NORCO COLLEGE

Norco Assessment Committee Minutes

10/9/19 09:00-10:30am OC 116

Present: Laura Adams (co-chair), Greg Aycock (co-chair), Cathy Brotherton, Courtney Buchanan, Tami Comstock, Ashlee Johnson, Stephany Kyriakos, Bibiana Lopez, Daniela McCarson, Jose Sentmanat, Tim Wallstrom, and Caitlin Welch.

Absent: Alexis Gray, Virgil Lee, Jethro Midgett, MK Pena (student rep)

- **Call to order: 9:03 am**

- **Review of Agenda:**

  o Motion to approve Agenda -Cathy Brotherton, second by Daniela McCarson
    Approved

- **Approval of Minutes:**

  o Motion to approve 9-11-2019 minutes – Courtney Buchanan, second by Jose Sentmanat
    0 abstention.
    Approved

- **Discussion Items**

  - **Accreditation Update**
    o Introduction
      ▪ ISER-Institutional Self Evaluation Report needs to be ready for the board by November and the visiting team by the second week of December. We have a request to move the March 2020 meeting to the first week (March 4, 2020) instead of the second week of the month. We will send out an email after we get approval from the accreditation chairs. This will allow the ACCJC visiting team to see the NAC meeting in action.
      ▪ Kris Anderson is an amazing accreditation faculty co-chair. She pulled out all of the sections of the ISER that pertain to assessment for us. We need to read through these areas to make sure assessment is represented well.
      ▪ The visiting team loves to hear examples of how we are doing assessment, please think about examples that are happening in your areas.

- IIB.1-The assessment highlight of the NAC meetings is used as an example of how we are communicating our constant improvement of student learning. The exact highlight is the one that we talked about the four pillars of Guided Pathways. Especially, the fourth pillar-ensuring learning-which greatly includes assessment. We are focusing on the accreditation visit now but after the visit we will want to look at our role in Guided Pathways.
  - Another example of how we communicate student outcomes and continuous improvement of student learning is the workshop we had last year that we discussed the data from the assessments of one of our GELOs and two of the PLOs from the AOE-Communications, Media and Languages. In the workshop we discussed the summary of assessment results disaggregated by ethnicity, age and gender. We can send out notes and data from the GELO workshop.
  - A suggestion of another example are the meetings and discussions pertaining to the Perkins grant. This is a great example because it is related to student achievement and discussions that are taking place outside of the Assessment committee.
  - Good example of communication are all the workshops and boot camps on assessment including breakout sessions on FLEX days.
  - These examples are leading to subgroups also talking about student achievement and creating a community of practice- example includes the equity workshops that faculty participated in where the IE department provided each participating faculty disaggregated data by race for their courses to analyze. This data also included department data to compare to. This came out of the Community of Practice. At a recent meeting good ideas were presented about the syllabus and the unwritten rules. For example- including the amount of time homework should take in a course and on the syllabus.
- IB.2-We have outcomes- PLOs official guide is in the college catalog and SLOs official guide is on the public site of CurriQunet.
  - Request to change the language of the last sentence to read 'annually' instead of 'each semester'- in reference to Student Services assessments. Only a few services are assessed each semester but all are assessed annually.
- IB.3-What are Institutional Set Standards? The Department of Education has required that all colleges have Institutional Set Standards that include floor and aspirational goals. For example-completion
- IB.4-Do we know the difference between student outcomes and student achievement?
  - Student achievement data includes success, retention, completion and grades.

