

## LAC Minutes\_(Approved)

Friday, 10/25/2013, CLIMB

Chat time: 1:15-1:30

Meeting: 1:30-3:30

### Attendance:

Kendra Cawley	x	Gabe Hunter-Bernstein	x	Linda Reisser	x
Sandie Curren		Katie Leonard-Floyd	x	Julie Romey	
Sally Earll		Priscilla Loanzon		Lisa Rosenthal	x
<i>Shirlee Geiger *</i>		Christine Manning	x	Torie Scott	x
<i>Sylvia Gray *</i>		Michele Marden (Chair)	x	Doug Smith	
Allison Gross		Laura Massey		Susan Wilson (recorder)	x
Sherie Guess		Scott McBeth		Stephanie Yurasits	
Anne Haberkern		Linda Paulson		Guests - None	
Wayne Hooke (Vice-Chair)		JulieAnne Poncet			

\*LAC Chairs Emeritus

### Business/Updates

#### Opening Question

"What do you think our focus should be this year?" Attendees were asked to fill out a card with their answer to this question. Christine Manning collected the responses.

#### Timekeeper

Christine volunteered to keep time for today's meeting.

#### Intros

Today's meeting was the first for new members Torie Scott and Linda Reisser .Welcome!!! Each member introduced him/herself and shared what kind of Halloween costume they might wear and one effective icebreaker exercise they have conducted or have been a part of.

We had several absences today. Sally Earll was at a Degree Qualifications Profile workshop. Wayne Hooke was busy working on the new assessment reporting templates (a task that keeps giving and giving and giving). Allison was at a SAC inservice where they will be discussing assessment. Doug Smith was at an elementary school discussing fire safety (ah, we should have asked to join him!).

#### Prior minutes

The group received the minutes from the last two meetings in advance of today's session. The minutes from June 7, 2013 were approved with only minor capitalization changes already made by the LAC chair. The group reviewed edits proposed via email for the minutes from September 27, 2013, and approved them as well.

#### Behavior Agreement

The chair reviewed the group's Behavior Agreement.

#### LAC Family

Stedman Bailey resigned from the LAC as her new position with PCC Prep won't allow sufficient time to participate on the council. Likewise, Pam Kessinger has resigned and Torie

Scott is taking her place on the committee. Last and sadly, the administrative assistant for Academic Affairs, Bonnie Alberts, lost her battle with cancer on October 18. The chair passed around a card on which members could write words of condolence to Bonnie's family.

#### Development from EAC/LAC Phase II Workgroup

EAC/LAC Phase II Workgroup (focused on coordinating efforts for the troublesome NWCCU Standard 4.A.3) decided at the end of last year that this year would be a year of "inquiry" where Curriculum and Degrees and Certificates members asked faculty about how they are assessing their outcomes. The following (or similar statement) will be added the **course and program approval forms** near the outcome area in the new online software (Courseleaf): "As you consider your outcomes and how to assess them, please be aware that the [Degrees & Certificates/Curriculum] Committee is in the process of gathering examples of assessments tied to outcomes to inform current and future PCC outcome conversations and decisions. At the [Degrees & Certificates/Curriculum] Committee meeting, please anticipate conversation around your degree/certificate outcomes and assessment."

The **intent of the discourse** is to get SACs thinking in terms of outcomes and assessment when submitting new or revised curriculum for approval. At this time it will not be an evaluative part of the process, and the results of such conversations will not impact the decision to approve or disapprove a course nor unduly slow the approval process. Still, it is critical that faculty are not blindsided with questions about outcomes and assessment, especially when the instructor, chair, or dean attending the EAC subcommittee meeting is standing in for someone in their department. The new language was shared at the Educational Advisory Council (EAC) meeting on 10/23/13. There were no comments on this request! Perhaps the LAC coaches could get the word out to their assigned SACs.

#### CIC October Highlights

Shirlee Geiger, former LAC chair and our Completion Investment Council (CIC) representative, sent the highlights from the CIC meeting on October 18 (summarized below). More information is available at the CIC's Spaces page.

