LOC Chair Status Report

- **Update on CAR/LOTS Project**

  Anthony made some modifications to the CAR form in the CWO section and set up permission for the committee member volunteers just before the meeting. The volunteers will be able to go into the CAR form to check out the input fields and provide feedback for any necessary modifications.

  Brenda attended the 11/1/10 IC meeting in response to concern among some division chairs about the project. Questions raised and responses given were:

  - **Will there be an approval process for CWO claims outside of the division?**
    Since the CWO’s have always been listed on the CAR and haven’t been subject to FCRC review and approval, there will be no change in that. The intention is just to provide more and better detail about the CWO claims on the CAR.

  - **Will the LOC be dictating to faculty whether or not CWOs can be claimed?**
    The LOC goal is data gathering and analysis in a more systematic and consolidated manner than previously allowed by having two separate databases.

  - **If instructors teach or assess outcome competencies in different ways, will describing something for an outcome mean that all instructors must use only that means?**
    The description of how a competency is imbedded in a course can be one or more examples. It is not restrictive and does not have to be an exhaustive list of all possible ways a competency is taught or assessed. On the other hand, if not all sections of a course imbed a competency in some way, it should not be claimed for the course.

  The IC members reaffirmed their approval of the project and gave consent to continue with the process in place.

  The LOC members discussed during this meeting that due to the delays in getting the database ready, it is not feasible to have divisions start entering data during the winter in-service day. Members generally agreed that a Spring in-service day plan was more realistic and that prior to that the LOC could review the process as a group and individual members could introduce it to their respective divisions as time permits during winter and early spring.
SBCTC Teaching, Learning and Assessment Liaison Retreat
Brenda attended the state retreat November 3-4. The major topic of concern for most assessment liaisons across the state was accreditation and how the campus-wide outcomes align with the new accreditation model. In conjunction with that, other colleges are addressing the consistency between outcomes at the campus, program, and course levels. Attendees shares successes and concerns about their respective processes.

“W” Designation for Writing Intensive Courses
The committee had further discussion about the need and purpose of a proposed “W” designation at GRCC. Brenda had data available provided by Diane Martin from 1987 when GRCC last evaluated having a W-course requirement. In addition, she obtained information from a faculty member at Spokane Falls CC, where they currently have a “W” course requirement, about their development of the standard and the process of monitoring it.

Katy asked the committee to consider whether we discourage instructors from including writing in their courses by not having the W designation and the reduced capacities that go along with a writing intensive course. Shelley also mentioned that a benefit of having a W designation would be to provide the student with the understanding that writing would be a major component of the course.

Several concerns were voiced. If the designation is just for the purpose of decreasing caps on the courses, it disregards the fact that other courses require significant grading as well. It was pointed out that one of the requirements of a W course would have to be that the writing is subject to review and revision, so cannot be compared to a single assignment. Other issues raised were whether faculty needed to be teaching writing and/or have a prerequisite of research writing so student had prior learning. Julie Moore sent forward the idea the a learning community where a W designated course is paired with a research writing course could make sense.

The committee members present still didn’t have conclusive instinct as to whether the matter should be recommended to IC or not. Brenda asked attendees to review the materials presented and discuss it further at an upcoming division meeting to bring back faculty thoughts.

Accreditation Committee Update – Pat Carter
Pat briefly updated the committee on the fact that there is a new accreditation process that requires outcomes language in the report. More information will be coming to the committee about this later.

Other agenda items were tabled until future meetings.
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