LAC Minutes
Friday, 4/17/2015, CLIMB 306
Meeting: 1:30-3:30

Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Brooks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Dana Harker</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Linda Reisser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra Cawley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wayne Hooke (Chair)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Julie Romey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Earll</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Gabe Hunter-Bernstein</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Lisa Rosenthal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirlee Geiger * LAC Chair Emeritus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Priscilla Loanzon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laura Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Goodman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Hannah Love</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Julianne Sandlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia Gray * LAC Chair Emeritus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Michele Marden (Vice-Chair, and today's recorder)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Torie Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Gross</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Linda Paulson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Doug Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Haberkern</td>
<td></td>
<td>Davina Ramirez</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Susan Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest: Elizabeth Cole</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Guest: Nora Stevens</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Guest: Ralf Youtz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTION ITEMS / HOMEWORK
- Send card to Lisa.
- Michele - share stuff thru email
- Chris - share stuff thru email (?)
- Members - consider the core outcomes and check out what is being done with the ones they like and want to keep (what will attainment look like? how will it be measured?)

BUSINESS

Bring-A-Friend Day
It was "bring a friend to LAC day." Introductions were given, including friends Elizabeth Cole, Nora Stevens, and Ralf Youtz.

Recorder and Timekeeper
Michele volunteered to take minutes in Susan’s absence. Sally offered to serve as timekeeper.
**LAC Member Update**

An update from Lisa R. was shared with the group. She had announced at the last meeting she was taking a medical leave this spring. Wayne, too, has been fighting his own medical battle in recent months. Cards for Lisa and Wayne were circulated with the heartfelt message: “We want both of you to return to full health!”

**I. Minutes from Last Meeting (Wayne)**

Two lines were deleted, there was a motion to pass, and all were in favor. (Insert Michele’s editorial comment here re Robert’s Rules.)

**II. Updates from Committees/Workgroups**

Summer Peer Review call for participation will come out soon. Participate!

- Chris updated on the Template/PT Review: PT survey was kiboshed. PT issues are a major point of discussion in contract negotiations, and we were informed that it would be likely that a PT survey from LAC would potentially result in consternation for SAC chairs, PT representatives, and others. Thus, we decided that discretion was the better part of valor and will seek to gather PT information as part of a more general end-of-year assessment survey.
- Feedback from coaches and last year’s peer reviewers will be consider. Chris and Michele will talk about this first (with focus on peer review SAC evaluation checklist). If needed, other members of the committee will be brought in (Gabe, Torie, Allison)

Linda updated Membership Subcommittee
- Guests, we hope you join!
- By-laws need updating, but this will be deferred to next year.

**III. Update on CIC (Michele)**

A handout was passed out that had the items with an ***

Reminder that CIC stand for Completion Investment Council. CIC is a group of faculty and admin that looks at completion/retention rates and how to improve them in order to proactively respond the emerging regional and national “completion agenda”; Current co-conveners Sylvia Gray, Chris Chairsell, Craig Kolins and someone filling in for Heather Lang

Last year CIC’s work was on “prepare” part of the Panther Path *** (Prepare, Engage, Commit, Complete, Thrive).

***A report was generated by the CIC. It was finalized early this year and presented to board. Went well. 4 themes of report:
1. Create clear pathways and transitions for all learners at every stage of their journey at PCC
2. Improve math and pre-college level course achievement and progression
3. Expand faculty and staff professional development that prioritizes learning and student success
4. Improve internal communication and collaboration throughout the organization
The report can be found on the Spaces page. Michele worked on #3. The hope continues that we eventually have professional
development that can support college work and lead to happier employees.

There has been discussion about how to connect our report to the strategic plan. There are still discussions on how to get info out to the
community.

This year the focus is on “engage”

We are reading AAC&U’s High Impact Practices (the booklet was passed around). This is ways to help students learn more deeply and
successfully.

March CIC meeting: Chris did presentation about upcoming accreditation highlighting the Core Themes. She praised LAC a lot. The focus
was remembering the scary rec we had back in 2010 for “hasten our progress” (PCC needed to demonstrate both that students who
complete their programs have “achieved the intended learning outcomes of degrees and certificates” and that assessment is used to
improve teaching and learning.)

The presentation also focused on the core themes and mission. NWCCU accreditation review is upcoming -- a big one (the 7 year). This is
4/27-4/29. The focus of this is to make sure the college is fulfilling mission goals and the 4 core themes. If you attend a part of the
accreditation visit, be ready for questions related to mission and themes. We currently have a recommendation from NWCCU on one of
the 4 themes: Quality Education.

