

LAC Minutes – Final

Friday, 10/24/2014, CLIMB 306

Meeting: 1:30-3:30

Attendance:

Chris Brooks	x	Gabe Hunter-Bernstein	x	Linda Reisser	
Kendra Cawley		Jamee Kristen	x	Julie Romey	
Sally Earll	x	Katie Leonard		Lisa Rosenthal	
<i>Shirlee Geiger * LAC Chair Emeritus</i>		Priscilla Loanzon	x	Julianne Sandlin	x
Marc Goodman	x	Michele Marden (Vice-Chair)		Torie Scott	x
<i>Sylvia Gray * LAC Chair Emeritus</i>		Scott McBeth		Doug Smith	x
Allison Gross (out Fall 2014)		Linda Paulson	x	Susan Wilson (Recorder)	x
Anne Haberkern		Amara Perez			
Wayne Hooke (Chair)	x	Davina Ramirez	x		

Action Items for Chair or Designee

- Susan: Make the approved correction to the 6/6/2014 minutes and post
- Susan: Circulate LAC directory and request corrections from those unable to attend today
- Newer Members: Let Wayne know which subcommittee(s) and/or task force you wish to join

BUSINESS UPDATES

Intros

No guests or new members were present, but chair Wayne Hooke allowed a few minutes for introductions and a chance for each person to tell about something fun and exciting. Gabe's survival of emergency gall bladder surgery qualified as neither, but was something to celebrate. Movie critic Chris said Captain America: The Winter Soldier didn't disappoint, but everyone else's summer doings paled in comparison to Julianne's trip to Italy.

Minutes

The minutes from the June 6, 2014 LAC Retreat were unanimously approved with one correction to page 5: Remove the second-to-last bullet from the list of LAC accomplishments.

LAC Membership

Subcommittee chair Linda Paulson gave a membership update—confirming the continuance of a few members whose status had been up in the air last June, noting Allison's absence this fall due to parental leave, and mentioning Laura Sanders' interest in joining the committee. Linda has the list of possible recruits generated last year, but she is open to additional recommendations and asked the members to send nominations her way. The LAC by-laws specify voting members to number no less than 18 and no more than 25. With just 18 voting members on the current roster, we need to fortify the voting ranks to offset future losses in membership.

Susan distributed the current LAC directory and asked those present to check their name and contact information for accuracy. For those unable to attend, Susan will touch base via email.

Subcommittee Participation

LAC members are required to join at least one subcommittee, and some of the newer members had not yet selected their subgroup of choice. For their benefit, Wayne reviewed the options:

- Membership - A standing subcommittee chaired by Linda and comprised of Allison, Doug, and Susan, with Wayne and Michele as needed.
- Funding – A standing subcommittee led by the current LAC chair (Wayne). Other members are: Kendra, Sherry Bjork (Kendra’s assistant), Michele, Scott, and Susan. The Funding group periodically reviews the LAC budget and makes spending decisions regarding recurring expenses (e.g., peer review) and discrete expenditures (e.g., conferences, grants, etc.)
- Meta-Analysis – A new subcommittee introduced and led by Wayne in 2013-2014 charged with collecting data from the End-of-Year (EOY) assessment reports. Later in the meeting, Wayne presented highlights from the resulting meta-analysis.
- Phase II Task Force – A temporary committee initiated in 2013-2014, led by Sally, and joined by Gabe, Jamee, Lisa, Amara, and Michele. Initially, the group planned to look at the process for writing course-level outcomes and also revisit the mapping matrix, but the latter was sidelined to allow full focus on course outcomes and aspirational goals. It is particularly noteworthy that their work resulted in the creation of a new (optional) section on the CCOGs for aspirational goals. Sally and Gabe are putting the finishing touches on mock CCOGs that ultimately will be posted online as examples of “good” and “bad” CCOGs. It is unclear if this task force will continue this year and, if so, what its focus will be.
- Software Review – This subcommittee was put on hold last year, but Wayne said its time has come. It is inevitable that our accrediting agency will one day require us to document course-level assessments. We are assessing course outcomes already but there is no formal mechanism to organize or track the data. It will take a sophisticated software program to systematically enter, track, and retain assessment data from across the district and convert it to a usable format. A subcommittee is needed to evaluate the cost, ease of use for faculty and administration, and capabilities of existing software programs.

The conversation moved away from the committee aspect at this point and centered on the software itself. Wayne said it is critical that the system ultimately selected is one that facilitates assessment and learning and isn’t just an expensive repository of information. He said the Distance Learning department is working on this already and is positioned to take what PCC already is doing with D2L and take it to the next level.

