

**PAC Meeting**  
**June 29, 2011**  
**1:00 pm**

**Attendees:** Dr. Richard Dawe, Dr. Mike DeLong, Joan Stirling, Tina Wheelis, Suellen Davidson, Trish Miller, Chris Lorch, Michael Orf, Scott Pinkston, Ruby Johnson, Kathryn Langston, Ron Helm, Nancy Dust

**Absent:** Holly Ayers

Joan opened the meeting with an overview of the purpose of the meeting for the day.

What is a learning college? Dr. DeLong provided a primer of information that defines the role of a Learning College. The focus is on what students learn versus what they are taught. This will require changes throughout the whole college, not just the classroom.

Everything has to do with learning. A Learning College places learning first and provides educational experiences for learners anyway, anyplace, anytime.

The Assessment Academy – came up with a four year plan at the academy – now we define the plan and implement the steps.

The plan starts from bottom and works up (course outcomes and go up from there):

Year 1 – educate everyone about what a learning college is and the parts that people will play, bring people in to talk about learning colleges, focus group, look at general education outcomes one or two outcomes at a time. Outcome mapping – ensure plan addresses outcomes

Year 2 – next general education outcomes, continuing education about learning college

Year 3 – next general education outcomes, continuing education about learning college

Year 4 – full implementation of general education outcomes and assessment model, continuing education about learning college

Dr. Dawe added comments –

There are some risks in this and I was cautious to embrace the learning college idea. Now, I have bought into it.

Peer institutions at the Assessment Academy were four- and two-year colleges. We seemed far ahead of many peers in assessment and establishing legitimate learning outcomes. We are doing a lot of things very well.

This will require culture change across the institution. A communication campaign must be established to get buy-in from people that will have an issue or view this as the "flavor of the month."

We need critical analysis at this time. Feel free to speak out and express your concerns and ideas.

Dr. DeLong – We will have an advisor/mentor and are requesting Cia Verschelden from our HLC team.  
Chris – What are you looking at for the course outcomes? Changing them all?

Dr. DeLong – No, we have some improvements to do but many of our outcomes are good.

Dr. Dawe noted that Holly helped us understand that by starting with course level first there would be less of a threat to having to redo all of the course outcomes.

Dr. DeLong – noted that the mapping will have been completed when the process is finished.

Ruby – What the student can do at the end of the course is the outcome – objectives are the things you do to get to the outcome. Want instructors to be part of this process...how to put this together to get the outcomes. We use the writing rubric that was approved by the college. We will use a presentation rubric for the nursing program. Not that we aren't doing the things already but we don't have them mapped.

Kathryn – It is common to look at the objectives of the textbook and use those on the syllabus – this is not the outcome for the course. What the student will be able to do when the class is complete is the outcome. For example all microcomputer applications instructors will get together to ensure that all outcomes are the same for this course.

Tina –That puts this in perspective for me. I understand the difference between outcomes and objectives now.

Scott – Ruby - How do you get there starting with the course. We want our nursing students to be able to do ABC at the institution level. If B is missing from the courses, you will not have it at the institutional level.

Michael – We don't know what we want from every program. I want my division to map my program outcomes back to my course outcomes.

Ruby – Assessment is not set in concrete...it changes through progressions.

Michael – We are saying our courses are more important than our programs.

Dr. DeLong – This is primarily for mapping purposes.

Michael – If the program outcomes are not good, then we are basing our course outcomes on bad program outcomes.

Chris – My concern with it is with the timeline – set the outcomes, implement the outcomes, assess the outcomes, then changes are needed based on the assessment. This takes a long time. This process looks quick and not long enough for good assessment.

Dr. DeLong – The concern with HLC is to have progress in the process.

Joan – We want it done well, not just pass over something and approve it to get it done.

Dr. DeLong – All of the courses make up the program. If we develop the course outcomes first, they should automatically fit into the program level outcome.

Joan – Maybe some areas will need to work in a different order; we do what needs to be done to get it right.

Michael – the general education outcomes are institutional and should be included in everything automatically, to me those should not be listed in individual programs, even though they are an expectation (an understood requirement).

AA Outcomes should be established before establishing the course objectives.

Chris - Instructors are more interested in their course level than program level.

Michael – I am comfortable with beginning with the course level if faculty understands that this is a rough draft that may change once program evaluation is complete.

Dr. Dawe – We don't want people to feel like their work was for nothing.

Dr. DeLong – We have to decide how to assess the outcomes of the program.

Michael – All the state cares about is completion. I get concerned when I reports that say college graduates can't do the job (such as in group work).

Trish – We have to reach the student with this. Students have to understand how these outcomes all tie together.

Dr. Dawe - Can we have the dialogue of program and courses as the same time; why does it have to be exclusive?

Ruby – Timelines will need to be flexible for different programs and courses.

Dr. Dawe - To map them, they must be integrated.

Dr. DeLong – Students ask us why do I have to take this course; the mapping will show the student what they will need/learn from the course. Outcomes must be measurable in the end.

Trish – We need to know for sure what the general education outcomes.

Michael – I propose that we change the name of general education outcomes to institutional level outcomes.

Review of institutional outcomes is scheduled for two per year.

Trish – Maybe we should have a meeting with the faculty as a whole and explain what is going on and the purpose of this.

Chris – In my mind, getting the faculty to buy in is most important. Doing the courses first will give them passion for the process. Program outcomes will not elicit as much passion.

Scott – If you were given the institutional outcomes would you tell us which courses helped meet these outcomes?

Joan asked if the English department could generalize the language outcome for the whole college.

Chris – Yes.

Dr. Dawe – Institutional outcomes are scheduled to take years to finalize according to our schedule. Maybe we should review them first.

Joan - As we come up with the outcomes, it is important that we determine how to assess it. Institutional outcomes have to come from faculty.

Dr. Dawe – We must introduce viable ways to assess them.

Dr. DeLong – Maybe need to look at the institutional outcomes before we begin working on the courses.

Trish – Who is going to revisit this?

Joan – We must have the faculty involved.

Trish – I think doing the courses first then the institutional outcomes would give us vision of where we want this to go.

Dr. Dawe – What can we do to make sure that we are all on board and have good outcomes?

Chris – Give outcomes, ask for assessment. This gives us something that proves the student learned this.

Michael – it's not the full time faculty we have to worry about, it's the adjuncts that are more difficult to get to buy in. We need to get them involved in the course level outcomes and assessments

Course outcomes are given to adjuncts by the division chairs.

Conversation continued about the first semester education plan with suggestions incorporated for improvement.

It was agreed to meet August 2<sup>nd</sup> at 11:30 am to continue the discussion.