April meeting was set for this morning, but was cancelled.

IV. Assessment Software Review Task Force Update (Marc)

We have three systems that don’t communicate well: Courseleaf (where course outcomes live), D2L (online learning management system
that is also used by some to support f2f classes), and Banner (where course grades live among a lot of other stuff). D2L gets students who
are enrolled from Banner. This is about it. Instructors have to manually enter grades from D2L to Banner.

The hope is to find a way to capture course outcomes. D2L seems to be the best of all the ones looked at so far as far as fitting into our IT
infrastructure the best. When grades for assignments are given in D2L for assessments it might be possible to capture student learning for
assessment without extra effort (or much extra effort). Example: If a paper is evaluated using a rubric that is also used for assessment,
faculty could enter rubric scores for students. If it is a quiz that is in D2L, certain questions could be pulled. If it is a quiz not in D2L, faculty
would have to enter the results of the selected questions from the quiz.

Major concern: It is too much to expect faculty to set this up. There would need to be a group of people who set it up and maintain it. The
curriculum committee sees about 20 changes per month for course outcomes on CCOGs (so around 100-120 per year). This is a lot to
maintain! Who would do it? LAC? D2L mentors? New group?
D2L claims that the next version is easier to deal with. We’ll see!

The minimum needed to make this work is have gradebook setup for faculty with rubrics, etc.

Discussion: If D2L is capturing what has been graded and is rolling it up, will instructors be “grading” the same? How can we keep this assessment and not grading? An assessment is different from getting a “B” on a quiz, test, or essay.

D2L might just be where we collect stuff. The papers could go into the dropbox to be pulled later, etc.

Benchmark levels of skill attainment could be set by SAC (competencies).

Assessment seems obvious and easy until one tries to do it! Will assessing outcomes turn into determining grades? Should a student pass a course who does not show “SAC agreed upon attainment” for all of the course outcomes? SACs view this differently -- and might view if differently for different courses within the SAC.

LAC founding principle: Keep faculty deeply involved in this work. We need to take care this is not lost.

Why are we doing this? Basically there is some worry that we are not meeting NWCCU Standard 4.A.3 for “student attainment of course outcomes.” So far we haven’t received a rec on this, but last visit, a team member asked about it. We want to be prepared for if/when we get a rec. Also, we should be concerned with how well students are doing with the course outcomes. Acting fast on this if a scary rec came our way could be really really really bad. There is no immediate intent to purchase software support, but we do need know what is out there in case we do need to act sooner rather than later. If we aren’t forced to act quickly, we could do an opt in program. Perhaps incentive it by skipping LAC reports for that year. Also, some SACs will be curious about student attainment of course outcomes and would like to have this data!

V. Update on State-wide Assessment Group (Michele)

A handout was passed out that had the items with an ***

PCC hosted Winter Quarter meeting (Linda Ferguson Kolmes and Marc Goodman attended).

This group didn’t have community college members until last year when Kendra joined. Now it has 3! This group was originally funded under the now defunct OEB. They hosted statewide teaching talks. Last year the teaching talk was on the Multi-State Collaborative and there were several participants from PCC. Currently teaching talks are on hold due to lack of $. Discussions are just beginning with the hope of eventually having funding from the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) that has replaced the OEB.
The group shares what is happening on their campuses around assessment. For some this includes the Multi-State Collaborative. Marc was able to get some good info and sharing about software -- other institutions are considering software support for collecting assessment too.

The chair is Donald Wolff (Interim Vice Provost, Professor of English, Eastern OR University). He did presentation at HECC on 4/2. HECC had expressed interest in measures like completion and how much $ a person earned 5 years after graduation. Presentation of LOA focused on Academic Quality (continuous improvement of teaching and learning, students demonstrating abilities with appropriate evidence, academic programs address areas that need improvement).

The presentation also included AAC&U’s 10 Academic Quality and Employability shared

***AAC&U’s National Employer Survey: The ten skills employers name as key to successful 21st century careers
1. The ability to work well in teams—especially with people different from yourself
2. An understanding of science and technology and how these subjects are used in real-world settings
3. The ability to write and speak well
4. The ability to think clearly about complex problems
5. The ability to analyze a problem to develop workable solutions
6. An understanding of global context in which work is now done
7. The ability to be creative and innovative in solving problems
8. The ability to apply knowledge and skills in new settings
9. The ability to understand numbers and statistics
10. A strong sense of ethics and integrity

Additionally, Donald gave examples of how High Impact Practices were being used at universities (but sadly no community colleges were represented):

