NORCO COLLEGE

Norco Assessment Committee Minutes

09/12/18 09:00-10:30 IT 218

Present: Laura Adams (co-chair), Kris Anderson, Greg Aycock (co-chair), Michael Bobo, Courtney Buchanan, Kevin Carlson, Araceli Covarrubias, Alexis Gray, Stephany Kyriakos, Dr. Samuel Lee, Jethro Midgett, Jose Sentmanat, Tim Wallstrom, Jeff Warsinski, Kara Zamiska,

Absent: Tami Comstock, Janet Frewing, Glen Graham, Daniela McCarson, Jethro Midgett

- **Call to order**

- **Approval of Minutes:**

  o Introduction of the new Research and Assessment Manager Kevin Carlson
    ▪ Kevin has been in education for two decades, half the time in Asia working in IR with SLOs and assessments. Kevin has his Ph.D. in Developmental Psychology and an interest in Guided Pathways. The plan for the semester is to transition the primary contact person to both Kevin and Laura. Kevin's plan is to make assessment feel more seamless to faculty by using Canvas and exporting students grading for assessment.

  o 5/24/2018 minutes. Motion to approve minutes – Jose Sentmanat, second by Stephany Kyriakos, 3 abstentions.

- **Today's Topic**

  o **Update on NAC Meeting**
    - Greg- New date and time. The survey of effectiveness and past meeting have shown that the previous meeting schedule did not provide enough time to get momentum to get things done. Try one time a month for an hour and a half. Need to reach out for representation of all disciplines. We no longer have a member from BEIT.

  o **Nuventive/ Improve Updates**
    - **Updates to improve**.
      ▪ Laura- Over the summer Debbie Karrer went through the active catalog to update the Improve system.
        - Question that came up was "What to do when there is a minor wording change to a SLO?" Is it considered a brand new SLO?

The safe thing to do was to change it only if nothing had been done on the old SLO.

- Greg- Please have faculty look at SLOs in each department. Look in both the active COR in CurriQunet and Nuventive/Improve. Debbie went through CurricuNET and Improve to make all the numbers match. If there was a major change to an SLO we had to inactivate it because it looks like there is a new SLO. We would like faculty to look at their SLOs and curriculum because there have been major changes to some.
- Laura and Jeff- For example Math 35 had a list of 8 plus SLOs they've now been revised to 4. Over the next year all courses will have revised SLOs. Some SLOs are being combined into one. So right now in Improve it looks like Math 35 has never been assessed although they have been. Greg and Laura talked and it looks like you can take a previous assessment from one of the sub-components and copy and paste it into as an assessment in your new SLO.
- Greg- We want faculty to make the call on which previous SLOs can be tracked to the new ones.
- Jose- Any changes to the COR in terms of SLOs will take two years to show up. Not sure if it is true but it is something to look into.
- Michael- per Curriculum Committee meeting: Have to include objectives especially if we are doing SLO reductions. Objectives should outnumber SLOs, the goal was 3-4 SLOs. Objectives should be rich with detail. Any COR revisions must have objectives or they will be rejected.
- Jose- Anytime you go into Meta to make changes you have to put in course objectives. Need to come up with course objectives that are broad enough that they allow the academic instructor the freedom to teach.
- Laura- Because we share our curriculum across the district we need to agree on our definitions of effectiveness and SLOs or we are in trouble. Also, we need training on SLOs and objectives.
- Jose- We don't need to assess course objectives because we do that when we assess the SLOs. If we can't meet the objective we won't meet the SLOs.
- Laura- We need the conversation about what an outcome is.
- "Is curriculum the definition of what an objective is?"
- Dr. Lee- Curriculum Committee is the owner of the objective side. Brian has a PowerPoint on the objectives vs. outcomes, it might be better to rely on Academic Senates guidance on this. Objectives can be a longer list of things you are going to teach and the SLOs are the summery of what you want the student to be able to do as a result of your objectives. Objectives can be general or specific.
- A concern: The stems for objectives and SLOs both indicate, "demonstrate skills," so if you go into Meta and you look at those stems, I don't see that distinction and that was confusing me.

