**Central Oregon Community College**

**Learning Outcomes and Assessment Group Meeting Agenda**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date:** | 6 February 2017 | **Facilitator(s):** | Wayne |
| **Time:** |  | **Notes:** |  |
| **Place:** | OCH 141 | **Agenda Maker:** | Wayne |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
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| Deborah Malone | √ | Wayne Yeatman | √ |  |  |
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Agenda

(Action items and person responsible in red)

1. Call to order (5 minutes), Chair
   1. Review of previous meeting notes, All
   2. Note-taker this meeting:
2. Review and approve a tool to evaluate program assessment
3. Develop a plan for group to evaluate program assessment

Next meeting: 20 Feb, 6 March, 20 March, 9 AM

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?

Notes for today’s meeting:

Wednesday 1/25/17 Michelle, Deb, and Shannon met in a small group to produce a draft of a rubric for discussion at today’s meeting. The group is hereafter and henceforth known as the “Wednesday Group”.

General comments:

* that the rubric is an excellent start
* was a big-picture comprehensive view of program level assessment
* helped guide thinking holistically
* not all programs ready to view their programs this comprehensively
* some programs ready to move beyond looking at their outcomes
* differences between GEGs and CTE – especially around program outcome development (set by state for GEGs, unless they want to change them)
* differences between CTE and GEGs probably exist about how to align and map courses to program level outcomes
* could this be redesigned as a flow-chart?

Recommendations/Edits to Rubric:

* Gray out areas that are “not required” as of yet – esp. alignment and mapping.
* Keep these areas on the rubric for programs that are ready to proceed
* Focus on the Outcomes and Methods/Measures lines of the rubric
* Criteria for methods/measures discussed and modified to reflect opinion of group in particular language around direct and indirect measures addressed.
* Add a line for a project description – to articulate how the project meets the SLOs
* We are starting in the middle – that is what we do best!
* We will work on the bigger picture line items (alignment and mapping for another day)
* Goal will be to evaluate the projects and submit feedback to deans so that they can communicate with programs about current degree of development of their assessment plans and next steps to take.

Homework:

We will each apply the three line items Outcomes, Project Description, and Methods/Measures to at least one submitted assessment project.

Claim the project you are going to work on by accessing the

“Index of Program Assessment Plans 11 03 16.xlsx” and putting yor initial in the appropriate column.

Here is the pathway:

N:\Group Folders\Assessment Management\Program level\Assessment Reports\2016 2017

Next meeting we will discuss how the rubric works in application and make further edits from there if needed.