**Central Oregon Community College**

**Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee Meeting Agenda**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date:** | 10/26/2018 | **Facilitator(s):** | Sarah |
| **Time:** | 2:30-3:30 | **Notes:** | Vickery |
| **Place:** | HCC 301 | **Agenda Maker:** | Sarah |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Attendees:** | Christopher Hazlett | X | Mindy Williams | X | **Guests:** |  |
| Jessie Russell | X | Sarah Fuller | X | Betsy Julian |  |
| Kirsten Hostetler | O | Vickery Viles | X |  |  |
| Michele Decker | X | Wayne Yeatman | O |  |  |

Agenda

(Action items and person responsible in red)

1. Call to order (5 minutes), Chair
   1. Previous meeting notes, approved
2. Norming of Feedback Rubrics – review the homework (all)

* Sarah created “LOA Review Workplace” folder in 1819 Reports folder for materials to be stored while we work on them (this worked well last year).
* Discussion of form and contact people. Do we need this here? It would be helpful if faculty listed all the faculty whose sections are part of the project and we don’t always see this.

Discussion of three reports

* If the outcome is compound, should the project assess each subsection?
  + Ideally, yes.
  + However, we don’t have that level of alignment across the college.
  + In GE, the outcomes are frequently compound but we can’t yet change them.
  + In CTE, they wrote the outcomes so in theory they should measure the subsections.
* Should folks from other disciplines be included in the analysis discussion of GE projects to be more “inclusive” (Should forestry bring in folks from science)?
  + It is an option but hasn’t been our practice. The should come together with a group of their discipline when that is an option.
  + This could be awkward for someone not familiar with the discipline.
  + If they did, this would be an option for college-wide assessment analysis.
* HUM 256 is a great example of an assessment which leads to options for improvement
  + Result is a very authentic assessment
* Closing the Loop issue in HUM 256 (not offered with frequency)
  + Report was well done, addressed the issue
* Discussion of Analyze rubric
  + Changed 2.2 from “Analysis is comprehensive across the data”
* Discussion of a report that answered some of our questions but not where we expected to see the information
  + Description info in the abstract (too much detail) or summary not evident in the abstract but you can piece together from other parts of the form (not enough)
  + The rubric should note yes if it was evident somewhere, but OK to note in the feedback that the question did not provide the answer but it was located elsewhere, or that you are extrapolating
* Kirsten could not attend today but sent her rubrics
  + They are very much in line with others’ comments and approach.
* Overall, projects continue to get better each year. Yay!

\*Improvement, notes for future work on forms—

* Change form to list all faculty participating followed by contact
* Do we have a place to list all the sections—list how many sections there are, then how many are being assessed
* Abstract and description are still somewhat redundant and problematic, look at for next form edit.

\*Improvement, notes for future work on process—

* Provide just in time feedback on assessment day?
* Provide drop in assistance between assessment day and Nov. 1
* Some found a faculty assessment coordinator very helpful

Summary Notes on norms for writing feedback:

* When we write feedback, make sure we recognize where the form wasn’t clear.
* In our comments, ok to observe that it is not clear how the measurement addresses each subsection of a compound outcome, but more appropriate for CTE than for GE.
* The rubric should note yes if it was evident somewhere, but OK to note in the feedback that the question did not provide the answer but it was located elsewhere, or that you are extrapolating
* Try for positive, appreciative tone (channeling Zelda); try to include letter with context this time.

1. Discussion: Splitting into smaller groups with deans for completing feedback (all)

* Last year: divide into CTE or GE to read projects
  + GE used model in which every project had a first reader and second reader, and they brought the problematic ones to the group for feedback.
  + CTE assigned out each report and read through all of them as a group.
  + Last year was problematic for deans to understand and deliver feedback
* This year, proposal to divide LOA according to dean; read with deans
* Groups would be:
  + Fisher Group:
    - Wayne
    - Vickery
  + Downing Group
    - Sarah
    - Jessie (in the field until Nov. 12)
    - Michele
  + Newby Group (on Nov 9)
    - Hazlett
    - Williams
    - Hostetler (currently this group has more projects)

1. Scheduling and assignments for feedback (all)

Vickery will update Projects to read document and make assignments, and email LOA members when this is complete.

Next meeting:

We decided to cancel the Nov. 2 meeting; the month of November will be focused on producing feedback rubrics. Target deadline: Thanksgiving break.

~~Friday, Nov. 2, 2:30-3:30 CANCELED~~

Friday, Nov. 9, 2:30-3:30

Friday, Nov.16, 2:30-3:30

Friday, Nov. 30, 2:30-3:30

Friday, Dec. 7, 2:30-3:30

Parking Lot/Future meetings:

* Cycle for GE courses offered with very little frequency
* Closing the loop: measuring twice
* Lead or captain for GEGs?