Welcome
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Educational Advisory Council
SAC Best Practices and Updated Resources Page
How to get your PT faculty paid for SAC In-service meetings
Professional Development Funds
New Placement Process starting soon
Integrated RD and WR courses
Update on Majors and Gen Ed Discussions
Assessment of Student Learning
Education Abroad – Faculty Led Programs
Credit for Prior Learning – Why, what, how and survey results

And then...off to Breakouts!
New (or returning after a break) SAC Chairs:

- Joe Urbina
- Felesia Otis
- Anders Rasmussen
- Josh Cary
- Mike Mackel
- Pat Semura
- Mary Schatz
- Mike Mostafavi
- Dan Dougherty
- Chris Jensen
- Jamie Rodrick
- Aubrey Baldwin

- Cynthia Killingsworth
- Marlene Eid
- Mark Andres
- Hilary Campbell
- Troy Jesse
- Rhianna Johnson
- Tanya Mead
- John Zackel

- Jim Parks
- Sarah Barrett
- Michael Meagher
- Lori Conover
- Adeline Stone
- Lee Collins
- Jan Underwood
- Walter Morales
Thank you to ALL SAC chairs!

We appreciate the work that you do, and your service to the college.
Welcome to our new Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs!

ELIZABETH LUNDY
Educational Advisory Council (EAC)
Chair: Sylvia Gray, History

Academic Policies and Standards Committee (APS)
- Pete Haberman, Mathematics

Curriculum Committee
- Jeremy Estrella, Communication Studies

Degrees and Certificates Committee (DAC)
- Eriks Puris, General Science

Student Development Committee (SDC)
- Wendy Palmer, Coordinator of Access Resources

Membership Committee
- Marlene Eid, Psychology

Advancement of Educators Committee (AEC)
- Jordan Durbin, Sociology
Your Curriculum Staff!

Jessica Morfin, Degree Audit & Transfer Specialist
Anne Haberkern, Director
Joy Killgore, Curriculum Specialist

Sally Earll, Curriculum Coordinator
Mandi Andersen, Office Assistant to the Director
Stacey Holland, Curriculum Systems Specialist
SAC Best Practices

• Federation negotiations resulted in formation of a “SAC Best Practices” Work Group
• Charged with looking at some of the issues that came forward from contract negotiations related to SAC chair workload. Absent additional compensation for SAC chairs, what could be developed to help SAC chairs be more effective and efficient in their work?

• Moe O’Connor
• Matt Stockton
• Alyson Lighthart
• Kendra Cawley
• Irene Guistini,
• Jen Piper
Recommendations

• Review and Redesign SAC Resources page to make it easier for people to find what they need.

• Develop an end of year “check in” survey to find out how the year went – any needing help for next year, etc.

• Convene SAC Chair focus group to inform both processes
Redesigned SAC Resources page

• From www.pcc.edu
  – Resources
  – Faculty and Staff (or All Resources)
  – Scroll down to “S”

http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/sac-resources/

Some helpful things:
• Checklist for SAC Chairs
• SAC Chair Duties and Responsibilities page
• Dept/SAC/SAC Chair/Admin Liaison
SAC Resources - General

SAC Minutes

SAC and Advisory Committee minutes are housed at PCC's wiki "Spaces." Faculty are inherent members of the SACs for which they teach and shall have access to their SAC's wiki page. Login to spaces.pcc.edu using the same user name and password associated with MyPCC account. Search for "SAC and Advisory Committee Minutes" under the "Committees" tab.

SAC Chair 101

New and existing SAC Chairs will find a wealth of resources in the subpages at the side bars and in the featured items linked below.

- SAC Chair's Checklist [pdf] - Printable checklist customized for SAC chairs, arranged chronologically for the academic year.
- Master List of SACs [pdf], chairs, administrative liaisons, and program review status.
- Tips, and Items Shared at In-Service Events:
EOY SAC Chair Check in Survey

• Mid June; 28 responses
• How did the SAC-year go for you/your SAC?
  – 19, Great or fine, 6 OK, 2 not so great
• Anything that went particularly well? (16)
  – Program review (7)
  – Curriculum work (2)
  – Assessment (2)
• Any problems? (12)
  – Too much to do, too little time; workload (4)
  – Getting everyone to meet/be on board with what needs to be done (3)
  – Others: Data, Funding, Dual Credit, Clarity
• Anything Academic Affairs can do to help?
  – Various – we are following up
HOW TO GET YOUR PT FACULTY PAID FOR ATTENDANCE AT SAC IN-SERVICE MEETINGS

SAC Chair and Friends, Fall 2016
Mona Smith
Click on the link to Submit

SAC_DAY_PAY_Sep2016
Dear Poppie the Panther,

Thank you for submitting your attendance for the In-Service week 1/2 Day SAC Meeting that you attended.

