Bernstein		JulieAnne Poncet	
Sally Earll	x	Pam Kessinger		Julie Romey	
<i>Shirlee Geiger *</i>		Katie Leonard-Floyd	x	Lisa Rosenthal	x
<i>Sylvia Gray *</i>		Priscilla Loanzon		Doug Smith	x
Allison Gross	x	Christine Manning		Susan Wilson (recorder)	x
Sherie Guess		Michele Marden	x	Stephanie Yurasits	
Anne Haberkern		Scott McBeth	x		

*LAC Chairs Emeritus

Guests: None

Action Items for Chair:

- Mail cards to four recipients
 - Put subcommittee recommitment on October agenda
 - See if Priscilla is interested and available for before meeting sharing in October

I. Business/Updates

- i. Timekeeping. Wayne agreed to be timekeeper for the meeting.
- ii. Introductions. Attendance was light today, but for the benefit of new member Susan Wilson, introductions were made around the table. We shared fun stuff that happened over the summer.
- iii. Spring Meeting Minutes. Michele was granted forgiveness for not sending out minutes from the last meeting.
- iv. Behavior Agreement. Michele reviewed the LAC Behavior Agreement. At each meeting, attendees are given a laminated card with 10 effective behaviors listed on one side, and an anthropomorphic orange on the other. Members are responsible for 'monitoring negative behaviors' and any one can hold up the side with the orange face during proceedings and call out the number of the behavior in violation.
- v. Council Changes
 - a. New Liaison: Linda Reisser, Dean of Student Development at Cascade, will serve as the administrative LAC liaison in 2013-14, replacing Heather Lang.

- b. Membership: A full discussion would have to wait until Linda Paulson could attend, but Michele explained why this topic was on the agenda. For one, bylaws need to be reviewed as they impact faculty who experience interruptions in teaching assignments. It is a shame to lose hard-working members only because their class sections are cancelled for a term.

Pam Kessinger has decided to withdraw from the LAC and return to the EAC Curriculum Subcommittee. She will continue to serve as a LAC SAC coach. Pam has recommended Torie Scott, a fellow librarian, as her LAC replacement. The attendees voiced no objections to Torie's appointment, though per our bylaws it is unusual to bring aboard members at this time of year. An exception is made because having a librarian on the council is important. Even with Torie, the LAC is on the bottom edge of voting numbers, so this is another reason membership is a hot topic.

The timing for bringing in new members and how to recruit them were debated briefly. One advantage of bringing in folks mid-year is the fact that newbies have time to observe proceedings and soak up the discussions even if they aren't given voting rights. A disadvantage is that there is a lot to learn about – and it is difficult to bring members up to speed without some sort of orientation. Having this mid-year is difficult. However, perhaps this is outweighed by the benefit of having their input and their ability to be advocates and LAC messengers. As for member selection, we need to discuss if we will have an open call as opposed to hand picking. Someone suggested using both methods. These will be topics for the Membership Subcommittee. Join the membership committee if these topics interest you!

- c. CIC Liaison: Past LAC chair, Shirlee Geiger, is pulling back on LAC work this year (including coaching). She will attend LAC meetings when possible, but not as an official member. She is the LAC's Completion Investment Council (CIC) rep. Shirlee discussed with Chris Chairsell about continuing to be our rep as a non-LAC member. This was approved by Chris and by Michele. She will take notes at the CIC meetings and keep the LAC apprised of Panther Path initiatives.
- d. Greeting Cards: Michele passed around four cards to sign; 'get well/heal fast' greetings for Linda Paulson and Bonnie Alberts, wedding congratulations to Shirlee Geiger, and a fourth expressing sympathy to the family of Diane Moore.

vi. Updates

- a. Inservice sessions: We had inservice sessions at SY (PT and FT), CA (PT) and SE (their combined FT/PT). We did not have a session at RC this year. The topic was popular (between 20 and 25 for each session). Based on last year's attendance, we expected smaller turn out. The activity involved reading and discussing an article about an experiment with Student Learning Outcome (SLO)-based grading within CSU-Fresno's Electrical Engineering Department. Lisa, Allison, and Susan had attended and agreed the 45-minute session was insufficient. Ideas for future events:

1. Use the same article as a kick-off activity for a full-day inservice.
2. Find an article that applies to the more 'creative' disciplines, as the chosen article and its engineering focus wasn't something all PCC faculty could follow or relate to.
3. Be clear as to the workshop's intended outcomes.

One observation was this: Few instructors have had formal assessment training. Institutions expect the faculty to know how to translate classroom objectives, activities, and student performance into quantitative assessments without giving them sufficient training.

- b. LAC Grants: No grants will be available to SACs for assessment-related projects this year. Minimal funds exist for refreshments for any targeted events/workshops developed for a SAC by the Faculty Development Subcommittee.
- c. Summer Peer Review:
 1. SAC Assessment Report submissions were back up above 90% from 81% in 2011-2012. For the 7 SACs that didn't turn in reports, the coaches will see if the departments find it less daunting to start with classroom-level assessment. What are you doing in the classroom...how does it relate to assessment and core outcomes? The LAC recognizes that some SACs operate with small numbers of full-time faculty and adjunct members that change year to year. The communication challenges are enormous.
 2. Peer reviewers were paid more this year—hooray! Reviewers were 'normed' and then assigned to a group of two. These two readers were assigned between 8-10 reports and were in frequent contact with the SAC coaches. The reviewers were able to conduct the reviews on their own time at their own pace. For next year, it was recommended that reviewer partners attend the norming training together to help ensure that there was agreement for how to evaluate the reports (having 3 different norming sessions may be problematic).
- d. 2013-2014 Report Format:
 1. A new reporting template will feature more check boxes and short-answer responses. The template isn't available for publication just yet.
 2. Coaches will have to be more technically proficient this year, so they have been asked to attend a six-hour training the week of October 7. SACs can start work, nothing significant has changed with the new template.
 3. PCC is restructuring assessment plans in 2013-2014, requiring SACs to submit their plan earlier in the year and their final reports in June.