**"Stand out" items from last year's CIC meetings** included insightful data, acknowledgement of the importance of the Panther Path, the necessity of focusing on math, and the value of 'getting out of departmental silos' and working toward a common goal.

The Developmental Education (DE) Task Force will start working this year. They will follow a three-pronged 'communities of practice' approach that looks at models/sequences/programs, student identity, and assessment/placement.

Exploring alternative math pathways, taking a closer look at developmental math, and gearing up for a math festival in August are the **primary projects** taking shape within the **Math Leaders Group**

Identifying and proposing best practices in DE is the charge of the new statewide **Developmental Education Workgroup**, formed under the **Community College Workforce Development** (CCWD). PCC is well represented on the committee.

Improving communication, developing a culture of data-driven changes, ensuring high visibility for the Panther Path, implementing successful pilots, and defining the CIC's role in strategic planning are informal **CIC goals for the coming year**.

At the EAC meeting, Heather Lang also shared the CIC's stance of the importance of investing in focused professional development for all faculty members.

### Announcements/Reminders

**Next month's pre-meeting sharing.** Priscilla Loanzon has agreed to host the pre-meeting chat in November. All members are encouraged to arrive at 12:45 to participate.

**CCP Forums.** The Center for Civic Participation scheduled two campus forums the week of October 28 to discuss Accountability at PCC. As described on a promotional poster, the moderated events are "part of a broad movement to create alternatives to polarized, adversarial, and polemical conversations. We NEED all points of view brought to the table, but expressed within a structure that helps people listen and learn across their many differences. These forums are crafted to help participants engage in deliberation and dialogue." Faculty and staff attendance is encouraged.

**Learning Assessment Templates.** More discussion is devoted to this later in the agenda, but the committee learned the new templates for 2013-2014 assessment plans will be available soon. SACs are encouraged to use the fillable forms over the old-style documents.

### **LAC Discussion**

#### Next month's discussion

November's meeting will focus on developing goals for the council this year – we may need to refocus and restructure the council's work this year. To that end, members returned to the opening question, "What do you think our focus should be this year?" Christine collected the group's responses after a five-minute silent brainstorm.

#### LAC membership

Declining numbers continue to be a critical topic, because a diminishing membership translates to lean attendance at meetings and smaller subcommittees. Today's and last month's meetings are indicators the council might be spreading itself a little thin; attendance is hovering around 36 percent.

#### EAC Subcommittees: Curriculum and Degrees & Certificates

Defining the LAC's role with the Curriculum Committee and Degrees and Certificates is another important task. The work around Standard 4.A.3 requires collaboration – and it is unclear when the LAC should advise, collaborate, or require change to meet accreditation standards. The EAC/LAC Phase II Workgroup will continue these discussions.

Since both of the EAC subcommittees will be capturing assessment information from faculty, it would be worthwhile for LAC members to attend when they can. Information about the meeting schedules, agendas, and minutes can be found at the following links:

Curriculum:

<http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/eac/curriculum/curriculum-committee/meetings.html>

Degrees & Certificates (DAC):

<http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/eac/curriculum/degree-certificate-committee/meetings.html>

### LAC Subcommittee Reports

A few minutes were afforded to each LAC subcommittee for a report-out. The groups are listed in bold with the name of its chair in parentheses and membership eligibility listed directly below it. At the next LAC meeting, discussions about LAC goals and priorities will be our main focus – this may shift the work in the subcommittees.

#### **Funding** (Michele)

Current LAC members or past members.

Making grant decisions has been struck from the group's tasks, as there are no SAC grants this year. "Balancing money with need" will be the group's priority in 2013-2014.

#### **Collaboration** (Sally)

Current LAC or past members and non-LAC members as needed.

Possible focus: Connecting with other groups within the college that need support around assessment (e.g., SPARC, Service Learning, etc.)

#### **Faculty Development** (Lisa)

Current or past LAC members and non-LAC members as needed.