Your submission is being processed and upon verification, the required pay method will be submitted on your behalf to HR for stipend payment. We appreciate your patience as this process is not instantaneous and takes at least 2-4 pay periods for the stipend to show on your paycheck.

Thank you and have a great Fall Term!

Mona Smith  |  Executive Assistant to PCC District VP Academic Affairs/VP Student Affairs
Office of Academic and Student Affairs
Portland Community College  |  PO Box 19000  |  SY CC 222K  |  Portland, OR 97290-0090
671-722-4621  |  mona.smith@pcc.edu

#thinkPCOfirst
Hello Mona Smith,

As SAC chair, please take a moment to reply to this email to confirm the attendance of Poppie the Panther at the In-Service Week SAC 1/2 Day Meeting for the The Best SAC Ever SAC that occurred during the dates of 09/19/16 thru 9/23/16.

Please respond ASAP as pay for attendance will not be submitted until confirmation is received.

Thank you very much for your time!

Here's to a great start of the Fall term!

Mona Smith  |  Executive Assistant to PCC District VP Academic Affairs/VP Student Affairs
Office of Academic and Student Affairs
Portland Community College  |  PO Box 15000  |  SY CC 222K  |  Portland, OR 97200-0990
971-722-4621  |  mona.smith@pcc.edu
#thinkPCCfirst
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

SAC Chair and Friends, Fall 2016
Kurt Simonds

Link to the new POD pages here (Note: you will need to be in the intranet to open this. You can copy the URL, and then get into the intranet, then past into the browser window and it should come up. Or you can navigate to it from the Intranet index.

https://intranet-pcc-edu.view.pcc.edu/resources/professional-development/funding/
COMPASS GOING AWAY SOON!
• New Placement process:

• Multiple Measures
  – HS GPA and Course Grades within 7 years
  – Testing: ACCUPLACER (RD/WR) and ALEKS (MTH)
  – Advising

• For details, questions, concerns, discussion –
  – Breakout session with the leaders of the Placement Work Group:
    – Karen Paez, Tammy Billick, Karen Sanders
INTEGRATED READING/WRITING

SAC Chair and Friends, Fall 2016
Kurt Simonds and Curriculum Office
Reading-Writing and Math Reform

Kurt Simonds
Dean of Instruction
Cascade Campus
September, 2016
Timeline

• 2012 – DE Program Review → DE Task Force
• 2013 – Inservice Challenge – Uri Treisman
• 2014 – Oregon DE Redesign Work Group
• 2015 – COMPASS Phase-Out Announcement
• 2015-16 – Pilot Math Literacy Pathway (58/98) and Linked RD-WR 90 and RD-WR 115
• 2016 – COMPASS Phase Out
Progression through DE, ESOL, and GED to College-level Writing Classes

PCC is working to simplify its pathways and align its curricula to shorten the path to and improve results in college-level writing classes.
DE Task Force

• 1. Examine and recommend multiple measures for entry and exit point to DE in order to more accurately place students, align curriculum, and potentially accelerate student progress between ABE, developmental, precollege, and transfer levels. Work with ABE, ESOL, and Comp/Lit SACs to design measures.

• 2. Design and recommend a DE program based on PCC institutional research, instructional best practices, and experts in DE with a focus on student success and retention.

• 3. Create a district-wide single model for Student Learning Centers coordinated with DE, Writing, and other faculty and student support staff.
DE Task Force Members

- Faculty, Advisors, and Deans
- Comp-Lit, DE, ESOL, ABE
- All Four Campuses Represented
- Library and Disability Services
- Regular Updates to Comp-Lit and DE SACs
- Participation in DE Redesign Work Group
Integrated Reading and Writing (IRW)

- IRW 1

- IRW 9
Intended Outcomes for IRW 90:

**Rhetorical Knowledge**
- 1. Read to understand main ideas, supporting details, and a writer’s purpose in a variety of texts.

**Critical Thinking**
- 2. Use composing and reading strategies for comprehension.
- 3. Use reading strategies to write coherent texts that develop ideas in support of a central idea.

**Conventions**
- 4. Use writing conventions (content, form, format) to communicate the writer’s ideas.
- 5. Develop strategies to enhance and diversify knowledge of vocabulary

**Process**
- 6. Develop a process to access information in textbooks and other reference texts.
- 7. Learn flexible strategies for pre-reading, reading, reviewing, rereading, correcting comprehension, drafting, revising, and editing.
Intended Outcomes for IRW 115:

Rhetorical Knowledge
• 1. Read to understand the use of rhetorical concepts (situation, audience, purpose, argument, inquiry, voice, tone, formality, & design)

Critical Thinking:
• 2. Use composing and reading strategies for inquiry, comprehension, and critical thinking.
• 3. Practice locating, evaluating and using information effectively and ethically to construct a line of inquiry and encourage intellectual curiosity.
• 4. Use reading strategies to compose texts that integrate the writer’s ideas with appropriate sources in support of a central idea.

