**Central Oregon Community College**

**Learning Outcomes and Assessment Group Meeting Notes**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date:** | Jan 23, 2017 | **Facilitator(s):** | Wayne |
|  | 9am | **Notes:** | Vickery |
| **Place:** | OCH 141 | **Agenda Maker:** | Vickery |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Attendees:** | Sarah Fuller |  | Vickery Viles |  | **Guests:** |  |
| Jason Lamb |  | Mindy Williams |  | Michele Decker |  |
| Deborah Malone |  | Wayne Yeatman |  |  |  |
| Shannon Waller |  | Zelda Ziegler |  |  |  |

Agenda

(Action items and person responsible in red)

1. Call to order (5 minutes), Chair
	1. Review of previous meeting notes, All
	2. Notetaker this meeting:
2. Review Homework: Tools to evaluate program assessment

Deb shared a rubric/checklist she developed based on feedback from the last accreditation visit. It is simple, covers both CTE and transfer. The theory is that we are starting with the basics.

Mindy shared some links she found. AACU has sample rubrics available, as well as a guide on levels of assessment (“how to” manual). Level 4 questions may be helpful for GEGs.

She also shared an NSF evaluation guide, which is not higher ed oriented by is comprehensive.

Discussion of benchmarks. Not all plans included them. Most skipped it. If you include them, you need a rationale of how you came up with the benchmark. Michele, thoughts on “happiness factor”—am I happy with this measure? Vickery, simplification for Year 1 with emphasis on improvement. Accrediting body sometimes provides benchmark. If not assigned, should be meaningful.

Who is the rubric for? Deans? LOA? Faculty? Goal: Share the same evaluation tool. Importance of giving feedback this year, otherwise this will be one more thing that is asked of us but not really important. Deans role in feedback. Joint meeting with deans? Importance of getting feedback out this year. Also, determine feedback cycle for future years.

Sarah amended the assessment day rubric. Changes include: offer GEGs the chance to write their own outcomes. Asst planning should go first, before assessment tasks. Add two rows: cross-curriculum (what % of courses are involved in the asst plan), and benchmarks.

Interest in getting an evaluation tool identified and then use it; we can improve on it later. Need to give feedback this year (that was a recurring theme, apparently).

General Plan:

* HMWRK before Feb 6: V will load examples to web, prepare to assemble a prototype evaluation tool. Not too complex for this first year, but enough detail to reflect both CTE and transfer and to reflect range of approaches.
* Next meeting (Feb 6), Agree on a prototype evaluation tool.
* HMWRK for Feb 20: Assign LOA members assessment plans to evaluate using the tool for the following meeting. Keep an eye out for examples to use as strong models.
* Following Meeting (Feb. 20), review results of evaluation.
* Some Future meeting: invite deans to discuss tool, elicit their support to disseminate feedback, plan Asst. Day.

Next meetings: Feb 6, Feb 20, March 6, March 20, 9am

Parking Lot:

* Structure/Framework at COCC
* How to assess/measure
* Cycle of Assessment image
* Professionalism – particularly in CTE programs
* Transfer degree outcomes (PCC/Gen Ed outcomes discussion)
* Lead or captain for GEGs?