

LAC Minutes – Final

Friday, 10/07/2016, CLIMB 306, 1:00 to 3:00

Attendance:

Voting Members		Voting Members, cont.		Non-Voting Members	
Chris Brooks, Chair	X	Linda Paulson	X	Kendra Cawley	
Elizabeth Cole		Davina Ramirez	X	Sally Earl	
Marc Goodman	X	Laura Sanders	X	Anne Haberkern	
Allison Gross		Julianne Sandlin		Susan Wilson, Recorder	X
Dana Harker		Torie Scott	X		
Wayne Hooke, Vice-Chair	X	Thomas Songer	X	Today's Guests	
Jessica Johnson	X	Nora Stevens	X	d'Marie Carver, MTH	X
Hannah Love (on leave Fall 2016)		Ralf Youtz	X	Ann Su, WS	X
Charles Pace	X			Catherine Thomas, ESOL	X

Note: Minutes are sent to all of the individuals listed above, plus the VP of Academic Affairs, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness, and all past LAC chairs.

ACTION ITEMS

- See about getting funds for additional PT members (Chris)
- Request vote-by-email on meeting minutes from June 2016 (Chris)
- Convene the Membership Subcommittee to review and update LAC by-laws (Linda and Chris)

2016-17 KICK-OFF

In his first meeting as chair, Chris welcomed all in attendance. As part of an LAC recruitment effort, various members had invited interested colleagues to attend. Today's guests were: d'Marie Carver (Mathematics), Ann Su (Women's Studies), and Catherine Thomas (ESOL).

After introductions, Chris held up one of the laminated LAC Behavior Agreement cards and said he wanted to enforce the group's code of conduct this year to keep meetings orderly and respectful.

The LAC will meet monthly, at CLIMB, from October through June. FT council membership has dropped a bit in recent years, but because PT interest has grown, there is the new dilemma of how to pay adjunct faculty for their participation. Wayne noted that there are five PT slots per year, and the five earn \$250 at the end of each term (fall, winter, and spring) for attending and participating in LAC meetings. With the heightened emphasis on institutional assessment these days, it may be time to restructure the membership roster to allow more adjunct participation. Chris will research this and report back.

BUSINESS UPDATES

Minutes from June 2016

Due to a lack of quorum when the meeting began, Chris refrained from taking a vote to approve the minutes from June 2016. He will conduct a vote via email.

Plan for the Year

LAC assessment requirements for 2016-17: SACs must conduct one assessment project involving, or aligning to, a current Core Outcome or to an exploratory outcome of their choosing.

PCC is again participating in the Multi-State Collaborative (MSC). In this third year of the national assessment effort, the theme is Year of Refinement. The LAC encourages whole-SAC participation in the MSC, but individual faculty contributors are needed, too. Along with the MSC, PCC will do an internal

assessment as it has the past two years. The in-house project is valuable, because if and when MSC goes away, we will have the infrastructure in place to move forward independently. In addition, the internal scoring project is our working model of what a college-wide summative assessment approach might look like, as discussed later in the meeting.

In addition to collecting artifacts from students who have completed at least 75 percent of their first degree, this year MSC also will accept artifacts from students who have completed 0 to 22.5 quarter credits. This change is significant, because it means PCC will have more eligible artifacts to send forward to the national clearinghouse. In past years, many of the sections participating in MSC were subjects that attracted more freshmen and had relatively few students with 67+ quarter credits (75% of an associate's degree).

PCC will offer assignment design workshops for faculty interested in MSC. Last year's workshops spent less time on design and more time on artifact-submission logistics—so if Chris has his way, there will be greater focus on design this year.

Completion Investment Council (CIC) Update

The CIC is comprised of administrators, faculty, and staff tasked with increasing student retention and degree completion following the PCC Panther Path of "Prepare, Engage, Commit, Complete, and Thrive." Laura Sanders volunteered to be LAC's CIC representative in 2016-17. Chris accepted her offer and appointed her to the role this afternoon. Future LAC meetings will include monthly CIC updates.