Conventions:
• 5. Use writing conventions (content, form, format, citation) to meet the expectations of diverse audiences.

Process:
• 6. Develop flexible strategies for pre-reading, reading, reviewing, rereading, correcting comprehension, drafting, revising, and editing.
# Implementation Team:

SAC Chairs, Faculty Department Chairs, Division Deans – all 4 campuses

## Reading / Writing CRN's - Fall Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RD 90</th>
<th>WR 90</th>
<th>RD 115</th>
<th>WR 115</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IRW 90 & IRW 115 Implementation Fall 2017

• IRW courses will **automatically become alternatives** for any course or degree/certificate that currently has RD/WR 90 or RD/WR 115 as a prerequisite or as a degree/certificate requirement, **UNLESS SAC wishes to opt out**

• Will **NOT** add any new credits or requirements for students. It just means that students will have two ways to meet their requirement for reading/writing; by taking the separate RD and WR courses, or by taking the parallel IRW course.

• **Process for opt out will be finalized in late October (prior to SAC day)** and sent to all SAC Chairs with affected courses, degrees and certificates. SACs who wish to opt out for 17-18 will need to submit opt out request at January 2017 Curriculum Committee meeting

• **SACS who do NOT wish to opt out do not need to do anything.** Without and out request, IRW 90 and IRW 115 will automatically be added to affected courses/degrees/certificates as alternatives, beginning in 17-18
UPDATE ON MAJORS AND GEN ED
Last year at this time.....

- Oregon Administrative Rule change allows CCs to officially offer subject area majors
- Interest from EAC and Learning Assessment Council members in looking at how well our General Education system is working
- LAC/EAC Leadership work group – charge from Vice President of Academic Affairs:
  - Study and make recommendations on these
Majors Work Group Summary

• Creating majors that ensure “Junior” standing within the major at multiple transfer institutions is problematic.

• The link between majors and increased completion has limited documentation.

• Many of the possible benefits of majors might equally well or more efficiently be met by other means (improved advising, faculty advising, greater student belonging, increased student support, general education reform, guided pathways, etc...).

• Design of majors should only occur after PCC resolves the ongoing inquiries into redesigning core outcomes, redesigning general education, advising review, and adopting a pathways model or not.

• Creating majors will require resources (staff and faculty time, systems, restructuring, advising, etc.) and so the college as a whole needs to look at all those pieces together.

• Therefore, the Majors Work Group feels it is premature to move forward with implementing majors until the above points are resolved.
BIG THANKS!

For all of the time, energy, assistance & input from all who participated in the Majors Work Group throughout the year!

Arlene McCashew
Emiliano Vega
Eriks Puris
Rachel Bridgewater
Lucinda Eshleman
Jeremy Estrella
Meredith Farkas
Emily Biskey
Gene Flores
Sally Earll

Usha Ramanujam
Sasha Grenier
Phil Christain
Ericka Goerling
Jon Kloetzi
Mike Farrell
Jessica Morfin
Kendra Cawley
Anne Haberkern
Linda Fergusson-Kolmes

Janeen Hull
General Education Year of Inquiry

– Needs for students in 21\textsuperscript{st} century re: Gen Ed
– How does our model measure up with others – what would it mean if we changed it?
– Are our Core Outcomes what we want them to be?
– How does our current approach to Gen Ed support development and mastery of the outcomes for students?
– How might state approval for majors at CCs affect general education at PCC?
And what we learned

• That this is complicated ("an unexpectedly challenging task") ... in several ways:
  • Many options for models
  • Many outcomes, with different levels of specificity
  • Many questions
  • Many concerns
  • Sometimes conflicting values
  • Different notions of what is important
  • New ideas: guided pathways choice architecture
Some things to consider...

• Student persistence and completion in college is much lower than we would hope.

• Student success is often framed entirely in terms of completion, with less emphasis on what has been learned.

• Gen Ed is often seen as something for students to “get out of the way” – by students, faculty and advisors.

