

# LAC Minutes – Final

Friday, 11/20/2015, CLIMB 306

Meeting: 1:30-3:30

## Attendance:

Chris Brooks, Vice-Chair	x	Dana Harker	x	Linda Reisser	
Kendra Cawley		Wayne Hooke, Chair	x	Laura Sanders	
Elizabeth Cole	x	Gabe Hunter-Bernstein		Julianne Sandlin	x
Sally Earll	x	Jessica Johnson	x	Torie Scott	
<i>Shirlee Geiger, Chair Emeritus</i>		Hannah Love	x	Doug Smith	
Marc Goodman	x	<i>Michele Marden, Chair Emeritus</i>		Nora Stevens	x
<i>Sylvia Gray, Chair Emeritus</i>		Charles Pace	x	Susan Wilson, Recorder	x
Allison Gross	x	Linda Paulson	x	Ralf Youtz	
Anne Haberkern		Davina Ramirez			
Guest: Thomas Songer	x				

## BUSINESS UPDATES

### Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves, including guest Thomas Songer from Math.

### Announcement

This year's learning assessment plans were due Monday, November 16. Susan said 51% of all SACs had turned in assessment plans for 2015-2016 as of November 20. LDC-DE submissions were standing at 60% and CTE at 45%, with new plans arriving daily.

### Minutes from Last Meeting

The corrected minutes from the meeting held October 2, 2015 were approved as presented.

## LAC DISCUSSION

### This Year's Priorities - Wayne

The EAC-LAC Integration Workgroup (comprised of leaders and members of the EAC, Curriculum Committee, Degrees and Certificates Committee, Academic Policies and Standards Committee, and the LAC) will continue leading conversations surrounding General Education, Core Outcomes, and Majors at PCC in 2015-2016. Looking at the assessability of options on the table will be a key task for the LAC this year; more on that later in the meeting.

### Multi-State Collaborative – Chris B.

2015-2016 is "Demonstration Year" for the Multi-State Collaborative (MSC). The goal of the MSC and for the group leading it (SHEEO--State Higher Education Executive Officers Association), is to see if collective assessment using standardized rubrics is effective and sustainable. The MSC project uses selected LEAP outcomes and VALUE rubrics from the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U).

2014-2015 was MSC's "Pilot Year," and PCC was one of several institutions from Oregon that submitted student artifacts for evaluation by AAC&U-trained raters. The College also conducted internal trainings and performed its own evaluations on a larger sample that included all PCC artifacts submitted to the national effort plus a matching quantity of artifacts that didn't meet MSC's criteria. Sociology was the only all-SAC participant in MSC and was, by far, the largest contributor, though individual faculty from many other SACs submitted artifacts.

Chris said PCC is seeking this year's MSC participants from the LAC and from last year's contributing group. Critical Thinking, Quantitative Literacy, and Written Communication remain the focal outcomes. Because last year's submissions for Critical Thinking were not wholly assessable using the VALUE rubric, Chris (and Jamee Kristen, Sociology) will lead workshops focused on assignment design. Workshop participants will earn a \$50 stipend and a free lunch. The same faculty will then give their students the MSC-designed assignment during the winter term, collect the assignments, and submit them electronically to Academic Affairs (the office leading MSC at PCC) at or after the end of winter term. Susan commented that using the D2L Dropbox as the artifact repository works especially well, but faculty also can send artifacts as individual Word or pdf documents. Chris will send the group a follow-up email with more details.

### LAC By-Laws

The LAC by-laws, modeled after the EAC's, have largely been unchanged in recent years and contain language that is no longer appropriate to and largely inflexible for the LAC. The Membership Subcommittee, led by Linda Paulson, is reviewing and rewriting the by-laws to make them more rule-oriented as opposed to process-oriented. By early winter, the subcommittee anticipates bringing the first round of revisions to the LAC for approval.

### Wayne's Big Question

"A checklist of pass/fail items provides more information than LEAP VALUE rubric ratings when 'plus one' scores are used. True or false?" That's the question Wayne posed to the group. "True" is the correct answer, as Wayne demonstrated with slides showing rubric-rated scores and how they stacked up to artifacts scored with a checklist. With MSC, a score is valid if two raters are within a point of each other on a given criterion (the 'plus one' factor), leading to greater ambiguity than when an artifact is judged by whether it has or doesn't have a particular element (pass/fail).

