

LAC Minutes – Final

Friday, 3/16/2018, CLIMB 306

Attendance:

Voting Members		Voting Members, cont.		Non-Voting Members	
Chris Brooks, Chair	x	Beth Manhat		Kendra Cawley	
Marc Goodman	x	Linda Paulson		Sally Earll	
Allison Gross		Davina Ramirez		Susan Wilson, recorder	x
Dana Harker		Julianne Sandlin	x		
Wayne Hooke	x	Torie Scott		Today's Guests	
Troy Jesse	x	Thomas Songer		none	
Jamee Kristen	x	Nora Stevens, Vice Chair	x		
Matt Levy		Ann Su	x		
Hannah Love	x				

ACTION ITEMS (none)

BUSINESS

Slideshow for Faculty

Chris shared a PowerPoint he created for the EAC meeting next week that provides essential information about the proposed Gen Ed framework. He developed the slides with individual faculty in mind and did not intend them as a to-do list for SACs. Based on council members' input, Chris made some cosmetic and minor content changes to the document on the spot; he will send the finished version to the EAC chair. He is unable to attend the meeting himself.

Flagged for Later

While going through the slideshow, a few tangential concerns were raised. Chris asked that they be flagged in the minutes and saved for future discussion:

- Capacity for collecting artifacts – Susan noted that a new system for collecting artifacts will need to be devised once the college begins systematic sampling of Gen Ed courses. Susan no longer will be able to manage secondary access to D2L pages through her own account. Currently, all of the course pages to which she is given faculty mentor access pop up under “My Courses” on her landing page at D2L. Wayne suggested that Susan have a conversation with Andy Freed in Distance Education, as he has been tracking the discussion on college-wide assessment and is familiar with some of the products and online platforms that might be used for this purpose.
- Assignment evaluation – It is felt that the process of critiquing an assignment's effectiveness [for assessment] will need to be done by a committee familiar with the rubric to which it was theoretically aligned. When SACs apply to have courses added to the Gen Ed list, assignment evaluation should not be part of the course approval process.

Teaching Talks

Ann, Chris, Marc, and Nora attended the Teaching Talks conference in Corvallis on March 9. Of particular interest was a presentation by EOU's Vice-Provost for Academic Quality, Donald Wolff. EOU has a system for institutional assessment that features:

- Faculty-authored rubrics
- Established benchmarks
- A system for scoring artifacts using the rubrics
- Analysis of data and matching it to benchmarks
- Flagging criteria when results do not meet benchmarks
- Professional development for faculty that addresses un-met benchmarks/criteria, followed by re-assessment for improvement

The council members were intrigued by the idea of targeted professional development, and Chris said he would follow up with Donald to see how it works. Chris and Jamee mentioned that LBCC has days built-in every term for this type of faculty work.

Referencing a widely-shared article by David Eubanks that appeared in AALHE's conference program in fall 2017, Jamee said the author's premise is that access to assessment data is only part of a good system, that putting it to actual use and improving teaching practices is key. Citing an example by memory, she offered, "you might learn 30% of students are struggling, so if you tweak the course for that 30%, are you leaving the other 70% behind?"

As college-wide assessment moves forward and needs are identified, Ann suggested that all PT faculty need to be included in the training and need to be paid for attending. Chris concluded, adding that PCC's funding priorities are opaque to faculty.

Here, Wayne mentioned how conversations that started between himself, Michele Marden, and Sally Earll years ago led to the ultimate creation of the EAC-LAC workgroup. If we start now and have some ad-hoc groups come together to plan and request funding, we might have a workable system in place by the time we are ready to implement college-wide assessment.

Templates

On the screen, Chris walked the group through the latest versions of the planning and reporting templates. He said he is inclined to use one form for both CTE and for LDC-DE. Marc thought this would work fine, as long as skip-logic is added to the fillable online form (i.e., Is yours a CTE SAC? If yes, answer Questions X and Y; if no, skip to Question Z).

Suggestions for **Annual Assessment Planning** Template:

- Question 6: Ask if project will be a "direct or indirect" assessment of student work. Delete the second sentence.
- Question 7, which asks "In what term(s) will you collect student work?" might not be needed any more. Wayne said this old prompt served its purpose in the early years of assessment, as it forced SACs to think ahead and not leave assessment planning to the last minute.

Suggestions for **End-of-Year Reporting** Template:

- Question 7 on SAC Involvement: Delete from EOY and add a question in the Plan that asks "How were faculty (FT and PT) involved in your SAC's assessment?" If one group or another couldn't contribute artifacts, were they at least represented in the scoring process?"

Chris asked folks to send further suggestions his way. He said he and Nora would be meeting soon with Kendra to talk about the nuances of CTE assessment.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned around 2:15.