Institutional Assessment Requirements

In advance of today's meeting, Chris prepared and distributed a brief document entitled, "Assessment: What We Have to Do." In it, he provided a bit of background surrounding the assessment expectations of our accrediting agency, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), and those of the State of Oregon (more specifically, the Joint Boards Articulation Committee—JBAC). At today's meeting he drew special attention to Standard 4.A.3. on page 2 of the document:

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.

Ahead of the meeting, he had also distributed JBAC's Appendix K, outlining the "Outcomes and Criteria for Transferable General Education Courses in Oregon."

These documents generated considerable discussion, much of which centered on the concept that assessment is obviously here to stay, so how do we rally the troops to get behind it? We definitely need a marketing plan, one that:

- Combats cynicism and evokes passion and commitment toward assessment
- Communicates the value of formative assessment ('improving teaching' being the bottom line)
- Builds in adequate assessment training and lead time for conducting assessments
- Will hold up in contract bargaining for faculty
- Includes increased incentives for participation (the carrot)
- Emphasizes what is at risk if we, as an institution, fail to adequately assess (the stick). Are we ready to turn the task of assessment over to sub-contractors? Are we ready for standardized assessments?

The idea of a marketing plan for assessment will be a returning theme this year.

LAC Coaches

It was pointed out that some assessment coaches are not members of the LAC. This is a concern for Chris and others on the council.

LAC DISCUSSION

Summative Assessment

Though the prior topic turned into more of a discussion than was originally intended, Chris had devoted the bulk of today's agenda to the topic of *Summative Assessment (SA)*.

It has been mentioned only briefly in past years at LAC, but the EAC/LAC Integration Workgroup has chewed on the concept of SA a bit more. One proposal is this: If SACs wish to teach courses that satisfy General Education, they must commit to regular and consistent assessment to ensure students have achieved institutional outcomes at the time of graduation.

Ideally, adoption of an all-in SA model would require an in-house method of assessment similar to PCC's Internal (MSC-like) Assessment Project. All Gen Ed sections would be expected to teach to a specific set of outcomes and would contribute artifacts to an internal pool. A sample of those artifacts would be scored by an assessment team comprised of PCC faculty using standardized yardsticks such as the LEAP VALUE rubrics or rubrics written in-house but based on the VALUE rubrics. For the process to be fully transparent, the institution would require that the rubrics be shared with faculty, coaches, and students in advance and that course outcomes would be mapped to Core Outcomes. SA has been found to encourage best practices across disciplines.

One of the CTE members observed that SA seemingly involves only the LDC-DE side of the house. Where does CTE fit in? Wayne said CTE still would be responsible for meeting Related Instruction requirements, but Chris noted that SA should release CTE from having to superficially assess the 'aligned' Core (where degree and certificate outcomes have been mapped to institutional outcomes). Plus, as another member observed, SA wouldn't make all other assessments go away—CTE still would assess focal outcomes—and course-level assessments would continue across the board.

Another member asked how SACs would 'close the loop' with SA; in other words, would the results of assessment be available at the course level or the SAC level to inform curricular improvements? Going back to the issue of faculty buy-in, she suggested that best practices need to originate from the SACs, not from the LAC.

Non-Standard Reports

This agenda topic was more of a preview of coming discussions. In the past couple of years, the LAC has received end-of-year assessment reports that do not follow the templates. SACs are doing really good work that is valuable to their disciplines even if the activities do not match LAC expectations. In respect to peer review, how do we provide meaningful feedback? Should these SACs be required to submit a proposal to the LAC before they launch a non-traditional project in lieu of their annual assessment?

By-Laws

The LAC by-laws approved in June 2012 are sorely out of date. Chris will be working with the LAC Membership Subcommittee this year to review and update the by-laws. Anyone interested in this project should contact Chris or Linda Paulson (chair of the subcommittee).

Meeting adjourned.