- Alexis - Suggestion for Improve -Can we add a field that gives a number to SLOs so they are organized? When the SLOs are changed the number triggers a field so we can see what SLO it used to be. This is meant for the wording problem. This is a way to create an archived history or cross reference. Suggestion so that at the front of each SLO there is a field box that is the active number and a number that is assigned for inactive past SLOs so they can be crossed referenced. Laura suggest sitting down together to go over this subject further. There is a need to map new to old SLOs.
- A question-Can there be a system or an argument on the college level that shows that the data on the SLOs have been revised and for accreditation can you say this has been assessed but we are in the process of updating or does it need to show all green checks? Answer- If the data is archived well it doesn't need to show all green checks.
- Dr. Lee-Accreditation board is looking for culture of inquiry rather than a culture of compliance.
- Greg- Accreditation has changed. Accreditation boards are looking for evidence of the questions being answered adequately and if not they will request more information or look for more evidence that the standards are being meet.
- **Google Spreadsheet**
    - Spreadsheet is due for an update, we need to improve- Improve. Laura is working on it. In the future we plan to recreate the report and tracking sheet each semester to provide a guideline for disciplines. This will be a way to track goals for accreditation.
    - Step one- get Improve updated, step two- create a report from Improve and step three- create a new tracking document. We need to have one system.
- **Programs with less than 18 units**
    - Greg- Programs have been defined by 18 units or more in the past. Programs can be as few as 6 units now. ACCJC says you define your programs as a college. Do we need to revisit this to have programs defined by each discipline?
        - Questionable because so many different 'programs' can exist.
        - A table is being developed so that every program of study is associated with a discipline. This includes programs that don't result in a certificate or a degree. Asked for this table to be brought to Program Review committee meeting.
    - Greg- It makes sense for disciplines to define a program according to the ACCJC standards.

- **Workshops, boot camps, drop-in hours… how to best connect with faculty to facilitate assessment**
    - Laura-– **How can we best connect with faculty?**
        - Any ideas please e-mail Laura, Kevin and/or Greg.

- Laura- Please ask around what is needed because we want to help in ways that are helpful.

- **Assessment Highlight:**
    - Assessment Section of Program Review Document
        - Last year we switched to a new three-year cycle of program review submitted through Nuventive. In the transition, the detailed section of assessment questions was removed from the program review document. We don't have the answers to those question for this program review cycle. This gives us a chance to look at what was asked and decide if that meets our needs going forward or if it needs revision.
        - Greg- If anyone thinks they have PLO assessment done, I don't think it showed up on this (the program review).
            - The assessment information produced for program review is called a four-column report. It's a standard report that looks at each SLO, the methods, results and changes made. It also looks if the bench mark was meet. Also, show an approved date that lets you know when the SLO was approved by the curriculum.
            - Approval dates come from the COR.
            - Units also completed a section titled "Highlights from Assessment." They did not receive specific instructions about what to include.
        - We are now only doing an optional annual update, so we may not get these data for another two years. But repairs can be made.
        - Greg- We haven't created a system in Improve. What do we need to see? Recommend that we add something into Improve that asks a discipline to summarize their assessment work by answering more specific prompts.
        - Need to have a discussion on how to create a process that doesn't create two steps or appear to create two steps.
        - Greg-It would be a red flag if it appeared as if assessment and program review were divided. Part of the program review is to reflect on your assessment. What do we need to see in Program Review as a reflection of assessment? Why are we scoring? What was our level of compliance with completion in the past?
            - Discussion on scoring past program reviews. Overall our level of compliance was good.
        - Question about what it was that was being scored, what was on program review or what was on Improve?
        - Do we want to continue doing the scoring in the same way as before? From an accreditation standpoint they will say to make sure you are assessing your assessment process and you owe it and can make the case for what you do.
        - The committee is looking for guidance, whether to ask the questions on Program Review. A suggestion is made to provide the questions from both Improve and program review so the committee can better understand the

request for guidance. Request to provide the questions that are asked in TracDaT (Improve) plus the handout and make sure they all connect back to each other.

- Please review the assessment questions on Program Review for evaluation at the next meeting.
- Conversation on the narrative, discussion and evidence of dialog of questions on the old Program Review form.
- Alexis - Cannot assume that TracDaT (Improve) is going to stay the same for this year because the annual update has not been built that will include repairs.
- Greg- Are we only ever going to score once every three years or are we going to keep doing an annual scoring of assessment?
  - Answer from Alexis- The only way to do an annual scoring is if those narratives are in TracDaT (Improve), the assessment portion, rather than in the program review section and that they are only reflected every three years.
  - Program Review- is an every three year document and used to be an every year document.
- Greg- Do we need to keep an update annually?
  - Answer from Alexis- The deal was that an annual update was going to be optional. Every three years was required. Annual update was only there if you need it.
- Laura- Big picture question, what do we need to track? What do we need to score?
  - Assessment every three years? Assessment committee decision? Bigger than assessment committee?
  - Suggestion to have annual reflection and discussions with faculty and disciplines, possibly in two meetings and compile the report out of the minutes.
  - Suggestion of a questioner or an online survey. More information will be sent out by e-mail.
- This topic is tabled for the next meeting.

- **Future meetings:**

  - Next meeting will be
    October 10, 2018 09:00 AM, IT 218

- **Good of the Order**