This particular subcommittee has lost members and needs to recruit new ones. Is it time for data summit? The focus for this subcommittee has been on activities that promote faculty awareness and engagement with PCC's assessment process.

#### **Conduit** (Allison and Katie co-chair, fall 2013; Katie chairs, beginning winter 2014)

Current LAC or past members and non-LAC members as needed.

Monitoring "the national and international conversation around assessment..." and assisting "PCC faculty members in their awareness and understanding of, and participation in this conversation" is the driving force behind this group. TLC sessions on academic freedom and assessment are planned this year.

#### **Membership** (Linda)

Current LAC members or past members.

Recruiting new members to maintain balanced representation in the LAC, and providing new members with information and orientation activities is the primary focus. As mentioned earlier, this group has its work cut out for them, due to the shrinking membership roster.

#### **Coaches** (Wayne)

While the coaches do not make up a subcommittee in the traditional sense, they are stewards of the LAC, trained to help SACs navigate through the assessment and reporting process. There are 10 coaches working with 88 SACs this year. One idea bearing further discussion is whether coaches might take on the role of the old PALS group.

## **New Task Force on Software** (Wayne)

Current LAC Members and other college members (Andy Freed (D2L); member of student services)

PCC is years away from adoption, but we need to take a look now at the software out there to have a better sense of what is possible and what might make sense for PCC as the discussions around course-level assessment develop.

The chair spoke to the powerful capabilities of one such software package: The software can capture student attainment at course-level and connect it to degree/certificate outcomes. This allows for the data to be sliced and diced by course, by core outcome, by SAC, by student credit hours completed (and probably other ways). An advisor could pull up a student's record and see that the student is struggling with a particular core outcome and suggest courses to develop their attainment. A librarian could send an email to students enrolled in courses that have research papers to offer library services. When a student graduates, there could be a print out along with the degree, that shows a student's particular strengths and weaknesses. Of course, the data entry by the faculty members will require training (and given this year's debacle with the "paperless late add" the idea of introducing software without proper faculty buy-in and training is worrisome – it is unknown if the college is willing to address this need).

Linda shared that Student Services is one year into its research of retention management software. It's a slow process.

A sign-up sheet was passed around on which members could recommit to or join subcommittees of interest.

## Overview of Assessment

Deadline for the **Multi-Year Plan** and the **Annual Plan** for assessment is January 17. The **Year-End Report** is due June 20. The Annual Plan and the Year-End Report will be combined and posted on the LAC website.

The Multi-Year Plan identifies *when* the SACs will look at an outcome. The Annual Plan addresses *what* and *how* the SACs will assess this year. The Year-End Report will describe *how the assessment went* and, for CTE SACs, provide summary data. The new templates, known as Option 1, were due for publication soon after today's meeting. While SACs are encouraged to opt in to the new forms, they can go with a modified version of last year's format, called Option 2, if they so choose.

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) has standards for two types of assessment: Accountability and Improvement. We are attempting to address both types in one report for the college's Degree and Certificate Outcomes (which, for the general and transfer degrees have the Core Outcomes as the basis). This is not an easy marriage, but if done intentionally and carefully, it may be possible.

The prior template structure had several weaknesses:

- They did not articulate the two types of assessment (improvement and accountability).
- Because many CTE SACs already do a lot of data-driven assessment, the prior templates made more sense to LDC faculty (some CTE faculty do so much assessment it was hard to know what to report).
- The "assess-address-reassess" cycle was not made clear

- Narrative format allowed for increasingly long reports where important information was sometimes still missing.

For CTE:

CTE programs can “**leverage existing assessment.**” For summary data (which falls under “assessment for accountability”), the LAC doesn’t want to require duplication of effort. Ideally programs who are required to report student data for national certification or state-required TSA (technical skill attainment) could combine assessment work in a way that makes sense for the SAC and assess only once and provide the same results to multiple audiences. Coaches should help guide CTE SACs to minimize the workload.

