

LAC Meeting – Final

October 2, 2015

CLIMB 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

Attendance

Kendra, Nora, Wayne, Jessica Johnson (new member), Allison, Elizabeth Cole (new, needs to be voted in after the meeting), Ralf, Laura, Torie, Linda, Sally (recorder), Michele, Chris, Marc, Julianne, Dana

Looking for committee representation

Looking to recruit a member of LAC to represent the group at the CIC. They meet monthly Friday morning, 8:30-11:30. The meeting rotates campus each month. At the conclusion Dana Harker volunteered to be the LAC representative on the CIC. She will contact Michele for details.

Introductions

Went around the room to introduced new and returning members.

New members: Jessica Johnson, DE. Elizabeth Cole, SE, ESOL and IE--been here for 8 years, new assessment coach.

Minutes reviewed and approved

Chris proposed a change to approving the minutes: distribute minutes before meetings and have changes handled electronically. Final version to be voted on at the start of future LAC meetings. This method approved.

Standing committee update

The chair indicated we may need to review the structure of the LAC standing committees. Is this the best model for the type of work this committee does and will do in the future considering the changing climate of assessment and ongoing changes at PCC.

Update on task forces:

Assessment software. Anything we do now will require major effort to bring degree, certificate and course outcomes into a structure where data can be drawn from a functioning database. D2L programmers are looking to simplify the system for competencies and learning objectives tied to learning. It may be possible, depending upon the changes in D2L, we may be able to combine what that system can do for the larger requirement to acquire and assess assessment data. Note: Inter-rater reliability cannot be ensured when using the D2L assessment interface as the assessments are tied to a single course with a single instructor.

Core outcome task force: limited update

Forms Task Force

There is no anticipation to make major changes to the templates for 2015-16 assessment tasks. The group showed a hearty response to this news.

Ongoing assessment issues:

There is an ongoing problem of workload creep.

The LAC/EAC Integration Committee wants faculty to talk about core outcomes during this year of inquiry.

Accreditation update:

A current interpretation of the accreditation report indicates a concern about assessment workload, requiring the assessment of two outcomes each year. For this reason we have reduced the assessment expectation to one outcome for this year. This is also to encourage SACs to discuss and participate in the Gen Ed / Core Outcomes / Majors discussion occurring this year.

SACs are encouraged to explore alternate core outcomes this year, meaning they do not have to follow their multi-year plan. CTE must do one focal outcome and the summary section. SACs are encouraged to explore outcomes such as quantitative literacy and information literacy that are relevant to them but not a current PCC core outcome. Coaches: Core outcomes may be changing so encourage SACs to explore new core outcomes, we want faculty to feel a connection with core outcomes. In Year 4 (2018-2019 maybe?) the mid-cycle accreditation visit will focus on assessment.

PT and FT issues with assessment: Because this is a negotiating year it was not recommended that we ask for funds for PT.

General Education and Core Outcomes Review

EAC/LAC integration committee is tasked to manage the college wide process for looking at our current gen ed practice and models implemented at other colleges with the goal to determine what is best for our students. Facilitators representing the integration committee will travel to all the campuses to engage everyone in a conversation about gen ed and core outcomes. The LAC has several representatives on this committee: Wayne, Chris, Marc, Gabe, Michele, Sylvia, and Nora, as well as Kendra, Anne, Sally, and Susan. One reason for looking at gen ed was a result of the assessment data (data driven decision making). There is concern that the PCC system, in its distributed model, cannot guarantee that PCC students meet core outcomes through gen ed courses.

There is some thought that maybe the cost of getting on the gen ed requires strong assessment and alignment to college core outcomes, not currently an expectation. Maybe there is a single rubric used across subject areas which must be used if a course is on the Gen Ed list and aligns with college core outcomes.

The core outcomes have been around for about 17 years, there is some thought that maybe it's time to review them again. At PCC we use Gen ed courses to ensure students meet institutional outcomes. The assumption is that at the end of a student career (Associate Degree) at PCC they will meet all core outcomes. This is not demonstrable via our current system. Students have choices and they may choose courses which do not focus on a specific core outcome not covered in their CTE program.

There are core outcomes which many SACs have said they do not align with. The least aligned outcomes are self-reflection, cultural literacy, and community and environmental responsibility.

Big questions relating to core outcomes:

- To what degree do the faculty share the responsibility to share the core outcomes ensuring our graduates meet them?
- Who outside of PCC should be engaged in the gen ed/core outcome conversation? What do employers want to see of their employees from the college? Maybe use a focus group.
- To what degree are we expected to have institutional outcomes? Must we? There is no language in accreditation guidelines relating to institutional outcomes.
- Why do we need core outcomes? Because in our current model gen ed courses align to core outcomes and transfer degree outcomes.

Gen Ed/Core outcome review process notes

Need multiple options for collecting data/feedback from faculty, especially faculty who cannot attend the local f2f meetings. Find a way to engage PT faculty in the discussion.

College will be engaged in conversations about Majors at the same time as we are looking at gen ed. It's an ideal opportunity to use this advantage to design a model that the gen ed program and majors are used advantageously.

Goal for LAC for upcoming year.

1. Since there are no major mandates coming from administration we will focus on the college wide discussion relating to General Education review and core outcome review.
2. Possible goal for LAC this year, to look at potential core outcomes, make sure they are assessable, chew on them in a small group before they go to a larger group.

Bylaws

We may need an update to the bylaws because they do not reflect how the committee actually works. We are a living, growing council and the bylaws do not reflect such. The bylaws are written assuming we do the same work year after year, which has panned out to not be the case. Chris would like a review of the by-laws to

be a priority for the Membership Subcommittee this year. He will join Linda P. (subcommittee chair) and the other members in this effort. Once the revisions are ready, they will be presented to the LAC before going to the administration for approval.

To do

- Identify one or more skills/outcome that is relevant to you and want to ensure all students and constituents are being held responsible for, i.e. computational literacy, informational literacy, and do background work including looking at rubrics and talking with other faculty about their interests.
- What is your interest or point of view as it relates to core outcomes.
- As the process rolls out make sure we are aware of issues/or individuals who are not being represented.
- Someone needs to watch out for centers and their members make sure they are part of the conversation and are represented.