

# LAC Minutes

Friday, 11/21/2014, CLIMB 306

Meeting: 1:30-3:30

## Attendance:

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

## ACTION ITEMS

- Susan: Send council members the link to the following web pages: LAC Home, LAC Agenda/Minutes/Handouts, and Policy S701 in the Academic Policies and Standards Handbook
- Susan: Send council members the results of the Subcommittee/Task Force sign ups
- Linda P: Extend invitation to Hannah Love
- Susan: Post Wayne's "Inter-rater Reliability" slideshow

## BUSINESS UPDATES

### Introductions

Attendance was light and most arrived late due to traffic issues, so the Chair skipped introductions.

### Minutes

The minutes from October 24 were approved with two revisions: 1.) Errant punctuation in the middle of page 2, noted by Lisa. 2.) A misstatement at the bottom of page 2 that said LaGuardia CC sent artifacts externally when their evaluation team is really internal, per Gabe.

### Membership Update

The Council welcomed Laura Sanders as its newest member. Laura wears many hats: PT English faculty, Community-Based Learning Faculty Coordinator at Southeast, and LAC coach.

Hannah Love, FT Philosophy at Rock Creek, has expressed interest in joining the LAC. Council members enthusiastically endorsed her candidacy, citing a desire to increase representation from Rock Creek. Linda P. will contact Hannah.

### LAC Subcommittees/Task Forces - Membership

While Wayne described their scope and purpose, Susan passed around sign-up sheets for the 2014-2015 LAC subcommittees. A thumbnail sketch of each appears in the next section along with names of those interested in joining.

- **Advisory Committee** (new standing committee) – Will provide guidance on these and other assessment-related items:
  - Recommendations for assessment guidelines if next contract does not provide funding for increased part-timer participation (At an EAC meeting it was mentioned that funding for higher education may increase, but maybe not to the extent needed to fund assessment activities. State-level funding is maxed out. If the dollars aren't there, how do we maximize our efforts without the luxury of paying adjunct instructors to assist?)
  - Recommendations for including/not including numbers/scores/specific items in SAC Peer Review feedback
  - Communication and education to improve faculty knowledge and understanding of assessment (A member wondered if Traci Fordham might assist with this—if only in a consulting capacity?)

While discussion wasn't anticipated in this part of the meeting, the bullet items above spurred some lively conversations. One member believes the LAC should take a firm position on the issue of funding and send a message that assessment simply cannot continue without adequate dollars. Along that theme, another member said a tiered approach might be effective:

With \$ level of funding, we can do this.

With \$\$ level of funding, we can do this and this.

With \$\$\$ level of funding, we can do this, this, and this. Etcetera.

Michele, Allison, Gabe, and Jamee expressed interest in this committee. A subcommittee chair will need to be elected.

- **Membership** (standing committee) – Manages the:
  - Roster of voting and non-voting members, liaisons, and support personnel
  - Recruitment of, nominations of, and invitations to prospective members
  - Orientation of new members
  - Revisions of by-laws, including an update to the list of standing subcommittees

Lisa indicated an interest in joining existing members Linda P. (chair), Doug, and Susan. Wayne and Michele, as LAC chair and vice-chair, attend meetings as needed.

- **Funding** (standing committee) – Oversees planned and discretionary expenditures from the LAC budget, including:
  - Peer Review stipends
  - Registration and travel expenses associated with assessment conferences
  - Course materials for the assessment classes held throughout the district
  - Grants for assessment-related projects

No new members signed on. Continuing on the committee are: Wayne, Michele, Scott, Kendra, Susan, and Sherry (Kendra's assistant).

- **Software Review** (task force) – This committee was moved to the front burner in 2014-2015 and will merge with an existing group of PCC managers from DL and IE who are preparing to evaluate a variety of online assessment management products from these vendors:
  - Desire2Learn (D2L)
  - ExamSoft
  - Taskstream
  - LiveText
  - eLumen
  - Argos

Julie would like to serve on this committee and Sally and Michele added their names as “maybes.” In an email following the meeting, Priscilla also asked to be added to this list. They would join Wayne, Marc Goodman (possible chair) and non-LAC members Steve Beining, Andy Freed, and Laura Massey.

