**Central Oregon Community College**

**Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee Meeting Notes**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date:** | Jan 31 | **Facilitator(s):** | Christopher |
| **Time:** | 2:00-3:00 pm | **Notes:** | Vickery |
| **Place:** | OCH 141 | **Agenda Maker:** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Attendees:** | Christopher Hazlett | x | Jake Agatucci | x | **Guests:** |  |
| Jessie Russell |  | Beth Palmer |  |  |  |
| Kirsten Hostetler | x | Vickery Viles | x |  |  |
| Michele Decker | x | Zelda Ziegler | x |  |  |

**Agenda:**

1. Call to order (5 minutes), Chair
	1. Review of previous meeting notes, All
* Kristin and Christopher have reviewed ABS projects and are awaiting coordination with Jenni to discuss.
* Action: Vickery will send out the summary of comments for recognition awards; members should read and please review the projects on which you were a reader to ensure the comments are based in reality.
* Notes looked fine.
1. [NWCCU Rubric for Assessment](https://www.nwccu.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Rubric-Evaluating-Outcomes-Assessment-Plan-and-Progress.pdf) (35 minutes), All
	1. Rubric located also in N: Drive

**Background**

COCC designed our current approach to assessment with LOA and the VPI, basically creating a more comprehensive and defined system than existed, beginning in 2015. There was not significant guidance from NWCCU at this time. More recently, the rubric above appeared and then was posted to the web site. LOA members can use this rubric as a tool to evaluate our current system of assessment knowing that the values implied in the rubric may not fully align with COCC’s approach.

**Discussion of rubric**

* Is it assessing the institution or LOA?
	+ It is focused on learning outcome assessment so useful for our “system of learning outcome assessment” but not for institutional assessment (APR for example).
* It refers to “reliable,” but that doesn’t apply. We are not conducting formal research studies in which the measurement is applied numerous times.
* Same issue with “inter-rater reliability”.
	+ Some COCC projects have used the same measurement over an extended period (forestry with the national foresters exam, psychology with their inserted reflective questions approach).
	+ Our focus at this point is on improving learning rather than specific standards of research approaches.
* Should we use the rubric to evaluate our system (LOA’s work) or to evaluate how projects are performing?
	+ This was an ongoing discussion point; generally, we think our system is developed /highly developed but we have projects in various stages.
* The rubric is difficult to use in some areas because it introduces new criterion at higher levels. We could consider writing our own evaluation rubric.
* Nonetheless, we persisted.

**1. Assessment Planning**

* Highly advanced: we have a clear plan (we call it a system) with several years of implementation.
* Our next challenge is to sustain this into the future. COCC has had a pattern of starting assessment approaches and then stopping (GEODE, COG/POG/TOG, General Ed).
* Our current approach is one of, if not the, longest sustained effort of learning outcome assessment at COCC.
	+ Elements that contribute to our ability to sustain it into the future: a position, LOA, the VPI and the leadership to include the instructional deans in the process.
* The “Sustainability Primer” has tools that can be used to sustain assessment efforts.

**2. Assessable outcomes**

* Are they referring to GE? Course outcomes? Program outcomes?
* For GE, these outcomes are provided to us and are problematic. Addressing this issue should be on our radar (discussed replacing them with more useful outcome statements).
* For CTE, this varies. About 2/3 are in good shape, and we see activity

**3. Assessment Implementation**

* This gives us support in asking faculty to better explain criteria used for evaluating student evidence, which is sometimes not clear.
* Are we evaluating projects or the institution? COCC expects alignment, but we don’t always have it at the project level.
* The system is “highly developed” but implementation is varied.

**4. Alignment**

* Not clear on what this means.
* The support services in the last cell were especially confusing. Does this mean “does tutoring support your students’ achieving of learning outcomes”?
	+ Tutoring
	+ eLearning
	+ Library
* Some align with outcomes, some don’t.
* If we remove the last cell and focus on the relationship of outcomes to curriculum, our system promotes this.
	+ For example, Curriculum Committee asks questions about the tasks and methods used to measure outcomes in order to better shape outcomes.
	+ This is happening at the program level more as well.
* Are we looking at course or program?
	+ Focus of COCC and LOA is program.

**5. Valid Results**

* Can we replace the concept of valid results with a representational sample? We have emphasized that in feedback (if you evaluated a course in the summer, or only sections taught by full-timers, is that a representational sample of all students in your course?)
* Or should we take this question to mean does the measurement align to the outcome? If this is the interpretation, the system expects this but individual projects are emerging.

**6. Reliable results**

* Can we interpret this as “norming” the scoring process? If we do this, then the system expects it and we have various levels of achievement.
* Some areas have one person, but others have several.

**7. Annual feedback**

* We are developed since we are not confident of the “departmental use” in the highly developed category.
* Could this be an area of growth for us?
* We provide feedback, but is it used?
* The feedback is much better since the deans are more involved.
* Posting reports and feedback on the intranet helps with this effort.
* The buddy project also supports providing feedback.

**8. Results are used**

* We are either developed or highly developed.
* Reviewed tracking of % of projects that result in improvements to learning
* Should LOA be a place for faculty to bring results and determine improvements to learning?
	+ These conversations about improvements should be ongoing, and not dependent on a formal structured meeting with LOA.
	+ Or, the LOA conversation could be informal
	+ Buddy system can help with guiding and supporting the ID of learning improvements.

**9. Planning and Budgeting**

* What does this mean?
* We interpreted it more as “does the institution provide sufficient resources and support for learning outcomes assessment?”
* Dir. Assessment position, intranet site, Assessment day, funds for PT faculty to participate

3. [Improvement to Assessment Forms for 2020-2021AY](file:///%5C%5Cad.cocc.edu%5Cdomain%5CGroup%20Folders%5CAssessment%20Management%5CAssessment%20Work%20201920%5C20-21%20forms) (20 minutes), All

* Christopher made the changes we agreed on (change to clear/unclear, fix formatting) but we still need to review.
* Do we need a Feb. 14 meeting?
	+ No.
	+ Vickery will cancel.
	+ The Feb. 28 meeting will dive back into form improvements again.

**Remaining Winter term meetings:**

* Feb. 28, 2020
* March 13, 2020

**Parking Lot/Future meetings:**

* Preparing for Accreditors visit (April 8-10)
* Further work on “Buddy” Program – identifying & contacting new “Buddies”
* Committee formation: Lead or captain for GEGs?
* Cycle for GE courses offered with very little frequency