• At PCC, we have Core Outcomes identified, but no certainty that we are systematically teaching them, let alone that all PCC Graduates achieve them (but we are expected to)
What is the relationship between General Education and our Core Outcomes?
PCC Gen Ed Philosophy Statement:

The faculty of Portland Community College affirms that a prime mission of the College is to aid in the development of educated citizens. Ideally, such citizens possess:

- understanding of their culture and how it relates to other cultures
- appreciation of history both from a global perspective and from a personal perspective, including an awareness of the role played by gender and by various cultures
- understanding of themselves and their natural and technological environments
- ability to reason qualitatively and quantitatively
- ability to conceptually organize experience and discern its meaning
- aesthetic and artistic values
- understanding the ethical and social requirements of responsible citizenship

Such endeavors are a lifelong undertaking. The General Education component of the associate’s degree programs represents a major part of the College’s commitment to that process.

New Gen Ed Courses must describe how they meet at least 4 of these 7 points
Statewide Discipline Studies Outcomes

Distribution List model of Gen Ed

- Courses for AAOT and ASOT Gen Ed (since 2010)
- Outcomes and Criteria developed for
- Foundation Courses
  - Writing (Includes Information Literacy)
  - Speech/Oral Communication
  - Mathematics
- Discipline Studies
  - Arts and Letters
  - Social Science
  - Science and Computer Science, and Mathematics
  - Cultural Literacy

Here is a link to these:

New Gen Ed Courses must show how they address the relevant statewide outcomes and criteria
PCC’s Core Outcomes

**Communication**: Communicate effectively by determining the purpose, audience and context of communication, and respond to feedback to improve clarity, coherence and effectiveness in workplace, community and academic pursuits.

**Community and Environmental Responsibility**: Apply scientific, cultural and political perspectives to natural and social systems and use an understanding of social change and social action to address the consequences of local and global human activity.

**Critical Thinking and Problem Solving**: Identify and investigate problems, evaluate information and its sources, and use appropriate methods of reasoning to develop creative and practical solutions to personal, professional and community issues.

**Cultural Awareness**: Use an understanding of the variations in human culture, perspectives and forms of expression to constructively address issues that arise out of cultural differences in the workplace and community

**Professional Competence**: Demonstrate and apply the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to enter and succeed in a defined profession or advanced academic program

**Self Reflection**: Assess, examine and reflect on one’s own academic skill, professional competence and personal beliefs and how these impact others.
• Core Outcomes are not explicitly linked to our Gen Ed Philosophy Statement or Discipline Studies outcomes, however

• Gen Ed is assumed to provide key opportunities for students to attain these outcomes

• The outcomes for the General/Transfer degrees (AAOT AS AGS) ARE the Core Outcomes

• NWCCU has moved in that direction as well, looking for evidence of assessment of Gen Ed Outcomes
Is there some opportunity here?

• Reevaluate our Core Outcomes?
  – In place for almost 20 years
  – Are there outcomes we don’t really embrace? (Should we claim we are doing something we cannot assess?)
  – Are there any outcomes we should be addressing but are not?
  – Do they reflect students need to be successful in life? (e.g., is broad integrative learning a value)

• Could restructuring Gen Ed allow us to both
  ✷ address those values in a more coherent way AND
  ✷ evaluate how well students are attaining the desired knowledge and skills?
Which leads us to ...

ASSESSMENT
Assessment Update 2016

(Or, how I learned to stop worrying and love assessment)
Why we do it: ACCREDITATION

4.A
Assessment
4.A.1 The institution engages in ongoing systematic collection and analysis of meaningful, assessable, and verifiable data—quantitative and/or qualitative, as appropriate to its indicators of achievement—as the basis for evaluating the accomplishment of its core theme objectives.

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.

4.A.6 The institution regularly reviews its assessment processes to ensure they appraise authentic achievements and yield meaningful results that lead to improvement.

4B
4.B.2 The institution uses the results of its assessment of student learning to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices that lead to enhancement of student learning achievements.
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.
Do we actually do that?

We do “formative assessment” - trying to improve teaching and learning - reasonably well with SAC-led assessment projects.

We do not do “summative assessment” - how well our students are achieving our core outcomes - in any kind of “regular and comprehensive” manner.
So...what do we do about it?

For what we already do:

• Get people to take the assessment class
• Work with your assessment coach

For what we need to do:

• Expect some changes - general education courses are *probably* going to require instructors to contribute student work for the purpose of summative assessment.
• Consider participating in the Multi-State Collaborative (Kendra will elaborate.)
On to the awards!

• Assessment awards were determined by peer review feedback and the maturity of assessment work this time, not just “perfect scores.”
MULTI-STATE COLLABORATIVE (MSC) TO ADVANCE LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT – YEAR 2 AND BEYOND?
• Started with the SHEEOs in 2012, based on two big concerns:
  – Completion agenda was “sucking all of the air out of the room” – is completion more important than learning ??
  – Employers were communicating concerns about university graduates and their ability to communicate, think critically, etc
Led to the question:
• Can we measure how we are doing with these key outcomes, in a way that is both authentic and meaningful, for both accountability and for improvement?