Different members shared their experience using rubrics. One individual said that even when a rubric is carefully aligned with a CCOG, it doesn't mean all raters will apply the rubric the same way. This situation makes norming sessions more challenging. Wayne contends that PCC is likely undertraining its normers in general. Norming is a difficult process that demands much more time that most departments can devote to the task.

MSC uses generic rubrics to score non-generic assignments. This was evident to Marc last year when he submitted student artifacts from a database programming class to MSC. Even though the assignment was mostly aligned to the generic Quantitative Literacy rubric, a rater unfamiliar with programming likely wouldn't render a score on a par with someone who teaches the subject.

Another flaw with rubrics is that they often come before the assignment. You're identifying where you want the student to be and setting the benchmark up front, then designing the assignment around it. And that assumes faculty know how to design course content to meet course outcomes, which not all faculty know how to do, according to one LAC member. It is not until assessment shows a lack of student achievement that departments or individual instructors see the need for changes in content and/or delivery. Sometimes, reassessment has to wait until the faculty have time to fix the holes and gaps.

Chris noted that we have to persist with assessment for accreditation, but he is concerned with the gap between the LAC, the coaches, and the faculty. Only five instructors signed up for this year's assessment class. PCC will not gain sufficient expertise in assessment if it cannot train greater numbers of faculty. Dana, who teaches part-time, said it is the adjunct faculty who especially need assessment training. LAC needs to target part-timers to get the word out about available assessment resources. Elizabeth suggested it might be time to create an online course geared toward faculty.

Sally mentioned an organization that has successfully used charettes to get things done quickly, and she suggested this approach might work for the LAC. A charrette involves an intense work session where people with expertise come together to finish a project in a short period of time.

#### Completion Investment Council (CIC)

Dana is on the CIC and is enjoying the experience, but her winter teaching schedule conflicts with the Council's meetings. She asked if anyone on the LAC would be willing to take her place—only temporarily! Nora volunteered.

#### Where to Put Our Energies This Year

After a short break, Wayne and Chris led the group in a brainstorming session to identify areas possibly impacted by the initiatives surrounding General Education, Core Outcomes, and Majors at PCC. To get the group started, Wayne put on the screen a short list of items he came up with before the meeting. Others were added and then individual members signed up to work on the areas that interested them. Chris sent the resulting Google document to the group following the meeting, and a much-edited list is excerpted below. LAC members are encouraged to access the list at <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-RmfZIKbBhQw2zpJl6PoEuestgamOyJomtZ4aKSGBs8/edit?ts=56549678> to add their names to the items they wish to work on this year as the need arises.

Marc suggested that the various task forces, if we wish to call them that, could meet a half hour ahead of each LAC meeting to touch base.

From Google Documents December 1, 2015 at 08:00:

- Course/Certificate/Degree assessment (summative) - Sally, Linda
- Assessment for improvement (formative) - Nora, Dana
- Outreach / communication to SACs / the college, Assessment terms / glossary (college-wide) - Marc, Dana, Susan, Torie
- Training for instructors - Jessica, Marc, Elizabeth, Torie, Gabe
- Coordination/Management of Assessment Issues - Wayne, Torie
- Structural Changes in LAC to respond to new assessment environment - Chris, Wayne, Dana, Linda, Hannah
- Part-time instructor issues - Elizabeth, Jessica, Laura
- Student Support Services Issues - Susan
- Outcomes/Mission Statement Compatibility/Coordination - Wayne
- Outcomes and Benchmarks at other Institutions - Julianne, Chris, Hannah, Charles
- Certification requirements (from the Feds, technical certs, other reporting requirements, etc.) -
- Ensure that assessments are meaningful - Allison, Marc, Sally
- State requirements (i.e. JTAC, etc.) - Chris, Charles
- Accreditation requirements - Chris, Charles
- Institutional Effectiveness - Torie
- Outside influences / bottom line / political pressures / performance-based funding - Dana, Hannah
- Assessment software - Marc, Elizabeth
- Meet the needs of BOTH CTE & LDC - Sally, Nora, Laura
- Impact on equity and inclusion - Allison, Jessica, Nora, Gabe

#### Adjournment

The regular meeting ended at 3:20, allowing time for the above groups to connect before leaving campus.