***AAC&U’s High Impact Practices to maximize student learning
1. First-Year Seminars and Experiences - UO First-Year Interest Groups (FIGs)
2. Common Intellectual Experiences (General Education)- PSU University Studies
3. Learning Communities- OSU The Adventure Learning-Living Community
4. Writing Intensive Courses - EOU University Writing Requirement
6. Undergraduate Research - EOU Spring Symposium
7. Diversity and Global Learning - WOU Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment
8. Service Learning and Community-Based Learning - SOU Fall in the Field (Environmental Education)
9. Internships, and Capstone Courses and Projects – OIT,- Multiple Engineering Cooperative Program

After the presentation, one of the HECC’s commissioners asked the following: Does the high PT/FT ratio undermine academic quality?
<Short response: Yes. Donald reminded them that this is due to Oregon’s disinvestment in higher ed>

Other news from the LOA listserv:
April 9 HECC press release: Commission approves change in public university funding model to improve student outcomes (focus is degree and course completion and alignment with community colleges and college credit programs with OR high schools, and increased funding); Goes into effect 2015-17 with a 4 year transition period (degree completion funding is currently 2%; will be 20% in 2016 and eventually to 60%; currently 40% of students at OR public universities do not complete within 6 years). From press release, “by shifting to a three-year rolling average of course and degree completion, the model provides a greater emphasis on stability and predictability than the more volatile enrollment based system.”

Donald asked LOA members to consider what quality measures we would like -- HECC seems interested in continuing the conversation.

LAC Members requested that the HECC press release be forwarded and also the request for ideas around how quality might be measured.

VI. Quick Review of Bias in Assessment (Wayne)

Wayne revisited some data shown before, but now he was able to show the apps!

The more rigorous assessments focused on harder outcomes -- and there were lower scores.

Wayne looked for evidence of bias and it did show up in the less rigorous assessments (eg, smaller sample size had more variability). When there was a smaller sample size, when there wasn’t inter-rater reliability, when there wasn’t proper sampling to generate the sample, there was more “positive” results for student work.

Wayne did a meta analysis and showed what it looked like if the gaps were filled in.

Qualification: If the small sample was really a population, this wouldn’t show up in the analysis -- it might be ok. A smaller group of students might get more attention and learn better.

Question: Do SACs know the difference between sample and population in order to choose the right word on the form?

There is also the concern of faculty submitting best work instead of randomly selecting work and sending it forward.

<short break>

DISCUSSION

VII. Core Outcome Review Task Force Update and Work (Wayne)

Recap: LAC was asked to review core outcomes back in 2007. But… the group had other things to do. Now we are finally ready to do this.
There are concerns for each: Should we change it? Keep it? Who will make the call? LAC? other?

As much as possible, we need to align with required stuff have have to do: JBAC (gen ed requirement) and LEAP (OR is a LEAP state).

Chris Chairsell approved a general education review. This is good as the two are connected and we hope combining the two will lead to transparency as the discussion evolves. This gives us some time to think for the rest of the year what the pros/cons strengths/weakness are.

Our main focus should be: Is the outcome assessable. We also need to have the outcome level identified (students are expected to do X upon graduation).

If the college decides to keep Professional Competence, we need to have a rubric or some way to measure it.

JBAC (Joint Board Articulation Commission) is something we need to consider, but it isn’t written in outcome language. Also, it might be changing -- what if we align to what it is now and it changes??? Kendra is the chair.

Wayne’s mapping from Core to JBAC and LEAP is helpful to the discussion. Chris also did a quick search for what other OR institutions have for their core outcomes. Happy to discover that PCC is not alone in this craziness -- OR as a state is all over the place. Chris will share this research with the LAC members.

LEAP has horizontal and vertical alignment. The rubrics are designed to be modifiable and have been vetted. There is concern over inter-rater reliability for the rubrics. For Multi-State Collaborative, scorers are counted in “agreement” if they are 1 level apart (eg, 1 and 2 are same, 2 and 3 are same, 3 and 4 are same). Is this really ok?

Another concern: In the rubric there might be a criteria like “uses good sources.” This is very different for the discipline. PSY might expect something entirely different from another SAC.

Question: Does NWCCU and LEAP play together? Does NWCCU care about LEAP?

NWCCU is over the region, not just OR. Other states may not be LEAP states. NWCCU focus is to make sure the institution is doing what they claim to be doing --- whatever that is.

We need to see if we value the Core Outcomes (Community and Environmental Responsibility, Cultural Awareness). If we value it, we need to teach it and be ready to assess it deeply.