

NORCO ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

September 24, 2015, 2015

CSS219 | 12:50-1:50pm

MINUTES

Present: Laura Adams, Khalil Andacheh, Greg Aycocock (Co-chair), Robbie Bishara (Student Representative), Sarah Burnett (Co-chair), Tami Comstock, Araceli Covarrubias, Diane Dieckmeyer, Kevin Fleming, Siobhan Freitas, Alexis Gray, Dominique Hitchcock, Stephany Kyriakos

Absent: Quinton Bemiller, Gerald Cordier, Mark DeAsis, Daniela McCarson, Jethro Midgett

I. Approval of Minutes

September 10, 2015

Motion to approve/Alexis Gray

Seconded/Siobhan Freitas

Approved

II. Co-Chair Report

- New TracDat training is completed and posted!
 - Sarah demonstrated how easy it was to locate the video on the website by clicking on the following:
 - Faculty
 - Assessment Committee
 - Scroll down to TradDat training video.
 - Please direct your department faculty to the video if they are unable to attend a training session.
 - We are looking at ways to pay faculty for inputting assessments into TracDat. Pay will be 1 ½ hours for self-training and assessment, or flex credit given. Please make sure they print the TracDat screen and submit it as evidence.
 - Shorter videos will be coming soon showing how to do reports and mapping. At the present time this will only cover SLO's.

- Update – GE PLO in Communication this fall
 - Approximately twelve disciplines will be coming together on October 6, to discuss this assessment.
 - The process is very simple and straight forward.
 - They will do their assessments, and in the spring we will look at the results.
 - All NAC members are invited to this meeting.

- Completed reports for SBS AOE, GE PLO Information Competency and Technology
 - These have been completed and are now on the website.
 - We will be focusing on the outcomes of these assessments in spring.
 - The reports are small and have been posted on the website. Please take the time to review each.
 - Senate approved the rotation plan.

III. New Business

Greg presented a power point on the key indicators, or the state of assessment at Norco. As per ACCJC recommendation, how are we systematically reviewing the student learning outcomes process? We also need to assess the evaluative mechanism.

- Key Indicators Analysis
 - Objectives
 - To review all parts of the student learning process systematically
 - ✓ Key Indicators Analysis Report
 - To assess the evaluative mechanism (assessment rubric used on APR)
 - Did it capture the essence of the student learning outcomes process?
 - Should anything be added/removed/changed?
 - Respond to part of Recommendation 2
 - NAC should be the body that reviews learning outcomes process
 - NAC are the experts who can plan how to improve learning as an institution
- Key Indicators Report
 - List of rubric scores by disciplines (APRs submitted by 9/1/15)
 - Analysis of means in each area (Loop-Closing, Improvement of Learning, Dialogue, Program Assessment) and overall
 - 0 – Indicates no evidence of assessment activity completed.
 - 1 – Indicates limited evidence of assessment activity completed.
 - 2 – Indicates clear evidence of assessment activity completed.
 - 3 – Indicates robust evidence of assessment activity completed.
- Results
 - Average Scores:
 - Loop Closing: 1.8
 - Improvement of Learning: 1.5
 - Dialogue: 1.5
 - Program Assessment: 10/27 (37%) disciplines involved
 - Average Scores (for disciplines who did assessment)
 - Loop Closing: 2.4
 - Improvement of Learning: 2.1
 - Dialogue: 1.9
- What does this mean?
 - As an institution, we are producing a mix of limited and clear engagement in the assessment process (Average of all disciplines)
 - For faculty engaged in assessment, there are clear to robust levels of engagement in the assessment process.
 - There are enough disciplines not engaging in assessment that it is questionable whether the institution has a “culture of assessment”.
 - More faculty are producing quality assessment each year which hopefully indicates a point in the future where we may hit a tipping point.
 - Thought Question: How can NAC move the faculty toward that tipping point?

Discussion: NAC members were asked to take this back to their department meetings and discuss scores. Educating faculty on each step and process so there can be a clearer understanding of scoring. The question was raised if the combined scoring rubric was returned to the faculty member. Sarah stated they were not returned. After discussion, it was agreed that Sarah would return the combined scoring rubric back to the author.

Think how NAC can help to move the tipping point?

- Take time at perhaps COTW to acknowledge outstanding assessments
- Practice workshops
- Open lab time perhaps in October
- Examples/Manual
- Sarah is creating a word document that will mirror TracDat titled "TradDat Worksheet"
- Multi-disciplines to share information
- NAC members to work with their department
- The chairs will now be helping and taking on a role
- Sarah did an analysis of all Program Reviews on what was learned, what was gained, and what was exciting. It proved to be very interesting and she will be sharing this information at a later date.

PowerPoint
Handouts

Meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

General Education Learning Outcome Assessment Plan

Fall 2015

GE PLO being assessed:

3 Communication

Specific skills being assessed:

Students will be able to communicate effectively in diverse situations. They will be able to create, express, and interpret meaning in oral, visual, and written forms.

