

# LAC Minutes

Friday, 03/14/2014, CLIMB

Chat time: 12:45-1:15

Meeting: 1:30-3:30

## Attendance:

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

Guests: Marc Goodman, CIS

## CHAT

At today's pre-meeting chat, Allison Gross presented on the work her SAC (Comp/Lit) is doing in their annual assessment. They have moved toward developing an assessment process that addresses more than student work alone, with an eye toward program development and long-term goals.

## BUSINESS UPDATES

### Intros

Each attendee introduced him/herself and spoke about their first or most memorable job outside of teaching.

### Timekeeper

Gabe Hunter-Bernstein served as voluntary timekeeper.

### Minutes

The minutes from February 21, 2014 were approved with only minor corrections, and those were made by Susan Wilson before today's meeting.

### Completion Investment Council (CIC)

Shirlee Geiger recently stepped down from the CIC for personal reasons, so LAC chair Michele Marden has agreed to fill the vacancy. As the LAC's new CIC liaison, Michele will give periodic reports on the Council's activities. The CIC hasn't met since the last LAC meeting, so there was no report to share today.

### Next Meetings

A reminder was given that the LAC meets again April 11 and May 9. It is still unknown whether the group will meet May 30, but members should hold the date just in case.

### Subcommittee and Other Updates

**Funding:** Michele said this committee is scheduled to meet soon. Afterward, we should know if money exists for conferences later in the year.

**Internal Review:** Wayne Hooke was out ill, so he couldn't give a report.

**Membership:** Linda Paulson reported on the success of the new member orientation held February 21. She announced Sandie Curren has resigned from the LAC, for this year at least, since her teaching labs in Dental Hygiene are in constant conflict with LAC meetings.

**Templates and Rubrics:** Katie Leonard-Floyd's group is in the process of compiling SAC feedback about the assessment plan templates and help guides. They hope to have something to present to the LAC next month. Another document under development is a rubric for evaluating the end-of-year assessment reports.

**Student Services:** Linda Reisser reported on the district-wide initiative to collect assessment plans from all student services departments. Ten have been submitted so far and others are getting final tweaks. Each has been asked to identify a service or learning outcome they wish to assess. Some new tools have assisted their efforts: namely, Argos and Qualtrics. Argos allows extraction of data from Banner, and Qualtrics is a polling tool that replaces the more expensive Survey Monkey. Linda's campus leaders are being trained in the use of both. Gabe mentioned that Middle College uses Argos, too. When Linda asked if anyone from LAC was interested in reviewing the Student Services assessment plans, Scott McBeth volunteered.

#### Pre-Meeting Chats

Michele thanked Allison for hosting today's chat. Scott agreed to host the one next month.

#### Phase II/Best Thinking

For the benefit of newer members Sally Earll gave a quick summary of her group's activities. Initially, this LAC-EAC bridge committee hoped to tackle two topics this year: 1) Look at, and potentially revamp, the mapping level indicators in the Core Outcomes Mapping Matrix, and 2) Determine how well the current "out there" outcomes focus is working. The latter proved to be a huge task and, as such, has become the group's sole focus.

The subcommittee came up with six questions, which they brought to the LAC and to the Curriculum Committee in recent months. With a collection of responses from both groups, the committee did a cut and paste looking for themes. One sobering response to surface was this: "Critical thinking, cultural literacy, and self-reflection are not assessable." The quote stimulated a lot of interest in today's meeting, but there wasn't time to contemplate it for long. Taking turns, Amara Perez, Lisa Rosenthal, and Gabe summarized the feedback gleaned (in italics below) from five of the original questions, noting a single response could represent a small-group or an individual's contribution.

Question 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?"

*Six respondents said yes (mostly CTE), six said no, and others said it depends. The results were generally inconclusive, though two-thirds indicate some degree of difficulty with the "out there" approach. This seems to stem from the inability to follow students beyond the classroom.*

Question 3 "If course outcomes represent what students have 'achieved' (per Standard 4.A.3), should we alter the frame given on the CCOGs?" Three suggestions for reframing were given.

*The question was admittedly wordy. Some respondents said we should keep the current wording "Upon successful completion students should be able to..." Others liked the idea of adding*

*“demonstrate” at the end. A third group preferred the more prescriptive “...student will be able to demonstrate...”*

Question 4, abbreviated: “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?”

*The wording could be improved, but no themes came to light. For every individual or group that feels we should keep the “out there” focus, there is another group that feels outcomes should describe student achievement and ability at the end of a term or the end of a program.*

Questions 2 and 5, combined: “Some SACs have unmeasurable course outcomes that might be best described as ‘aspirational.’ This is problematic for Standard 4.A.3 and assessment in general. However, capturing the ‘hope’ for the course is important... Do you think your SAC might utilize a new field in the CCOG where aspirational goals for the course could be articulated? ...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?”

*The respondents were generally in support (16:5) of adding an optional second category for outcomes which might be deemed aspirational. One suggestion was to call them “learning goals” to distinguish them from measurable outcomes.*

The subject of aspirational goals/outcomes and the earlier quote about critical thinking not being assessable sparked the most discussion at today’s meeting.

Allison shared with the larger group something she had mentioned during the chat. When she was a TA at the University of Washington, her department measured student achievement according to a set of standardized outcomes. All students submitted portfolios and those were graded using department-created rubrics. Instructors could base 30 percent of the final grade on proprietary criteria, but the remaining 70 percent had to reflect the students’ degree of mastery of the sanctioned course outcomes. She contrasted that to the approach toward assessment she encountered in her first year at PCC, which permits a greater degree of freedom. Such an approach has its benefits but can also prolong and/or complicate one’s transition to a new program.

The next step for Sally’s group is to rework the questions with help from the in-house social scientists (Jamee Kristen and Wayne) and to get more input from groups like the EAC and Degrees and Certificates. They hope to have tangible feedback to share at the May 9 meeting.

## **DISCUSSION**

### Strategic Planning

For the remaining time, the chair asked the group to break into three workgroups to begin crafting a mini needs assessment. There was just enough time for attendees to create personal ‘wish lists’ for themselves, for their SACs, for the LAC, etc., and to share two of their items with their table group. Time to continue this activity may be allotted at a future meeting.

### Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:30.