4. In addition SACs will be asked to complete a Multi-Year Plan due with the Yearly Annual Plan that will show timeline of coverage of the outcomes.
5. Next summer's peer review rubric will be redesigned to better measure quality of content.

vii. Announcements/Reminders

- a. Pre-Meeting Share/Discuss: There has been a desire by members to share more from conferences and investigate other topics, but our LAC time is always too short. The 15 minutes of chat time before meetings isn't quite enough time. LAC Leaders suggested that we dedicate 30 minutes before our meeting for sharing. The suggested time is 12:45-1:15 for future meeting dates—with pre-scheduled speakers and topics. Allison nominated Priscilla Loanzon for next month's chat. To ensure an audience for any pre-arranged speaker, it was suggested notices be sent ahead of time to ensure there is enough interest and LAC Members are able to arrive early. Michele and Wayne indicated that the LAC Faculty Class (held at RC from 10-12 this fall) may interfere with the designated chats, but they will do their best to get there.
- b. Center for Civic Participation (CCP): The CCP at PCC will hold a series of forums in October to initiate deliberative dialogues on Accountability in Higher Education. This is their first forum. CCP intends to have a course where students are trained in the National Issue Forum process (including how to develop the issue books that go along with forums and how to facilitate the discussions). Please attend! Incidentally, Shirlee was scheduled to teach an associated philosophy course this term (PHL 299F Practice of Democracy), but it was cancelled due to low enrollment.
- c. Chris's Fall Get-Together: Chris Chairsell has once again invited LAC members to her home – and coaches are also invited this year. This year's event occurs October 11, 4:30 to 7:00, and Michele is taking a headcount.

II. **LAC Discussion**

i. Focus of the year

- a. Standard 4.A.3 is our focus for the year.
- b. LAC Subcommittee Leaders: The agenda listed the following leaders for this year's subcommittees:
 1. Funding (Michele)
 2. Collaboration (Sally)
 3. Faculty Development (Lisa)
 4. Conduit (Allison)
 5. Membership (Linda)
 6. Coaches – not really a subcommittee (Wayne)
 7. New Task Force: Software (Wayne gave a little insight as to how software could be used in the assessment process. D2L might be used to collect

student learning for course-level assessment work, but we won't know what we need until we figure out Standard 4.A.3.)

- c. Task force: Student Evaluation of the College and Instructor (This task force is on hold for now. There is some discussion in other places in the college. We will keep tabs on it.)
- d. Recommitting to Subcommittees: Given low attendance, recommitment will be postponed.
- e. Liaison for Linda Reisser's student service assessment council: When Linda presented at our last meeting in Spring, she asked if there were members interested in joining or being a liaison to the student service assessment council. Scott and Priscilla volunteered then. If still interested, it would be great to have overlap of members! This topic will be mentioned again due to low attendance today.

III. Back to Outcomes

- i. After the agenda topics were exhausted, the conversation returned to outcomes. Michele noted that the EAC Curriculum Committee and EAC Degrees and Certificates Committee will now ask faculty how they plan to assess their outcomes. Approval won't be denied if an assessment plan is absent. This is a way to get the conversation started (and to capture responses for what assessment work is happening – especially at the course-level). The intention is that three- to five-years from now, it will be a regular part of the curriculum approval process. Wayne noted that PCC as an institution doesn't do a very good job of documenting course-level assessments.

During a conversation about different approaches and perspectives in teaching writing, it was observed that while CCOGs are SAC-driven, there seems to be reluctance on the part of faculty to 'teach *to* the CCOG,' because it sounds dictatorial. For that reason, a member said faculty might be more amenable if we said "teach *for* the CCOG." The change in wording could be helpful, but it is possible that those who are resistant are going to be resistant no matter what word choices are used.

A comment was made regarding the expectation other faculty members have for courses that are pre-reqs. When a SAC needs particular knowledge/abilities/skills/competencies, they choose the pre-req courses based on the CCOG (whether the post-req course is inside or outside of the discipline). A LAC member commented that it is deeply concerning to hear that some faculty may not be covering what is described in the CCOG as much time and consideration has gone into choosing appropriate pre-req courses. If faculty are teaching different things, this could be potentially very detrimental to students who need certain knowledge/abilities/skills/competencies from the pre-req class to be successful in the post-req course. Another LAC member commented that it is also very frustrating to the faculty members teaching the post-req course when students do not have the expected knowledge/abilities/skills/competencies.

The LAC recognizes the need to balance academic freedom and academic responsibility. However, it was generally agreed that when a course is used as a pre-req, it is critical students are taught what is described in the CCOG. More communication between SACs who teach pre-req courses for post-req courses both within and outside of their discipline might help ease this tension. This is of particular concern for MTH, DE and WR (and could be a concern for any sequenced courses or pre-req/post-req courses).

A LAC member commented that perhaps the post-req courses have the wrong pre-req. Example: For courses that use WR 121 as a pre-req, do the post-req courses need more grammar, vocabulary, editing skills, or some other aspect of writing than is currently being taught in WR 121? If so, what options do faculty members have for their post-req courses? Note: Similar statements could be made for MTH.

Adjournment: The meeting ended at 3:30.