

LAC Minutes -- Final

Friday, 12/08/2017, CLIMB 305, 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 Earll	x
Marc Goodman	x	Julianne Sandlin	x	Susan Wilson	
Allison Gross		Torie Scott	x		
Dana Harker	x	Thomas Songer		Today's Guest	
Wayne Hooke	x	Nora Stevens, Vice Chair (today's recorder)	x	Beth Manhat (CH)	x
Troy Jesse	x	Ann Su			
Jamee Kristen	x	Ralf Youtz			
Matt Levy	x				
Hannah Love	x				

Acknowledge return of Dana Harker; introduce Beth Manhat.

Feedback from SAC chairs focused on two main areas:

- Compensation: most concerned that PT faculty be compensated for more than minimal involvement.
- Training: also concerned how to handle assignment design training

Chris predicts that assignment design training will be iterative and that there will be feedback on assignments as well as artifacts when student work is assessed.

Hannah noted that SAC chairs had trouble articulating how the assessment process was valuable, particularly in the classroom.

Wayne pointed out that early emphasis was on “low-hanging fruit”, things that were easy to assess, and that emphasis has not been altered, particularly with coaches.

Chris commented that many faculty in the assessment class commented that the inherent value of assessment had been hidden for them before the class. They asked why the LAC is not reaching out to the college to remind them of the value of assessment.

Expert Peer Review:

Starting this summer, we will use a core of people doing peer review. The hope is that this will mean more consistently meaningful feedback to SACs (currently reviews are widely divergent in quality). Chris thinks we could do quality peer review with 12-14 people. All should be well versed in assessment so that they can chew through the reports quickly. Estimated 8-9 reports per person (usually 60-ish reports submitted each year), a return to numbers of several years ago. This number of reports takes a while but summer is usually more flexible and \$500 is reasonable remuneration.

Discussion: Who should be chosen for this group? Only LAC members or chosen more broadly? LAC members would be more aware of college-wide issues. Few CTE faculty in LAC but could add to balance with several CTE faculty among experienced peer reviewers. Could ask all reviewers to join LAC but not make requisite to reviewing. Using existing peer reviewers should speed up training/norming process. Should CTE continue to only score CTE and LDC only LDC? Several members commented that they, as LDC, had scored CTE with no problems so that

limitation seems unnecessary. Removing this limitation eases the need for more CTE faculty to be part of peer review but number of CTE faculty should still be as high as possible.

In addition to SAC formative assessments, what about college-wide assessment (general education SACs/courses – grouped by discipline area)? Up to now, Multi-State Collaborative (MSC) has been run by Academic Affairs (Kendra and Susan) but LAC should be involved going forward. Who will score the artifacts? How will instructors receive feedback on assignments? How will rubrics be maintained/evolved? How should LAC assert its voice? Linda notes that if there is no coordination between “normal” assessments and gen-ed assessments, then maybe get different feedback voices when it comes to program review. Chris felt that the reviews will have different goals so they are likely to be different regardless but coordination is still sensible.

Jamee will be strongly involved in developing the rubrics and subsequent assignment design workshops. Kendra and Chris will attend as often as possible for continuity. Jamee noted that this work requires a lot (multiple meetings plus working on assignments) so it would be helpful to name the committees that will be developing rubrics so faculty can get credit for their faculty service. Maybe the committees could be integrated with the LAC. Chris agreed that linking the committees with the LAC would help to ameliorate the lack of discipline level subject expertise in peer review and college-wide assessment review. This expertise is very needed as we move forward with rubric and assignment design and feedback.

Jamee noted that 12 faculty worked will for designing the Cultural Literacy rubric and she hopes the groups for the rubric creation for the other three discipline areas will not be much larger.

Several members asked if they could attend the rubric design workshops as observers. Chris said he would ask Kendra but understood that there was a need to not overload the process.

Wayne commented on concerns with interrater reliability (IRR): his initial review of the data from last summer suggested 7 of 10 reviewers had agreement no better than chance but one was almost perfect. These data suggest it is particularly important to have a cadre of expert reviewers. Also, the rubric needs to resonate well with the discipline area and the assignment must be well-written to meet the rubric. Chris agreed that assignment design and feedback will have to be an iterative process.

It was noted that assignment design is the next big frontier in this change in the assessment process at PCC. Someone asked if courses that wanted to be on the Gen Ed would have to show the Curriculum Committee an assignment that fits the rubric. Do we anticipate pushback on vetting of assignments? Chris felt not because the feedback on assignments would be explicitly about their match to the rubric. The MSC did not include assignment review as part of the process so, why are we? Because our assessment is now all in-house so we can choose to assess the assignment as well as the artifacts.

Discussion of how artifacts will be scored. MSC wanted artifact to be scored separately from assignment, something PCC will likely want to do as well. Then scorer can look for evidence of each dimension/criterion independent of what the assignment asked. Assignments can be assessed and given feedback separately, after the artifacts are scored.

