

LAC Minutes

Friday, 02/21/2014, CLIMB

Chat time: 12:45-1:15

Meeting: 1:30-3:30

Attendance:

Chris Brooks	X	Gabe Hunter-Bernstein	X	Davina Ramirez	
Kendra Cawley	X	Jamee Kristen	X	Linda Reisser	
Sandie Curren		Katie Leonard-Floyd	X	Julie Romey	X
Sally Earll		Priscilla Loanzon	X	Lisa Rosenthal	X
<i>Shirlee Geiger * LAC Chair Emeritus</i>		Christine Manning	X	Julianne Sandlin	X
<i>Sylvia Gray * LAC Chair Emeritus</i>		Michele Marden (Chair)	X	Torie Scott	
Allison Gross		Laura Massey		Doug Smith	X
Sherie Guess		Scott McBeth	X	Susan Wilson (Recorder)	X
Anne Haberkern		Linda Paulson	X	Stephanie Yurasits	
Wayne Hooke (Vice-Chair)	X	Amara Perez			

Guest: Marc Goodman (CIS)

Action Items (for Chair, unless otherwise stated)

- Finalize and announce the LAC/EAC/Phase II retreat details
- Confirm Allison G. for pre-meeting chat in March. If not Allison, maybe Scott?
- Send feedback/edits for emails re Multi-State Collaborative project to Kendra (group)
- Create Google doc for Strategic Planning discourse
- Send Sally notes taken during discussion session (table notetakers)

CHAT

Priscilla Loanzon hosted this month's chat, "What You Really Want to Ask About Assessment" modeled after a session by Jodi Levine Laufgrabel, Temple University, at last year's ANNY (Assessment Network of New York) conference. Priscilla facilitated a discussion fueled by her colleagues' "burning questions related to quality and meaningful assessment of student learning."

BUSINESS UPDATES

Intros

Attendees introduced themselves and briefly described how they spent the recent snow days. New LAC member, Jamee Kristen, was attending her first meeting.

Timekeeper

Vice-chair Wayne Hooke served as voluntary timekeeper.

January Meeting Minutes

Susan proposed to update the description of last month's pre-meeting chat using an abstract provided by Priscilla. With this revision, the group approved the minutes from January 17, 2014.

Behavior Agreement

The LAC chair explained the group's Behavior Agreement.

Upcoming Meetings

The group was reminded that no meeting will be held February 28. Instead, the next meeting will occur March 14. Further, a retreat is being planned for LAC, EAC, and Phase II. More information will be announced as the details become available.

Completion Investment Council (CIC)

The CIC meeting scheduled earlier today was cancelled, so there were no updates to share.

Subcommittee Reports

- Funding Committee – No updates
- Templates/Rubrics – Katie’s group is making progress on the peer review rubric to be used for the end-of-year (EOY) assessment reports. They also have received feedback about the new templates and help guides, and different themes are apparent between CTE and LDC. Out of all the respondents, only one SAC opted to use the ‘old’ style forms, known as Option II.
- LAC Coaches – Wayne said he and the coaches are “working very hard in isolation, and we’re getting there.”
- Membership – Linda announced her group was hosting the New Member Orientation directly following today’s meeting.
- Phase II – The latter part of today’s meeting will focus on discussion questions coming out of the LAC/EAC Phase II Task Force (Sally’s group).

Assessment Plans Incoming

Out of 86 SACs, only 20 have not turned in their assessment plans, according to Susan’s latest numbers. Emails were sent from Michele to SAC chairs and to the SAC dean liaisons in those cases where SACs have not explained the delay or offered an ETA for the missing plans. Kendra, Wayne, and the SAC coaches were cc’ed on these emails. The hope is that the dean liaison will learn about the SAC’s needs and, collectively, we can assist the SAC with their assessment work.

Pre-Meeting Chats

The chair thanked Priscilla for hosting today’s chat. Allison couldn’t attend today, so Michele will check to see if she still is interested in hosting next month’s chat. Scott may host an upcoming one, too, depending what transpires at the upcoming AAC&U conference.

Multi-State Collaborative

PCC is not the only institution wrestling with the question, “How do we know if students are achieving core outcomes? With the goal of advancing learning outcome assessment, nine states have formed the Multi-State Collaborative. Initiated by the Massachusetts Department of Ed, the Collaborative also includes Connecticut, Indiana, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Utah. Using a slide show to touch on key points, Kendra shared information about an ambitious pilot project that is taking shape.

The Collaborative seeks to assess two essential competencies, Written Communication and Quantitative Literacy, in students who have completed 75% of their associate’s or bachelor’s degrees. The assessments will occur in six institutions (three community colleges and three universities) from each of the nine states. Faculty participation will be voluntary and assessment artifacts will come from embedded assignments. LEAP Value Rubrics will be used, and scoring will be conducted by faculty from a mix of two- and four-year schools in the Collaborative.

PCC is one of the six participating Oregon institutions, along with Chemeketa CC, Southwestern Oregon CC, Oregon State University, Oregon Tech (OIT), and the University of Oregon. To solicit faculty volunteers at PCC, Kendra plans to send an invitation by email explaining the project, describing who is eligible, and promoting the benefits to be derived. She passed around drafts of two emails and asked for the group's input on both. One will be sent to the part-time and full-time faculty at PCC, the other to SAC chairs. The LAC gave their support for the project, which has two very big selling features: 1. It's voluntary, and 2. It serves a dual purpose. Participating SACs can use the pilot project process and results for their 2014-2015 PCC annual assessment.