Which led to the project:
• Collect student work generated in regular courses across many disciplines
• Score against a common rubric for these big outcomes
• AND, do this across multiple institutions in multiple states:
LEAP Outcomes and VALUE Rubrics

— LEAP: Liberal Education Americas Promise
— VALUE: Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education
— Developed by faculty and vetted at >200 colleges and universities
Pilot Year 1 & "Demonstration" Year 2

- Y1 9 states; 29 CCs, 24 universities; 12 states Y2
- 75 samples/outcome/institution
- Students >75% of the way through their degree

How hard is this to do?

Can the data be meaningful?
   - What information do we need to find the data useful?
   - What is needed for us to have confidence in the results?

What value might it have?
   - What could we learn about student outcomes attainment?
   - What are the strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and challenges of this process of outcomes assessment?
For our part in the national project

- Started with interested faculty
- Worked on assignment design to ensure alignment with rubric
- Faculty gave us access to the assignments (all students in the course)
- Academic Affairs
  - redacted the artifacts to remove all identifying references.
  - ran banner reports to collect # credits and demographic information
  - created the artifact code that would allow the project to connect the artifact with the demographic information, but not student our instructor or course
  - uploaded the artifacts to the MSC project
Thank you to the PCC Faculty who submitted student work this year

- Alissa Leavitt, HE
- Chris Brooks, HST
- D. Alan Miles, CIS
- Dana Harker, WR
- Hannah Love, PHL
- Heather Mayer, HST
- Jamee Kristen, SOC
- Julianne Sandlin, ART
- Kim Smith, SOC
- Laura Sanders, WR
- Linda Fergusson-Kolmes, BI
- Marc Goodman, CIS
- Patrick Zwartjes, BI
- Rekha Rao, CIS

Qualifying artifacts:
- 54 for Written Communication
- 58 for Critical Thinking
- 59 for Quantitative Literacy
MSC Scorers were selected from participating colleges and universities

Our Scorers in the National Project:
- Shirlee Geiger – Critical Thinking
- Susan Wilson – Written Communication
- Nora Stevens – Quantitative Literacy
- Marc Goodman – Quantitative Literacy

- Attended 2-day national norming session in Kansas City
  - 2nd year scorers did an in-depth online refresher
- Scored artifacts for the MSC project
- Trained/normed PCC faculty for internal project
Learning to use the data

• There is a LOT of data to try to organize, and determine what differences are significant

• The project has been careful:
  – Last year there was NO state level data made available. Institutions got their own data, and national data (separated for 2-yr and 4-yr)
  – This year we might get state data, but no state-to-state comparisons will be

• Inter-rater reliability was not as good as they hoped, but not as bad as they feared.

• BUT – we can do this internally too....
Internal Project

• Our approach to assessment of Core Outcomes has been at the SAC level.
  – GREAT for formative, assessment – for improving teaching and learning
  – NOT-so great for assessment for accountability

• NWCCU has observed that there appears to be no college-wide agreement on what we expect of students, or how we figure out if they’ve learned it.

• Since we have all these nicely de-identified artifacts, can we use the same protocols address our own challenges in assessing the Core Outcomes?
Leveraging the MSC work at PCC:

– Our faculty, normed by our national scorers, can score the same artifacts as were sent forward.
– Look at additional artifacts – students w/ < 24 credits?
– Investigate inter-rater reliability?
– Increase faculty experience in this kind of assessment
– What would make this approach meaningful for us?
– Get the data, learn how to best interpret it.
– Also – can we do it? What does it take? How many artifacts do we need to do, and do we have the capacity?
# Internal Project Trainers & Scorers

## Critical Thinking
- Martha Bailey
- Shirlee Geiger
- Carly Clark
- Debra Cozzoli
- Magda D'Angelis-Morris
- Andrea Hills
- Bob Kingston
- Estefania Llaneza Garcia
- Hannah Love
- Beth Manhat
- Marie McGhee
- Sasa Miljevich
- Martin Wittenberg
- Choikam Yip

## Quantitative Literacy
- Nora Stevens
- Marc Goodman
- Bonnie Altus
- dMarie Carver
- Jarrod Dunham
- Sasha Grenier
- Jamalieh Haley
- Cara Lee
- Esther Loanzon
- Minoo Marashi
- Alexie McNerthney
- Ann Su
- George Zamzow
- Barbara Zuercher

