3/20/17

LOA Meeting Notes

Wayne Yeatman, Debbie Malone, Shannon Waller, Vickery Viles, Betsy Julian, Zelda Ziegler, Mindy Williams, Jenni Newby, Julie Downing, Jerry Schulz, Michele Decker, Michael Fisher, Jason Lamb

1. Call to order
	1. Today’s notetaker: Viles
2. Background of LOA (Wayne)
	1. Task Force last year
		1. AA approved as a standing committee, approved charge last spring
		2. 16-17: Lots of potential directions: Structure for assessment, workshops, training materials, feedback on reports, etc.
		3. Focus for 1617: Evaluate assessment projects that were turned in F16
			1. Started working on rubric to provide evaluation
			2. Gen Ed and CTE have different needs, started developing different rubrics
			3. CTE rubric (presented by Michele)
				1. Smaller group worked on preliminary rubric, discovered CTE vs GEG differences
				2. A little bit foggy about where we are currently, some are focusing on the whole journey, some are looking at just the beginning
				3. Shifted to focus on fall work, can we assess the quality

How can you do this well?

How can we help you? How can we coach

Role of deans: evaluation of quality for progression

Moved from four columns to a checklist (either you are doing it or not)

Reviewed rubric

Need to clarify 1.4 vs 2.3

Writing rubrics may lead to revising forms

Examples would be great

* + - 1. Gen Ed Rubric (Zelda)
				1. Rubric was designed with an eye towards the trajectory of faculty as we learn more and improve
				2. Scope (BJ-need to find a way to recognize those situations in which there is only one section and one section)

1 instructor doing 1 section should be applauded

* + - * 1. Clarification of gen ed requirement-courses must meet all of them
				2. By accreditation we will need to show that we have measured the outcomes for all of our gen ed courses
				3. BJ example, gen ed groups might appreciate the start of an assessment exercise to use across the group
				4. Mindy example: could collect artifacts that demonstrate GEG outcomes, and then evaluate across the group
			1. Feedback to people who have submitted plans F16
				1. Have CTE example (PHM) of Plan, Analyze

Want people who have turned in projects to

self-assess their projects using the rubric and example,

also want feedback on the larger rubric

Letter of feedback to GEG

Strengths, area of impact,

* + - 1. Dean’s role?
				1. BJ: CTE vs Gen Ed differences; in CTE, Dean is defined. Deans should be working closely with each area

Deans can talk about that at dean team meeting

SW: you can rewrite it or move forward on this, this time around doesn’t have to come from deans

MF: PIRT moved to faculty-driven process, maybe look at PIRT model. But this is more institutional so maybe should be deans? Has coaching role; PIRT: one person is coach, one is reviewer. Difference in motivation between PIRT and assessment.

Assessment is not individual, must work across departments

BJ: What are we measuring institutionally

* + - 1. Tony’s role
				1. Asked to provide rubric for Writing, Arts and Letters, CL if appropriate
				2. Rubric will provide one common way to evaluate assignments, then report centrally
				3. He is writing the model, not applying it
			2. Assessment Day
				1. Putting it all on assessment day is a mistake
				2. Need lead up, need GEGs to have some support before then
				3. Assessment day is an attempt to make room for this work
				4. Looking at ARA assessment question

Theory: do it once and not twice

* + - * 1. Need to celebrate those who have stepped forward and stepped up
				2. Idea for training, and/or assessment day: Fairy tale accreditation report. What does successful instructional assessment look like at COCC?
				3. People need to know:

clear explanation of what they need to do,

that it is not just busy work, sense that there is real meaning to it

* 1. Next steps
		1. Unite responsibility and control
		2. Dean team meeting to discuss feedback
		3. Another meeting with Deans