Sally said it would be ideal if the software could communicate with CourseLeaf. Torie suggested that the ability to interface with D2L should be a priority. Gabe spoke to the need for software that addresses very diverse needs, giving as an example LaGuardia CC, which regularly assesses a handful of key courses and sends the artifacts to an internal evaluation team (with IDs removed) for scoring and data synthesis. To this, Wayne acknowledged that a product such as the one used in D2L might work better for LDC/DE and that CTE may need something different.

Thinking it prudent to give all products a thorough test drive before adoption, Marc asked if we would be granted a trial period. Sally said product trials are fairly standard these days—Leepfrog let us do that with CourseLeaf.

Chris has no issue with evaluating software programs, but he feels strongly that no implementation should occur across all sections until and unless NWCCU mandates it.

- Assessment Procedures Oversight (APO) – [This subcommittee was inadvertently and temporarily skipped. To keep like topics together, we have placed the notes for APO in this section, even though they chronologically happened later in the meeting.] This is a proposed subcommittee for 2014-2015. Wayne noted there hasn't been much oversight to date. Forms (e.g., reporting templates and peer review checklists) are developed by small groups or by the chair and vice-chair and sometimes put into circulation with little or no review or testing. This subcommittee would serve as the quality control branch of the LAC. The consensus: Yes, there is interest in having an oversight committee.

Marc suggested creating an assessment tutorial directed at new practitioners. The responsibility for assessment often is shouldered by new SAC chairs and/or new faculty who have no experience with it. A tutorial would go a long way to introduce the unique terminology of assessment, to explain why we do it, and to give some historic context to those who didn't get in on the ground floor of assessment at PCC.

Priscilla suggested restructuring SACs so there is a smooth transition from one chair to the next to avoid the situation Marc described. Others countered that while this might be the ideal, it is impractical for one-person SACs and isn't enforceable across the district.

LAC DISCUSSION

Core Outcomes

From NWCCU's website, Standard 4.A.3:

"The institution documents, through an effective, regular, and comprehensive system of assessment of student achievement, that students who complete its educational courses, programs, and degrees, wherever offered and however delivered, achieve identified course, program, and degree learning outcomes. Faculty with teaching responsibilities are responsible for evaluating student achievement of clearly identified learning outcomes."

LAC's biggest project this year is to tackle the issue of Core Outcomes. The current Core Outcomes were not adopted with assessment in mind. They are vaguely defined, offer no benchmarks by which to measure student attainment, and do not adequately serve PCC's assessment goals. By mid-spring, the LAC must:

- Determine what PCC values
- Establish a set of new and/or rewritten Core Outcomes
- Fix the mapping matrix and define benchmarks
- Submit to EAC, in advance of their May meeting, a recommendation as to what PCC's Core Outcomes should be

As Wayne sees it, we have four options:

1. Keep the current Core Outcomes (rewritten to be assessable)
2. Keep some or all of the current Core Outcomes and add some new ones
3. Adopt the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes and VALUE rubrics
4. Adopt a Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) framework

The strengths and weaknesses of all four options must be explored. LAC's quest is to come up with a meaningful and measurable set of Core Outcomes, and Wayne contends: "If we have to do a bunch of work, let's find a way to make it less painful. How can we integrate it into what we are already doing?"

The LAC can rely on the Integration Workgroup, comprised of members of the EAC, CC, DAC, APS, IE, and the LAC, to give viable and frank feedback throughout the process.

Meta-Analysis of 2013-2014 Data

Using something called meta-analysis, Wayne spent considerable hours last spring and summer crunching the data collected from the 2013-2014 End-of-Year assessment reports. It was the first time such information had been captured and analyzed, and he acknowledged the assistance of students from his psychology classes in extracting some of the data. Accompanied by a slide show, Wayne walked the committee through the highlights of the meta-analysis:

- attainment rates for identified benchmark levels
- opportunity for improvement of SAC-identified performance levels
- outcome attainment data*
- critical thinking attainment for LDC/DE disciplines (where available)
- recommendations coming out of the meta-analysis

*Wayne noted that caution must be taken in interpreting the attainment rate data. They "cannot be definitively interpreted as 'official' attainment rates, because...some SACs chose difficult-to-attain outcomes--others did not; and we cannot be sure how representative the report data are..."

The slideshow will be posted with the minutes at the LAC web page.

Next Meeting / Adjournment

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, November 21, followed by Chris Chairsell's annual gathering for members of the LAC.

This meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.