## Written Communication
- Dana Harker
- Susan Wilson
- Andrew Butz
- Kris Fink
- Benjamin Foster
- Sonja Grove
- Jessica Johnson
- Tara Larsen
- Heather Mayer
- Jean Mittelstaedt
- Kirk Perry
- Laura Sanders
- Torie Scott
- Leora Troper
A first brief look at this Year’s Data...
Written Communication
PCC scoring of our students’ work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># credits</th>
<th>&gt;67 (n = 61)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context and Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre &amp; Disciplinary Convention</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Where would we like our students to be?
- Is the average misleading? Is it more useful to see how many of each score?
- If we established a benchmark, we could score differently: meets/does not meet; would that be more informative?
Written Communication
PCC scoring of our students’ work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># credits</th>
<th>0-16 (n = 60)</th>
<th>&gt;67 (n = 61)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context and Purpose</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Development</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre &amp; Disciplinary Convention</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uh oh. Wonder what this means?
Critical Thinking
PCC scoring of our students’ work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># credits:</th>
<th>0-1 (n = 29)</th>
<th>13-28 (n = 34)</th>
<th>66-80 (n = 30)</th>
<th>81-156 N = 34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Issues</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context and Assumptions</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s Position</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hmm… what differences are statistically significant?
## Quantitative Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># CR</th>
<th>1 – 25 (n = 26)</th>
<th>26-55 (n=24)</th>
<th>56-79 (n=23)</th>
<th>81-226 (n=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Quantitative Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># CR</th>
<th>1 – 25 (n = 26)</th>
<th>26-55 (n=24)</th>
<th>56-79 (n=23)</th>
<th>81-226 (n=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seems worth further exploration

• More faculty/sections to get more representative population
  – We can get reasonable data assessing 150 artifacts
  – It would be good for us to learn how to sample

• Our scorers have unique insight into the usability of rubrics, VALUE in particular
  – What we might expect for our students?
  – Are there any problematic elements?
  – What might we tweak to make these more useful for us, or should we use different ones altogether?

• SAC Project?
SACs can also score, to compare to PCC faculty scoring

NOTE: Statewide conference on Assignment Design in October – we can send 6 faculty – contact Chris Brooks or me.
SAC Chair and Friends, Fall 2016

EDUCATION ABROAD
Office of Education Abroad

• We have one!!!
  – Anne Frey, Manager of Education Abroad
  – Ali Garfinkle, Education Abroad Specialist
  – Cascade TH 116

• Focus on
  – Supporting students who wish to study abroad
    • Options, scholarship advising and assistance
  – Facilitating the development and execution of Short term Faculty-led programs
• Ed Abroad Office:
  – Application materials for proposals.
  – Review proposals for viability
  – Assist faculty in developing applications for committee review
  – Faculty Handbook (on the website)

• Ed Abroad Workshops for faculty – required
  – Friday, October 7, 8:00 – 3:00, CA TEB 113 & 116
  – Friday, January 27, 8:00 – 3:00, Location TBA (for 2019 and later)
  – Description and outline of proposal and approval process (including timeline)
  – Working with providers -- who will be present!
• Ed Abroad Review Committee
  – Voting members all faculty; Chair: Morgan Lindberg
  – Developing principles and criteria for PCC faculty led programs
  – Supported by Ed Abroad Staff
  – Reviews proposals and makes recommendations for approval

• “Call for Proposals” for Programs to run Spring-Fall 2018 will be October – December 2016

• First cycle for proposal/approval of faculty-led programs was completed Spring 2016. Ready to recruit students now to run Spring or Summer 2017
Programs for Summer 2017

COSTA RICA
  BI 200B Principles of Ecology, Sandy Neps

TOKYO, JAPAN
  PS/SOC 211 Peace and Conflict, Doug Byrd

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
  SPA 203 Spanish (capstone), Dawn Stanfield

TANZANIA
  BI 200B Principles of Ecology, Lynn Larsen

LONDON, ENGLAND and PARIS FRANCE
  ID 122 & 123 History of Furniture, Amanda Davis

LIMA, COUSCO and MACHU PICCHU, PERU
  COMM 140 Intercultural Communication, Teela Foxworth
CREDIT FOR PRIOR LEARNING
Spring 2016
SAC SURVEY on CPL

• Sent to SAC chairs to answer, to delegate or offer to all SAC members
• Queried current practice, knowledge interest, concerns, questions.
• One of the questions:
“I would be interested to know the biggest advantages of and primary motivations driving CPL”

• Cost and time to degree
  – If students have achieved college level knowledge and skills through other means, and it could be recognized it would help them complete their degrees sooner

• Public interest (and thus, legislative interest)
  – in cost/time to degree, and applicability of experience to college credit.