- **Core Outcome Review** (new task force) – This subcommittee must accomplish an ambitious agenda by mid-spring 2015, detailed in the Discussion section below.

Chris B., Julianne, Sally, Michele, Laura, (and Shirlee post-meeting) signed on to this ad-hoc group.

Katie, Davina, and Torie are unassigned to subcommittees/task forces at this time.

On a related note, Linda P. mentioned the list of standing subcommittees in the current version of the LAC By-Laws is out of date. The Membership Committee will discuss this at their next meeting.

## **LAC DISCUSSION**

### Core Outcomes Review

As discussed at the October meeting, 2014-2015 is the year for reviewing PCC’s Core Outcomes, because all signs are pointing to the probability that PCC will be asked to provide evidence of course-level outcome attainment. If that happens, we want to make sure we have explored ways to do it that are organic and useful, which ties in with the efforts of the Software Review Committee. Faculty will retain control over the Core Outcomes model used, but transparency to stakeholders will be essential. D2L-type software would be a way to enter and collect data for IE analysis—and see where we might be failing. By January 30, 2015, the task force and the EAC/LAC Integration Workgroup must:

- Familiarize themselves with the available options, which may include:
  - Keeping current outcomes—no changes
  - Keeping current outcomes and adding others
  - Adopting primary and secondary outcomes (aka ‘required’ and ‘optional’)
  - Going with a ‘smorgasbord’ approach (not recommended by Ron Baker in 2012)
  - Adopting the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes and VALUE rubrics
  - Adopting a Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) framework
- Identify strengths/weaknesses of each
- Create several distinct, rough draft options
- ‘Guess’ at how we might have to measure them
- Identify expected levels of performance
- Take PCC’s culture/values into account

- Ensure assessability of outcomes selected
- Ensure compatibility with Oregon JBAC standards
- Identify interest groups and those with insight/expertise to provide initial feedback

Communication, critical thinking/problem solving, and professional competency as outcomes are pretty traditional and more easily embraced. If there are areas ripe for debate when it comes to keeping or adopting core outcomes categories, Wayne thinks information literacy, quantitative literacy, cultural awareness, and environmental responsibility will prompt the most discussion.

Gabe mentioned that “Embedding and Assessing Cultural Awareness” is the theme of the professional development class to be offered this winter by the Center for Careers in Education.

Someone asked “How often do SACs have to assess course-level outcomes?” and Sally said Policy S701 in PCC’s Academic Policies and Standards Handbook addresses this. The policy pertains to SAC responsibilities in general. Susan said she would send the group a link to the policy.

Thus far, Wayne, Michele, Chris B., and Kendra from the LAC; Linda Fergusson-Kolmes (CC), Janeen Hull (DAC), and Sylvia Gray (EAC) are on the Integrated Workgroup task force assigned to look at the Core Outcomes. It is believed the smaller LAC task force could do some legwork of its own and ultimately pair up with the Integrated group to tackle the long to-do list.

#### Inter-rater Reliability

This topic was listed as an “if time allows” bonus, and Wayne ended the meeting with a slideshow titled, ‘Inter-rater Reliability—challenges affecting LAC assessment projects.’ Susan agreed to post the slideshow at the LAC Agendas/Minutes/Handouts page after the meeting.

In 29 slides, Wayne addressed:

- The purpose of inter-rater reliability (IRR)
- A basic model for calculating IRR
- Benchmarking IRR
- Generalizing the percent agreement calculation [a “mind blowing” segment that dispelled everything we thought we knew about rater agreement]
- Problems with the percent agreement statistic
- Optimizing the estimate of agreement for assessment

Suffice to say, few instructors, let alone SACs, have been calculating rater agreement correctly. More training is needed for LAC members, coaches, and faculty in general. Members not present at today’s meeting are encouraged to view the slideshow at the LAC web pages as a starting point.

Two questions that arose during Wayne’s presentation:

1. If raters are not in agreement in a norming session, should the LAC impose a way to handle this?
2. What steps might SACs take to resolve rater disagreement?

Michele is planning to create an Excel spreadsheet where SACs could input rater/artifact stats and the computer would calculate rater agreement. Julie, CAS instructor, offered to assist in its design.

#### Next Meeting / Adjournment

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 16. This meeting adjourned at 3:20 in order for the subcommittees to briefly convene if desired.