- Student outcomes data includes SLO and PLO assessments a more fine grained into how students are learning. For Student services this would be an SAO service area outcome.
- Request to check the evidence including PR-SSS-rise-Assessment for completion-has this evidence been verified because some areas had gaps in NuVentive. Student Services will follow-up for completion.
- Does the description of our problems with NuVentive make sense? How program review and assessment were not linked like the software NuVentive had promised. so our prior years program reviews more clearly identified assessment in our program reviews. This happened so we should be honest.
  - IB.5 Do we assess accomplishment of the mission with our SLO assessment? We link the mission to our assessment through program review. Assessment data is linked to the resource request and the resource request is linked to the mission. Our last round of program review we were unable to link the assessment data because of a disconnect in NuVentive. Our goal is to connect assessment data to resource request.
    - Example- in the past assessment data has been used to request faculty positions.
    - Example-Anthropology used assessment data to show that when ANT received their first set of physical skulls students were more successful. This data was included in program review as a resource request for more skulls.
    - Examples can be from any time- the visiting team would really like to hear any examples.
    - We should make sure that assessments are part of the new algorithms being developed for faculty request and resources in general. We need to work with Academic senate.
    - Suggestion for the technology committee to add a request for assessment data to their technology request.
    - We need to gather the assessment information so it can be part of these processes.
  - IB.6- We have found that it is more meaningful to disaggregate at the PLO and GELO level because of the sample size. We are currently doing this at the GELO and PLO level specifically in the AOE's. We could have a good sample size at the course level if we gathered years of data in the same course. This could be accomplished in Canvas.
    - Anthropology has disaggregated data between online and face to face courses and used this in their program review. CIS has suggested in program review.
    - Now with AB705 a request to see the success data for students that are and are not enrolled in support courses.
    - AB705 is explained and discussed.

- The committee is interested to see the data that is related to AB705.
  - IB.7-How do we evaluate (assess) the assessment process? This came up in our last accreditation visit in 2014. And we were not ready for it. Basically in the past we have done a key indicator report in which we scored all assessment portions of the program reviews. The IE department would take the scores and do an average across all disciplines. This produced our Key Indicators (started an assessment loop, closed, were involved in assessment, etc.) Because we didn't have any assessment data in the 2018 program reviews, we did the spring 2019 assessment survey in its place. Request to send out the scoring rubric for the program reviews.
    - The current data we have been tracking for accreditation is have all our SLOs been assessed in the six-yr. cycle.
    - We need to come up with a new way to assess assessment.
    - How do we track our assessments if we are constantly changing curriculum? This is something we need to think about. See assessing assessment for further discussion.
  - IB.8- We have raised the bar of communication in assessment: our website is in process of being a good resource for communication; Emails from NAC; First Fridays should be added to the ISER as a form of communication. The committee has good representation from all departments and assessment is a regular agenda item in department meetings.
  - IB.9- Assessment is part of Program review. Have we seen the quality of program review increase by the inclusion of assessment?
  - Use ANT-Resource request skulls example as an example of justification for the need through assessment data. Add to ISER 'As seen through the assessment data for ANT resource request' –ANT skulls example
  - IC-3 How do we communicate academic quality- do we talk about academic quality? Used to be an academic standards and quality committee. Can we define academic quality? An example- PSY rewrote PLOs to lineup with the American Psychological association's guidelines for the undergraduate national standards.
  - Faculty news section of the regular update is supposed to be highlighting student success. We need to be communicating this through the regular update. The regular update is becoming our main mode of communication on the campus. The Regular update is on the website so it is accessible to the community.
  - We will continue this conversation of the ISER at the next meeting.
- **Assessing Assessment**
  - We need to be thinking about what we want to do this year. Suggestion to pull up the old program review that created the key indicators reports to look at how we used to do the assessment.
  - Suggestion to add a check box on the curriculum cover pages to ask if changes are a result of assessment. These cover pages are in process currently. Suggestion to bring this up in the next curriculum meeting and bring back feedback to NAC.

- o We need to think about what are meaningful markers and how do we capture them.
- o For CTE should we be linking our SLOs to GELOs? Does this belong at the PLO level or the SLO? It would help tremendously if the connections between GELO and SLOs are on curriculum. This practice provides evidence for the ISER-IC.11.
- o Do non-credit courses need to have outcomes and do they need to be assessed?
  - ▪ Currently they do have SLOs so they probably do need to be assessed.
- o Do we want to include assessment questions in program review and what do we want them to look like?
- o This discussion will be continued
- **Update on Strategy for Program Assessment**
  - o Caitlin went through and looked at all the mapped SLOs to PLOs and created reports for many of the programs. We want to use this mapping to do the PLO assessment. She has created the mapping reports for PLOs that need to be assessed. These PLO faculty have been invited to the workshop this Friday.
  - o An email will be sent out with a video to show people how to map their SLO to PLO. The percentage of PLOs without any mapping is very small. If you feel like you are ready to start your PLO assessment please set up a meeting with Laura. We do have one workshop scheduled for December the week of finals.
  - o If not all the courses that are in the PLO have been assessed can we still assess the PLO? That is up to the faculty. You need to make the decision if there is enough data from the SLOs to assess the PLOs.
  - o We are looking for a cycle of continued improvement.
  - o Update on the status of NuVentive. We are still waiting for the contract to go through district so we can use managed services. Greg will be contacting NuVentive next week.
  - o Student Services want to be educated on what a true Student Learning Outcome and a Service Area Outcome are. Is there training available to better explain?
- **Assessment Highlight: Assessment and the ISER**
  - o Covered in "Accreditation Update" agenda item above