• Note:
  – FTE is not a motivator for us – we don’t get FTE for CPL
  – Tuition is not a motivator for us – we are expected to NOT charge full tuition, but to set fees based on real costs
Legislative Background

• **House Bill 4059 (2012)** directed the HECC to report to the Oregon Legislative Assembly on Credit for Prior Learning (CPL), and with identified goals:
  – increasing the in number and type of credits that could be awarded for prior learning
  – Development of transparent polices and practices for awarding CPL
  – Improving prior learning assessment practices for CPL
  – Creation of tools to develop faculty and staff knowledge
  – Navigating transferability of CPL

• The Committee met in the fall of 2012 recommended beginning with additional analysis, planning and coordination in the next year to identify:
  • the current landscape for awarding credit for prior learning;
  • the policies and practices than can be developed to ensure consistency
  • the factors that may encourage and deter students from seeking CPL.
  – PCC input: Craig Kolins was the CC representative on and co-chair of the committee; JBAC was a working resource for the committee

• The committee developed standards that were approved by the HECC in 2014, for implementation in 2015-16
Oregon Credit for Prior Learning Standards
Adopted by the Oregon Higher Education Coordinating Commission
May 8, 2014

Summary of Standards:

1. Develop intuitional polices/procedures to ensure that credit is awarded only for high quality college-level competencies, for courses approved by institutional curriculum approval process, and directly applicable to degree or certificate requirements. Develop a cross-functional Leadership Team to guide this work.
# PCC’s CPL Leadership Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kendra Cawley</td>
<td>Dean of Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammi Billick</td>
<td>Dean of Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Kolins</td>
<td>Dean of Instruction, Southeast Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Goldberg</td>
<td>Assoc VP Workforce and Community Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Benson</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Haberkern</td>
<td>Director of Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Wilson</td>
<td>Bursar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traci Boyle</td>
<td>Manager Professional and Organizational Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Massey</td>
<td>Director of Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Tillery</td>
<td>Division Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al McQuarters</td>
<td>Division Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Haberman</td>
<td>EAC Academic Policies and Standards Committee Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Estrella</td>
<td>LDC FDC, Curriculum Committee Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Lindsey</td>
<td>CTE FDC, Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Kraft</td>
<td>CTE FDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Stiffler</td>
<td>Non Trad Credit Processor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff DeMott</td>
<td>Veterans Service Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Murphy</td>
<td>Perkins Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HECC Credit for Prior Learning Standards, cont.

2 Provide a guided process to assess student learning and provide the required evidence for awarding credit.

– Evidence shall be evaluated by appropriately qualified teaching faculty

– Credit awarded must be based on sufficient evidence provided by the
  • student,
  • institution (such as challenge exams, performance based assessment, portfolio evaluation or industry certifications) and/or
  • an outside entity (e.g., ACE, CAEL, CLEP etc.)
3 Make tuition and fees for CPL transparent and accessible, and based on the real costs of (including faculty workload) of evaluating work for CPL

4 Identify CPL credit as such on the transcript. Work with receiving intuitions to promote transferability of CPL.

5 Collect and report data on the types of CPL awarded.

6 Have a policy and plan for faculty and staff development for CPL

7 Conduct ongoing evaluations of institutional CPL policies and practices, and of student performance in subsequent, to be submitted to the HECC.

8 Clearly communicate CPL policies and expectations in the college catalog and electronically
Leadership Team 2016-2017

• Establish website for CPL

• Work with SACs currently offering CPL to get categories and processes currently in place clearly outlined

• Develop consistent and fair practices for workload and compensation related to Prior Learning Assessment (PLA)

• Establish appropriate fees for all forms of CPL, including those that require active PLA by faculty

• Connect with SACs interested in offering CPL identify resources needed.
# Types of Transfer and CPL Credit

and current/proposed practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Degree seeking students:</th>
<th>Evaluation by</th>
<th>Recomm Fees for Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses from Regionally Accredited Institutions</td>
<td>Evaluated upon receipt of official transcript</td>
<td>SR determines LDC equivalencies; FDCs for CTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement/Int’l Baccalaureate</td>
<td>Evaluated upon receipt of official scores</td>
<td>Cut scores/credit amount HECC; SAC chair determines equivalences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP/DANTES</td>
<td>Evaluated upon receipt of official scores</td>
<td>Cut scores, credit amount and equivalencies by SAC chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-regionally accredited post secondary institutions</td>
<td>SR route official transcript &amp; signed request to SAC Chair</td>
<td>All equivalencies determined by SAC Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Services Transcript - Courses</td>
<td>JST coursework evaluated upon receipt</td>
<td>SR determines LDC equivalencies; FDCs for CTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Services Transcript - Occupations</td>
<td>For occupations that have an ACE credit recommendation</td>
<td>SAC Chair determines LDC equivalencies; FDCs for CTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE Recommended, Non-military</td>
<td>Student submits CPL form along with official scores</td>
<td>SAC Chair determines LDC equivalencies; FDCs for CTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry certification/Professional Licensure</td>
<td>Student submits CPL form and docs to SR, SR to FDC</td>
<td>FDC determines equivalencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house Challenge Exam/demonstration or portfolio</td>
<td>Student submits CPL form and fee to Student Accts</td>
<td>Student works with FDC for exam or evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SURVEY RESULTS

