**Central Oregon Community College**

**Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee Meeting Notes**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date:** | January 16, 2019 | **Facilitator(s):** | Sarah |
| **Time:** | 1:30-2:30 pm | **Notes:** | Vickery |
| **Place:** | OCH 141 | **Agenda Maker:** | Sarah |

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

Agenda

(Action items and person responsible in red)

1. Call to order (5 minutes), Chair
	1. Review of previous meeting notes, All

Notes approved with no changes.

1. Updates from deans re:workgroups (Sarah)

Sarah met with each instructional dean to check in on the status of feedback and to generally check in. Here are her notes:

Feedback from Deans about Workgroups for Review of Assessment Reports Fall 2019

1. All the deans thought that being involved with the review of projects early on was better than previously when they were just brought in at the end.
2. Expressed difficulty with finding time, scheduling. Suggestion that maybe deans schedule the meetings next year with their groups
3. Julie’s group is finished and Julie delivering feedback this week
4. Jenni’s group only met once so far but has another meeting scheduled to finish project review
5. Michael’s group - ?
6. Liked working with the faculty within their own departments rather than faculty from outside disciplines – helped to inform the discussion – more efficient
7. Best if the dean group could have experienced LOA members included to help write the feedback provide help with level of expectations – a group of all new members too LOA would find it harder to provide feedback efficiently
8. Would like to have a cross-section of their discipline areas represented in their workgroups
9. Question the value of second reader approach – too time consuming?
10. Feedback language on rubrics – less concern with positivity, straightforward works
11. Better file naming system for keeping track of the final versions and/or finding the reports (esp. from earlier years) – not immediately obvious where to look.
12. All liked the idea of a buddy system to assist individuals with projects prior to submission deadlines
13. Agreed that deans should be the ones to communicate with faculty whose projects are problematic but having a mentor resource might be helpful
14. Inequities in the assessment system – some faculty required to do a lot more than other faculty depending on the size of their discipline groups/courses.
15. Some faculty need help with translating into the assessment “language”.
16. Deans are coming on board with their leadership role for the assessment system to work
17. Brought up submission deadlines – is Nov 1 too late. Does this motivate faculty to really get to work and do the job on assessment day in September? Is an earlier deadline better? How would this work with a “buddy system” since help from buddy should precede submission.
18. Room assignments during assessment day – make sure that the dean groups are in close proximity – possibly near faculty offices – since some faculty chose to return to offices to work

Vickery will email the deans to see if the rubrics can be moved into the folders with the reports (rather than the LOA workspace folder).

LOA conversation:

* 1. How to support projects earlier in process next year: buddy system similar to PIRT? How would that look and fit into the timing of assessment day?
	2. What to do about projects/reports that are significantly below expectations? Dean feedback confirmed that the deans would take this information back to faculty, rather than the committee.
	3. The second reader was more helpful last year, when this was a newer process. The rubric and feedback process were still in development. This year, we are more familiar with the process.
	4. Filing naming convention—we could look at sorting by program/course rather than by year of plan (though there are some complexities there). We need something that works for the duration, as we will accumulate more reports over time.
	5. Nov. 1 deadline-is that too late? How can we get faculty to make full use of the assessment day.
	6. GEG leads as committee members? May encourage a change in terms of membership (3 years for CTE/Transfer, 2 years for GEG leads?)
	7. Issues needing to be hashed out:
		1. Timing
		2. Buddy system
		3. Committee structure
1. Closing the loop expectations: discussion continued from parking lot
	1. Vickery summarized the conference sponsored by NWCCU with Dr. Jillian Kinzie; she confirmed that closing the loop as we have defined it is an important (and challenging) part of current learning outcome assessment thinking. Also, major emphasis on improving learning (vs. compliance or focus on quality data collection/analysis)
		1. Can we get Betsy to give us a summary of this session?
2. Work plan for future meetings
	1. Picking exemplary projects – sooner rather than later – while still fresh in our minds

(January 30)

Homework for all members: Come to January 30 meeting with one or two projects to nominate for recognition for either an exemplary characteristic, improvements to learning (and possibly now or in the future, for a complete project)

* 1. Update on how many scheduled projects were not turned in (January 30)
	2. Forms updates based upon our work reading the projects (Feb 13th)
	3. Assessment Day planning (spring term)

Winter meetings:

Wednesday, January 16, 2019

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Parking Lot/Future meetings:

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