One big change with the new templates is CTE SACs do not have to include TSAs (technical skill attainment) data in the PCC report --- at least for now. TSA data is captured by the college before it is sent to the state. It is unclear if TSA reporting is meaningful to CTE faculty members or if the requirements of the state capture what we need.

Some specifics on TSA data:

- One guy at state approved the assessment data for the entire state (and the quality of the approved assessment may be questionable)
- Only skills are covered by TSA reporting. So, all degree/cert outcomes may not be covered or only part of a degree/cert outcome is covered (in which case, the SAC should assess and provide summary data in their cycle)

As we consider TSA summary data, the following questions need to be considered:

- Was TSA developed with assessment in mind?
- Have SACs aligned TSA to degree/cert outcomes?
  - If not, will Multi-Year Plan be difficult?
- Is TSA meaningful to SACs?
  - If not, could it be?

Another change for CTE:

Since many CTE SACs are doing a lot of assessment, it has been unclear what they should report. The Annual Plan asks CTE SACs to pick 2 “focal outcomes” to assess more deeply. This falls under “assessment for improvement.” These choice of the “focal outcomes” could be from summary data, anecdotal evidence, faculty curiosity/exploration. Also, the assessment does not have to occur in a capstone class (eg, the faculty may wish to explore an element of student learning in one of the first courses). The focal outcomes will follow the “assess-address-reassess” cycle. There is no expectation that the SAC will cycle through all of the degree/certificate outcomes for *focal outcome analysis* (they will be required to submit summary data on all of their degree/certificate outcomes in a 2 year cycle – unless approved for a longer cycle)

Some unanswered questions:

- Is it ok if a SAC focuses on the same “focal outcomes” year after year?
- Does it make sense to pick only 2 and dig deep?

For LDC:

The multi-year plan will give us a glimpse on the coverage of the Core Outcomes. We will see if the SAC “owns” the outcome, but not how deep the coverage is (could be for one course and just barely covered in that course). However, if some outcomes aren’t being owned widely by LDC SACs, this is critical information – and we may need to re-evaluate the Core Outcomes or, if the college wants to keep them, have more coverage by SACs.

For the Annual Plan, LDC SACs are asked to describe the “aspect” of the Core Outcome being assessed. This “aspect” defined by the SAC. Some LDC SACs have not understood that they are free to tailor the Core Outcome for their purposes and used the descriptors given with the Core Outcomes (eg, dance had students write a paper for communication instead of communicating through dance). To alleviate this, there is a blurb on the Core Outcome website:

“Note: The Core Outcome names are links that lead to pages where sample indicators and levels of achievement are suggested. Subject Area Committees (SACs) are encouraged to establish indicators that are appropriate to the program or discipline and are aligned with these levels of achievement.”

This clause currently appears below the six institutional outcomes but was intended to appear above them (and has some spelling mistakes); Susan will fix this at the website.

The core outcomes are purposely vague and lend themselves to SAC interpretation. While SACs need to have some leeway in deciding how an outcome applies to their discipline, some consistency across the institution is needed to ensure quality (and to met expectations of NWCCU, our regional accreditors). It may be time to re-evaluate the descriptors and the indicators that describe the levels.

LDC SACs do not submit summary data like the CTE SACs do. Capturing summary data for the Core Outcomes remains problematic because the LDC SACs have a collective responsibility to ensure student development (eg, Kendra’s lovely “cheesecloth” analogy). Because of this the main focus for LDC SACs is on “assessment for improvement” more than it is for “assessment for accountability.” Discussion for how to capture “summary data” for the accountability aspect will need to be considered more.

Some questions to consider:

- Is it reasonable to assume that the equivalent of “summary data” happens in 200-level courses?
- If so, do we need to know how many 200-level courses assess core outcomes?

### Closing

3:30 came around before the group was able to discuss what the year-end report template will look like. The meeting adjourned around 3:33.

### Action Item

1. Review and summarize responses to opening question (M Marden)
2. Fix language at web page where 6 Core Outcomes are published (S. Wilson)