Jamee noted that the Gen Ed list may shrink when SACs are required to resubmit their courses through the Curriculum Committee and are required to provide assignments that meet the discipline area rubrics. Courses that have been on the list solely in the hopes of getting more enrollment may be reconsidered. This would ease up assessment and thus it may not be as cumbersome as peer review. Sally commented that many SACs have, in response to poor student results in assessments, decided they need to change their rubric. Now that they won't be able to change it, because it has to be acceptable to all discipline-area SACs, they will likely work more

on assignment design. Dana wanted to stress the importance of expertise in reviewers. Discussion of commonality of assignments. Some SACs may choose to impose a particular assignment on all sections of one course but many others will want to create their own assignments. Matt noted that his SAC would have a problem with different assignments as they would then question the validity of the artifacts produced. But, as others noted, we can't dictate that any topic will be taught identically, either, and current SAC assessment projects do not have common assignments. Another member noted that we do not have the authority to even enforce that faculty are teaching to the CCOGs, let alone any particular assignment. FT faculty maybe report to their deans and PT to chair but few teeth.

Wayne again noted that he is concerned about IRR as we go forward.

There was a concern that there could be a political problem if an individual instructor's assignment was singled out as a problem. Particularly "dangerous" to PT faculty.

One member asked if there was a "nirvana". Do we have a goal for what this looks like? Can we employ backward design to get there? Chris reiterated that training was highly important. Jamee worried that training might become no more than a series of videos, losing the value of meeting with colleagues. Marc was concerned that with feedback on assignments, not all faculty will be willing or able to do assignment design or revisions. A SAC-committee or expert could make the assignments to share. This would also help the feedback process to improve assignments. Needs to be some mechanism to vet assignments as courses get onto the Gen Ed list. Davina noted that there is a huge variety of SACs: some with many PT faculty, some with very few faculty, other differences. We will need different models to accommodate the diversity. Linda noted that we need to highlight how the process will benefit the SAC and/or how PT faculty will find their jobs easier. Marc mentioned that doing the assignment means you get full Gen Ed classes. Chris concluded by noting that we have a little while to decide on logistics for this initial summer run.

Chris noted that the LAC needs three new forms:

- A revised Peer Review form without points; only feedback
- A peer review form for college-wide assessment
- Simpler reporting templates for formative assessment, starting with Allison's work from last year.

Chris anticipates he and Nora work on these and return to the LAC for comments. All members found this acceptable.

How does college select artifacts for college-wide assessment? According to Chris, Kendra says "random choice". Wayne and Hannah hoped that choice would be based on students rather than courses. Would that mean classes usually peopled with students not typically assessed, like few credits, wouldn't have artifacts pulled? Chris noted that Kendra has been assessing both students with few credits and those nearing completion. Jamee noted that artifact selection needs to be always possible so people won't slack off because they know they can't be chosen that year. PSU does this in their assessment process. Dana was concerned about a poorly-on-boarded PT faculty member being surprised that their class was expected to provide artifacts. Jamee, noted that as a dept chair, she would have to ensure that faculty know their requirements for a particular course they are teaching. Providing sample assignments for dept chairs from different SACs would be very helpful. What happens if a course/instructor consistently does not have artifacts? If Academic Affairs isn't the direct supervisor, can the course be pulled from the Gen Ed list? Chris noted that Katy Ho is well aware of the process and that it will take a while. There will be higher up "teeth" to keep SACs compliant. This is another reason the LAC needs to be strongly involved. Wayne suggested that the LAC be the encouragement and admins be the teeth.

Who will ensure that faculty comply? SACs don't have authority over faculty. The only faculty with much to lose are PT without assignment rights or MYC. It doesn't make sense to put those most sensitive on the chopping block. The LAC has always emphasized that the peer review process is anonymous so it won't be a threat. We won't punish for how the assessment goes but we do have to ensure that the assessment happens in the first place. There should be less worry about enforcement than chairs educating faculty, especially PT, about Gen Ed assignments. As not all dept chairs are in the SACs of the faculty they oversee, the SAC needs to be the communication pathway. Eventually the process may become divorced from the SAC and put onto instructors and training. Need a taskforce with administrators to make a smooth transition.

Ongoing training: About 80% of faculty are PT – mostly without MYC. Given this diversity, PT need to go to paid trainings for assignment design. Kendra and Katy are worried about money for this training. Marc noted that in CS/CIS, most PT are handed a complete teaching shell. All other faculty disagreed! For their disciplines, they expect to either come in with a course they can adapt or write the course from their prior learning, using the CCOGs as a guide. Teaching is a labor of love and many resent being given an existing shell. The LAC needs to strongly encourage paid training to make this process viable. Chris noted that Katy Ho is already saying we need a central assessment office to coordinate assessment efforts across the district. She says she wants the LAC to still be strongly involved and acting as guides. Matt commented that the LAC will help SACs feel heard. There was a question why there is money for a new assessment office but not money for training. Chris asked why POD has not become involved with assessment and why can't we use them? Training is to match the assignment to the rubric. This could be for Gen Ed instructors and/or for SAC bodies that aid in improvement of assignments. In some SACs, there will be shared assignments; in other SACs, there could be embedded assignment experts. Further discussion of video training vs. live. Davina noted that we as educators know that multiple modalities would be most effective.

Meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.