**Central Oregon Community College**

**Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee Meeting Agenda**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date:** | 12/15/2017 | **Facilitator(s):** | Mindy |
| **Time:** | 1:30-2:30 | **Notes:** | Vickery |
| **Place:** | OCH 141 | **Agenda Maker:** | Vickery and Mindy |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Attendees:** | Sarah Fuller | x | Vickery Viles | x | **Guests:** |  |
| Jason Lamb | x | Mindy Williams | x | Betsy Julian | x |
| Deborah Malone | x | Wayne Yeatman | x | Jenni Newby | **x** |
| Shannon Waller | x | Zelda Ziegler | x | Julie Downing | x |
|  |  |  |  | Michael Fisher |  |

Agenda

(Action items and person responsible in red)

1. Call to order (5 minutes), Chair
   1. Welcome deans
   2. Notetaker this meeting: Vickery
2. Feedback to faculty on assessment plans
   1. Reminder of [feedback plan](file:///\\ad.cocc.edu\domain\Group%20Folders\Assessment%20Management\System%20of%20Assessment\Asst%20Report%20feedback%20schedule.xlsx)

The deans are the liaisons with faculty, and ideally would look for themes and facilitate/encourage conversations among faculty members.

LOA reviewed feedback plan proposed out of dean team meeting last year: LOA reviews plans in November and December; the deans review plans and provide feedback to faculty in December and January. The feedback timeline is running late since it is mid-December.

* 1. LOA Process used for 2017-18

Various LOA members described the process for reading and providing feedback on plans. Overall, there is a philosophy of moving forward and making improvements in the future (don’t rewrite the plan unless it is helpful in the future. The Analyze report has a place to describe changes.) Another theme is to recognize the effort and work that is done, which is a primary consideration to feedback for improvements. COCC is still somewhat developmental and our work is improving.

The plans were divided into GE (Mindy, Jason, Sarah, Zelda, and Vickery) and CTE (Wayne, Debbie, Shannon) and each group developed a process.

In GE, each member was the primary/first reader on 8 plans. Each person identified 4 plans that were either problematic or exemplar, for everyone to read and then to discuss as a group. The group met and reviewed each of these plans in order to resolve problematic areas and to norm our responses. Then, every plan that had not been read by all was assigned a second reader to review and provide feedback. The first reader prepared a final version.

In CTE, each plan was assigned a first reader who provided a draft of feedback. All members read each plan and then they met together to review each plan and norm responses.

* 1. [Location of feedback in N drive](file:///\\ad.cocc.edu\domain\Group%20Folders\Assessment%20Management\Program%20and%20Degree%20level%20Reports,%20feedback\REPORTS,%20feedback\2017%202018\GE%20Finished%20final%20reads), Vickery

1. Theme: Project is difficult to discern. There is not enough information to follow what is proposed, so t’s hard to provide feedback. Frequently, these plans used the “simple” version of the form and didn’t provide all of the information. Feedback will suggest that more information is provided in the Analyze report.

An example of this issue is the Art plan. It looks like a major step forward (yay) but it is hard to tell what is going to happen. Is it a quiz? Test? Assignment? What will be asked? How does it connect with the outcomes?) How to support this faculty member moving forward. He may discover and learn as he proceeds. He may benefit from assistance (LOA had some ideas).

1. Theme: Project provokes significant questions. For example, there may be disconnect between the outcomes and measurement. Or, there may be minor issues such as no identification of who will analyze or what students are assessed.
2. Theme: Excellent models. Lots of really good work this time around.
3. Feedback discussion

Deans wanted more assistance in sorting out which projects were in which category. Reviewed several of them (ratings are frequently Unmet or Not met). Agreed that LOA members would use the LOA Review Assignments spreadsheet to categorize those that needed a discussion and those that were exemplar, in order to accelerate the deans review.

Should LOA members be available to assist with feedback? Consensus was that LOA members are willing to assist and support deans. The primary reader is available, or they can meet as a group (which is harder to schedule but an option). Different areas will warrant different strategies.

Other points:

* Need to post good examples to the intranet.
* Collectively, proceed and move forward rather than rewrite or revise.
* Need to phase out simple form.
* Issue of general question prompts in SS. Sometimes the questions are very general or not included (SOC), and sometimes they have more structure (CJ). General issue of question of students telling us whether they met the outcomes or not. Many of this style project need more information to see what his happening and whether the project is an adequate measure of the outcomes. This approach should be monitored for efficacy and future improvements.
* VV will reorganize [folders in N drive](file:///N:\Group%20Folders\Assessment%20Management\Program%20and%20Degree%20level%20Reports,%20feedback\REPORTS,%20feedback\2017%202018\LOA%20Review,%20rubrics) to make it easier to navigate.