Kendra asked for attendees to read the drafts and send any edits or thoughts to her via email. (kcawley@pcc.edu).

PCC's Strategic Planning Initiative

Strategic planning (SP) is underway and the president and his cabinet are seeking input from the college community. In January, faculty and staff were asked "What is your vision for PCC's impact over the next five years?" The next question, posed mid-February, was, "Reflecting on your view of the future and PCC's strengths and weaknesses, what would you suggest should be a strategic objective for the College?"

Speakers at assessment conferences often emphasize the critical importance of having assessment connected to the college's resources. Given this, Michele was hoping there would be an assessment representative on the strategic planning steering committee (which, if Michele understands correctly, is supposed to focus the college's attention and resources on specific areas). Although it was a disappointment to not have such a rep, perhaps we could craft a response to the questions. If someone on the LAC, for example, were to post a response on behalf of the LAC and that suggestion was "liked" by numerous supporters, it might gain momentum. However, with this said, if assessment is connected to strategic planning, it may have more of a "top down" feel. Faculty are, bit by bit, seeing the value in assessment. Our "bottom-up" movement has been slow, but is working – a top-down approach could harm this momentum. Since we don't have a member on the strategic planning steering committee to share PCC's approach and past successes--someone who could guide the conversation--perhaps it is best to not connect assessment to strategic planning. The chair will create a Google doc to attempt to define what we would want from strategic planning for our faculty-led approach to assessment

LAC DISCUSSION

In Sally's absence, Gabe moderated over the discussion part of the meeting which consisted of a small-group Q&A. The room was pre-divided into four table groups, and each group was charged with answering three of six questions. At the end of the half hour, Gabe started with question 1 and worked through all six allowing each group to quickly summarize their thoughts on the questions they were assigned. These are the questions addressed in today's discussion:

1. Does the "out there" focus work for your discipline/program? If so, what do you like about this focus? If not, what do you not like about this focus?
2. Some SACs have unmeasurable course outcomes that might be best described as "aspirational" (e.g., enjoy a life enriched by calculus). This is problematic for Standard 4.A.3 and assessment in general. However, capturing the "hope" for the course is important. If this is a concern for your discipline/program, do you think your SAC might utilize a new field in the CCOG where aspirational goals for the course could be articulated?

3. If course outcomes represent what students have “achieved” (per Standard 4.A.3), should we alter the frame given on the CCOGs? Possible revised framing for course-level outcomes on the CCOGs follow:
 - a. Keep the current wording:
Upon successful completion students should be able to. . . <outcome>
 - b. Keep “should,” but emphasize “demonstrate”:
 - i. Upon successful completion students should be able to demonstrate they have knowledge of . . . <outcome>
 - ii. Upon successful completion students should be able to demonstrate what they know and can do relating to . . . <outcome>
 - c. Replace “should” with “will” and emphasize “demonstrate”
 - i. Upon successful completion of the course, students will have demonstrated the ability to. . . <outcome>.
 - ii. Upon successful completion students will have demonstrated they have knowledge of. . . <outcome>
 - iii. Upon successful completion students will have demonstrated what they know and can do relating to. . . <outcome>
4. The current “out there” focus does not specify a timeframe for expectation of when the student should be able to demonstrate the outcome. What time frame is reasonable for displaying outcome? For example, should “upon successful completion of the course” indicate what students know and can do immediately after completion of the course vs the next month or next year?
5. To meet NWCCU Standard 4.A.3, we need to move to outcome statements which are measurable (expectational). However, faculty often have ideals and hopes for a course that are not measurable or easily measurable. Sometimes the ideals and hopes are aspirational. These statements might include words such as appreciate, enjoy, and understand. Does your SAC have outcomes that are not measurable? What would be the pros/cons of having a new optional CCOG field where unmeasurable and/or aspirational goals for the course could be articulated, but assessment would not be required or expected?
6. In your opinion, what role do outcomes play in a course? Which of the following do you agree and/or disagree with:
 - a. Course outcomes should collectively represent the totality of the expected learning in a course--a thorough description of the course.
 - b. Course outcomes should be only the main key/critical elements for a course that will be covered and assessed in all sections, but may not capture all the expected learning for a course.
 - c. Course outcomes should be the absolute minimal expectations for student learning in the course (e.g., in some way representing "C level").
 - d. Is this dependent on the course and/or the SAC?

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

New Member Orientation

Membership Committee veterans Linda Paulson and Doug Smith presided over the new member orientation from 3:30 to 4:20. In attendance were Michele Marden (LAC chair and guest) and new

members Chris Brooks, Jamee Kristen, Davina Ramirez, Julianne Sandlin, and Susan Wilson. Amara Perez was ill and could not attend. New members received a personal copy of the June 2012 Learning Assessment Council Guidebook, and were oriented to the group's history and behavior agreement (Linda), the annual assessment process (Michele), and to assessment-related and PCC-centered acronyms spelled out in a handy guide (Doug).