Sections included and Coordinating Instructor:

(If multiple sections are offered they will all be included in the assessment, including any hybrid or on-line versions)

Course	Instructor(s) of Record (IOR) in Class Schedule
Anthropology 7	Gray
Anthropology 8	Gray
Art 6	May, Skiba (on-line)
Biology 11	Moore
Biology 36	Finnern
Communications 1	Cruz-Pobocik, Dhaliwal, Lewis, Muto, Norris, Rihan, Stinson
Communications 1H	Olaerts
English 1B	Capps, Cortina, Hogan, Mills, Mull, Tschetter
English 1B H	Tschetter
Geography 1	Eckstein, Jacobson
History 1	Kyriakos
Hum 4	Palmer
Hum 10	Heimlich, Lape, Palmer, Sentmanat, Westbrook,
Political Science 1	Brown, Kehlenbach, Madrid, Makin, Popiden, Synodinos,
Political Science 4	Brown
Theater 3	Stevens

Coordinating Meeting:

A meeting will be held on 10/6 from 12:50-1:50 in room (TBD). All participating IOR will be invited to attend this meeting in order for the assessment process to be explained and to identify the kind of data, format of data (charts etc.) they might be interested in receiving from the assessment. For Full Time Faculty, Flex credit will be available, for Associate Faculty this will serve as an assessment training that can be used towards your Professional Growth activities.

Process for Assessment

- An email will be sent, to each faculty involved in the assessment, which links to a data entry screen in TracDat. The screen will display every student enrolled in each section of the courses being assessed.
- Each IOR involved in the assessment will identify an assignment from their section that most closely ties to the *identified specific skills being assessed*, namely:
Students will be able to communicate effectively in diverse situations. They will be able to create, express, and interpret meaning in oral, visual, and written forms.
- A short statement (rationale) indicating how the assignment corresponds to the identified GE PLO skill should be provided to NAC - this will be used as part of the introduction section of the report that will be generated after the data is collected.
- Once the IORs have graded the identified assignment they will then identify in the TracDat data entry screen how well each student did in the assignment with regard to the *identified specific skills being assessed*, and will rate each student using the following 1-4 rating scale.
1= Little or no evidence of competency was demonstrated in achieving the identified GE PLO skill
2= Limited evidence of competency was demonstrated in achieving the identified GE PLO skill

3= Adequate evidence of competency was demonstrated in achieving the identified GE PLO skill

4= Strong evidence of competency was demonstrated in achieving the identified GE PLO skill

- Data entry to TracDat should be completed no later than the 2nd week of the spring semester 2016.
- Results will be generated and disseminated to all faculty involved in the assessment and NAC members, for analysis and input prior to a report being generated.

KEY INDICATORS ANALYSIS

Norco Assessment Committee
September 24, 2015

OBJECTIVES

- To review all parts of the student learning process systematically
 - Key Indicators Analysis Report
- To assess the evaluative mechanism (assessment rubric used on APR)
 - Did it capture the essence of the student learning outcomes process?
 - Should anything be added/removed/changed?
- Respond to part of Recommendation 2
 - NAC should be the body that reviews learning outcomes process
 - NAC are the experts who can plan how to improve learning as an institution

KEY INDICATORS REPORT

- List of rubric scores by discipline (APRs submitted by 9/1/15)
- Analysis of means in each area (Loop-Closing, Improvement of Learning, Dialogue, Program Assessment) and overall
 - 0-indicates no evidence of assessment activity completed.
 - 1-indicates limited evidence of assessment activity completed.
 - 2-indicates clear evidence of assessment activity completed.
 - 3-indicates robust evidence of assessment activity completed.

Results

- Average Scores:
 - Loop Closing: 1.8
 - Improvement of Learning: 1.5
 - Dialogue: 1.5
 - Program Assessment: 10/27 (37%) disciplines involved
- Average Scores (for disciplines who did assessment)
 - Loop Closing: 2.4
 - Improvement of Learning: 2.1
 - Dialogue: 1.9

What does this mean?

- As an institution, we are producing a mix of limited and clear engagement in the assessment process (Average of all disciplines)
- For faculty engaged in assessment, there are clear to robust levels of engagement in the assessment process.
- There are enough disciplines not engaging in assessment that it is questionable whether the institution has a “culture of assessment”.
- More faculty are producing quality assessment each year which hopefully indicates a point in the future where we may hit a tipping point.
- Thought Question: How can NAC move the faculty toward that tipping point?

Assessing the Evaluative Mechanism (Rubric)

- Does the rubric adequately capture the essence of the “student learning outcomes process”?
 - Do any areas on the rubric need to change or be deleted?
 - Should we add any areas?
 - Do the 0-3 scores need to be adjusted or reworded?
 - Any other changes?