LOC Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 19th 12-1
RLC Conference Room

Attendance: Judy Burgeson, Catherine Cantrell, Shelley Leavens, Donnie Hallstone, Barbara Brucker, Ken Marr, Julie Moore. (Attending via e-mail: Jaeney Hoene, Janet Ash, Brenda Bindschatel)

Informational Items

- **Liaison Retreat**: Julie shared some “Big Ideas” from the recent Assessment Liaison Retreat she attended on Feb. 7th. The newest thing on the horizon is coming from the State Board. There is increasing support for integrating technology into instruction. Keep an eye out for state budget proposals that support this integration as well as increased opportunities for faculty to work on integrating new technologies into their teaching/classes.

- **Update from Student Responsibility Assessment Team**: We are postponing this until a future meeting.

- **Update from the QSR Assessment Team**: Donnie Hallstone reported for the QSR Assessment Team. They are in the third year of the three-year Campus-wide Assessment Cycle for QSR. The following outlines what they are doing this year to reassess QSR.
  - They’ve designed and administered a pre-test and post-test for Math 97 that focuses on QSR Competency #1. The team has administered and scored the pre-test, and they will finish with the post-test at the end of the quarter.
  - The team has designed and will administer a survey for faculty who attended last year’s workshop that focused on increasing understanding of QSR. They will also administer this survey to faculty who imbed QSR into their courses. The goal is to see how faculty understanding has improved as a result of training completed last year.
  - They are working on a recommendation to the faculty that we do an end of degree assessment for QSR on a regular basis.

Action Items/Discussion

- **Written Communication Competencies**:
  - **History**:
    - The LOC responded to a recommendation from the Written Communication Campus-wide Assessment Team and did more research across campus to determine whether or not
competencies of the Written Communication Campus-wide Outcome needed to be revised to be more global and thus better fit the way writing is applied across the disciplines.

- The LOC found that there was ample support from divisions to revise the competencies.
- The LOC recommended to the I.C. in early winter quarter 2008 that the campus revise these competencies. The LOC asked the I.C. whether this should take place through the campus-wide vote process or if the I.C. members could vote on this and make the decision.
- The I.C. asked LOC reps and Division Chairs go back to their divisions with two key questions. 1) Do you feel this issue is of enough campus-wide significance to warrant an all-faculty vote? And 2) Do you support this proposal to revise the competencies of Written Communication?

**LOC Discussion and Vote Results:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you support this proposal to revise the competencies of Written Communication?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes – Revise as suggested by LOC at beginning of winter quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
---

- **Discussion points: Don’t Omit Competencies**
  - As long as students are learning most of the competencies by the end of their degree, that’s fine. Each student doesn’t have to learn every competency by degree’s end, and not all classes that claim an outcome need to cover every competency. Therefore, it’s unnecessary to omit competencies that are taught in only a few classes.

  - If we value the competencies as they stand, we should stand by this by not omitting competencies. If we as a campus truly feel that these competencies are important to one becoming a proficient writer, don’t change the competencies to fit curriculum. Change curriculum to fit the competencies.
The competencies of Written Communication have the endorsement and support of those who teach English on campus. They also were approved by all faculty through an all-campus vote. This means that these competencies are all needed and important. To omit certain competencies erodes the significance and scope of the outcome.

**Discussion points: Omit Competencies**

- By omitting competencies and focusing on the core of the outcome, this outcome better fits the needs of Professional Technical students. Right now the outcome seems designed more for the transfer student. By revising it, it makes the outcome more applicable to all students, both Prof. Tech and Transfer students at GRCC.

- The suggested omissions to the Written Communication Outcome don’t interfere with the core of the outcome. The central and most important aspects of the outcome would remain.

- The request to omit competencies is just for this outcome. We are not trying to set precedent here that could apply to other outcomes in the future.

---

**Do you feel this issue is of enough campus-wide significance to warrant an all-faculty vote?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.C. Vote</th>
<th>All Campus Vote</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion Points on Voting Process:**

- If the I.C. votes for divisions, it could give more priority to first discussing the issue in the division. An all campus vote might not emphasize and/or prioritize the discussion process needed to make an informed decision on this topic. While there would be forums prior to an all-campus vote, many faculty have historically not attended these. Therefore, the needed discussion might not take place if left to an all campus vote.

- Each division will still get a vote and a voice if this is left to an I.C. vote.