• The information will help the Leadership Team
  – Identify what is being done, so we can organize the website by current practice
  – Follow up with SACs that are SACs interested in offering CPL to determine needs
• In case you are a little bit curious......
Results of CPL Survey Spring 2016

5. Is your SAC already offering Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) (e.g., Course Challenge, Challenge exam etc)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No, but we are interested</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No, and we are not interested</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

("No and not interested" skips to question 9)

Note: at least one response from nearly every SAC (78/83). Some SACs have >1 response.
Is there a Difference in Career Tech vs. Lower Division Collegiate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CTE (47)</th>
<th>LDC (28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, but interested</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, and not interested</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Does not include duplicate responses from one SAC in the same category
  - There were 3 responses from ENGR, all “No, not interested”, counted as 1

- Did count in more than one category in some cases
  - There were 4 responses from WL, 3, interested, 1 not; counted as 1 Interested and 1 not
    (difference seems to be by Language)

- Mostly consistent, but a few SACs seemed split between interested and not.
What methods are in use?

6. If you are offering CPL, what methods of assessment are currently in use for your SAC (please check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Challenge exam</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Portfolio evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Performance evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ACE-recommended credits (e.g., military, CLEP)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Credit for certification or licensure</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other (please identify/describe briefly)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Not offering CPL at this time</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. IF you are NOT offering CPL but are interested in doing so, or are interested in expanding your current practice, what methods would you be looking at (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Challenge exam</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Portfolio evaluation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Performance evaluation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ACE-recommended (e.g., military, CLEP)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Credit for established certification or licensure</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other (please describe briefly)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Not sure yet, but would like to consider</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If your SAC is not offering CPL, what is the main/secondary reason?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Main Reason</th>
<th>Secondary Reason</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students don’t request it</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are not sure how to create consistent practice around CPL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation for evaluating student work is uncertain or unavailable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty in our program/discipline are not in favor of offering CPL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here are some of the other reasons:

- External accreditation requirements
- Seems like we don’t have time to think about cool things, let alone discuss them. We are very busy. But I for one advocate for more CPL, if its thought out, useful to students and our profession
- We want students to take our classes
- It’s just never been done
- It’s just never been something we tried to tackle as a department because of all the unknowns & uncertainties
- Its our intention that all of our students graduate with the same technical core which can only be consistent by taking the courses.
- Our courses need to transfer so we encourage student to take up challenge with their transfer university
- I’m not actually against it, but I get the distinct feeling that others are
- I don’t think it’s a good idea for our program or our students
- We do allow students to request placement into higher level courses on a case-by-case basis. It is always up to the individual instructor how to proceed with the process (whether or not to offer CPL or give challenge exam, etc.)
- Our department is too small, there is not enough time for faculty to do this additional evaluating work to offer CPL.
CPL: Concerns?

- I worry about maintaining standards, or letting standards slip to jury-rig completion.

- I have concerns that PCC hasn't encouraged and supported more CPL, which is especially important to older students with extensive learning from various forms of experience. CPL would enhance their ability to complete a Degree/Certificates, and make it more affordable.

- I am mainly concerned that the challenge exam (if adopted) is a fair measurement of each of the courses to be challenged -and- that a cutoff passing % could be reliably obtained.

- Workload.

- Seems like it would take a lot of work to create, vet, and maintain. Does this fall on the responsibility of individual instructors for a particular class or would it go to one person in the department?

- Consistent review over the years. Adequate documentation. Faculty review compensation.

- Personally, no, as long as there are some guidelines and guidance.
CPL: Questions? *(and some answers)*

- Is the feeling that each SAC or department would be free to develop its CPL according to the needs of its own students and faculty and the nature of its discipline? *Yes, absolutely.*

- Do we need permission before we do it? *Yes. The college needs to know that assessment is being done with appropriate accountability.*

- How are you going to give me release time to match the required time for CPL? *Compensation for evaluating student work is part of the plan.*

- Can we offer this for our pre-req classes required for our program? Biology, Math, Writing, ...etc? *A SAC cannot offer credit for a course in a different discipline (BI cannot recommend WR 115 credit, for example), but alternative to prerequisite requirements could be developed (assuming they are implemented consistently)*.

- Does PCC have any plans to structure Portfolio evaluation across several disciplines? *Seems like it would at least be good to provide a template, and professional development, so yes.. What would be helpful*?
THANKS FOR YOUR ATTENTION!

SNACKS AND BREAKOUT SESSIONS IN TCB BLDG