

LAC Minutes – Final

Friday, 5/31/19 – CLIMB

Attendance:

Voting Members		Voting Members, cont.		Non-Voting Members	
Chris Brooks, Vice-Chair	x	Jessica Martin	x	Kendra Cawley	x
Magda D'Angelis-Morris	x	Linda Paulson	x	Sally Earll	x
Marc Goodman	x	Davina Ramirez		Susan Wilson, recorder	x
Allison Gross		Sara Robertson			
Wayne Hooke	x	Julianne Sandlin	x		
G.D. Iyer	x	Torie Scott			
Troy Jesse		Thomas Songer		Today's Guests	
Jamee Kristen	x	Nora Stevens, Chair	x	Jean Mittelstaedt (WR)	x
Hannah Love		Delpha Thomas	x	Liz Rain-Griffith (BI)	x
Heather Lubay		Jacki Williams			
Juan Maldonado					

INTRODUCTIONS

For the benefit of today's guests, Nora asked for a round of introductions.

BUSINESS

LOA Session

Delpha, Magda, and Nora attended a recent Teaching Talks put on by the statewide Learning Outcomes Assessment group. The theme was Equity and Inclusion; the keynote speaker was from Salt Lake CC. LOA meets once or twice a quarter at venues around the state, and PCC has had a noticeable 'two-year' presence over the years given it's one of the few community colleges that attends the events.

Many colleges are struggling with the very same issues as PCC, including realigning General Education and improving assignment design. The keynote address spoke to setting up courses to promote equity, and the breakout workshops were all about sharing what others have done and how administration is helping faculty. A couple takeaways were these: Delpha learned that having someone with budget line authority on each committee helps to turn ideas into action. Magda said PCC is way ahead in assignment design efforts and that we are an example for the four-year schools. Nora said it helps that our efforts are faculty-driven and organic. Jamee suggested that the LAC explore ways to get PCC's work publicized.

Delpha said LOA employed the PechaKucha presentation format, which limits breakout speakers to six minutes and advances slides at prescribed intervals to keep a presenter on track. It is all about skipping the preamble and cutting right to the meat of a speaker's topic.

Peer Review 2019

Nora says she has eight reviewers ready to go. After explaining how peer review works, she said norming will occur June 24 and all of the reviews, including those of the four leads, will wrap up by August 1.

As discussed in previous meetings, this year's reviews will pilot what has been termed custom "SAC questions." With the college moving toward annual program reviews, Katy

and the deans want the SACs to reflect on their assessment efforts and connect them to the planning process. It is a way to formalize their plans for 'closing the loop.' The prompts would give SACs validation that people are really reading what they are submitting, and the SACs' responses would put more administrative eyes on assessment work. Nora and Chris met with Kendra earlier this year and came up with the idea of adding a prompt in the peer review feedback document. There will be one custom question posed to each SAC. It could be part of a commendation that asks how the SAC will sustain its good work, or a request for the SAC to elaborate on something the peer reviewers didn't understand. If a SAC doesn't submit an end-of-year report, its custom question would ask why that was the case. It is critical that the question provide enough context for someone who hasn't seen the whole report. Coaching the reviewers on how to frame these questions will be part of the peer review training process. Chris thinks the custom question could be added in the same block where the reviewers write their general comments now.

In fall 2019, for the pilot run, each SAC will send its response to the LAC mailbox, but once annual program review kicks in, the custom question will be embedded in the program review template itself. Kendra described what the annual template will look like and how it differs from the more comprehensive one used in the five-year review cycle. The plan is to give each SAC in September (beginning 2020?) a tailored template that has been pre-populated with discipline-relevant data in addition to the general questions and the custom one. Each SAC would complete and return its review document by the end of December. The management team would then be able to use the reports to inform budget planning for the year ahead.

Assessing Communication

After working with the Gen Ed groups, after forming the DSACs, and after identifying their outcomes--Integrative Learning for Arts & Letters; Quantitative Literacy for Science, Math & Computer Science; Social Analysis and Inquiry for Social Science; and Cultural Literacy (for the DSAC of the same name)—the outcome Communication hasn't found a home. Kendra explained that we piloted all four adopted outcomes this year, collecting over 875 unique artifacts borne from signature assignments that were aligned to the various rubrics.

Rather than letting Communication fall by the wayside, Kendra would like to leverage the artifacts in possession, and so she asked the LAC how they felt about assessing *writing across the curriculum*. We have assessed Written Communication using the LEAP VALUE rubric of the same name several times before, and while those artifacts were purposely aligned with the WC rubric, the two previous trainers (Susan and Jean) feel the papers collected for the DSAC work also could be measured against a modified version of the VALUE rubric. Kendra has the funds to hire 10 scorers this summer.

Susan and Jean, as prior WC scorers and trainers, fielded a few questions, and there was a bit of debate as to whether we should allow 0 or N/A scores (0, yes, because that's the precedent on the national scene; N/A no), and whether scorers should be able to see the assignments that produced the artifacts (no). Julianne asked if we are assessing writing or communication. This year, *written communication*, based on the artifacts we collected. There was further discussion about the pitfalls of writing across the curriculum, including the difficulty of embedding writing in some subjects or the varying expectations faculty have for writing quality even if they do not have time to teach it. Marc moved to recommend assessing Written Communication this summer using the VALUE rubric or some form thereof. The motion was seconded and approved.

Gen Ed Outcomes

The previous discussion prompted Chris to remind the group that the adopted outcomes are known as General Education Outcomes and that we need to refrain from calling them Core Outcomes.

2019-20 Priorities

- Evaluating/addressing results of spring and summer scoring, including inter-rater reliability
- Assignment design workshops
- Assisting in the General Education overhaul via GEARS
- Recruiting more members

The DSACs will meet for a half-day in the fall to look at their scoring results. Chris, having scored for Social Analysis and Inquiry, said while it wasn't a "labor of love," it wasn't too painful either. He found it easier than expected to score artifacts outside of his discipline. Marc scored for Quantitative Literacy and observed that this year's assignments were more closely aligned to the rubric. Jamee acknowledged that we should be able to identify exemplars from this year's batch, and that might allow us to move toward asynchronous scoring.

Vice-Chair

This was Chris's last meeting as vice-chair. He is passing the baton to Delpha for the year ahead.

Assessment Class

Nora secured a room a CLIMB for the fall assessment class. It will begin the second Friday of the term and meet weekly from 11:00 to 1:00, except for Thanksgiving Week.