- **Future Meetings:**
  - o Next meeting November 13, 2019 OC 116

- **Good of the Order: 10: 32am**
  - o **PLO Assessment Boot Camp**
    - ▪ **October 11, 2019, IT 125, 11:30-2:30**
  - o **SLO Drop–in Workshop:**
    - ▪ **October 25, 2019, IT 125, 11:30-2:30**

Standard I.B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness [up to 17 pages]

Academic Quality

1.   The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

As cited in the College's core commitments, the culture of Norco College is engrained with the values of collegiality, mutual respect, and integrity (1-01_Core-Commitments-2019). These values have been expressed in a very healthy legacy of dialog on student outcomes through committees which have overseen areas such as student equity, strategic planning, institutional effectiveness, and student learning. To facilitate this dialog among constituency groups, within the strategic planning councils and many college committees, there is a tri-chair structure including an administrator, a faculty member, and a classified staff member, as seen in the Business and Facilities Planning Council, the Student Services Planning Council, the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee, and the Grants Committee (1-02_Tri-Chair-Evidence-2019). To further deepen the dialog, most college committees include a student member so that the student voice will always be represented, as represented on spring 2019 membership lists for the Academic Senate, Library Advisory Committee, and Student Services Planning Council (1-03_StudentRep-2019) .

Regarding student equity specifically, dialogue has occurred through several committees. Initially, it was through the Student Success Committee. Equity discussions appear in minutes from this committee from November 9, 2015, and May 23, 2016 (1-04_SSC-Minutes-11-9-15, 1-05_SSC-Minutes-5-23-16). An Equity Workgroup inclusive of various stakeholders was formed for implementation of the 2015-2018 Equity Plan (1-06_EquityPlan-p16-2015-18). As part of development for the 2017-2019 Integrated Plan, an Equity Retreat was held on June 2, 2017, with representatives from faculty, staff, and administration (1-07_PlanningRetreat-6-2-17, 1-08_IntegratedPlan-Agenda-6-2-17). As with all planning documents, equity plans were brought to college councils and the Academic Senate for dialog and approval through the shared governance process. To assist in implementation of the 2017-2019 Integrated Plan, the Legacy Committee transitioned into the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee, with its strong focus on equity, as described on the committee's webpage (1-09_DEI-Webpage-2019) and in this committee's spring 2019 report to the Institutional Strategic Planning Council (1-10_DEI-Report-ISPC-Spr19). Equity-focused dialog also permeates the work of the Teaching and Learning Committee, an example of which appears in a meeting of April 20, 2017 (1-11_TLC-Minutes_4-20-17). These examples indicate the importance the College places on this essential issue.

Dialog about institutional effectiveness (defined as improving the structures, processes, and outcomes of the college) has been robust and widespread across the College. Regarding the evaluation of planning processes as outlined in Policy 2010-01 (1-12_Policy-2010-01), at least six out of seven of the procedures entail a discussion of the findings and how the

process or body being evaluated could be improved. A good example of dialog as well as an effective procedure for improving institutional effectiveness is found in the discussion surrounding the Report on Annual Evaluation Cycle during the ISPC Strategic Planning Retreat in December 2017 (1-13_ISPC-RetreatMinutes-12-8-17). It should be noted that not only was this a discussion on how to improve each of the processes involved in the annual evaluation procedures, but it was also a higher-level meta-analysis of the procedures themselves, in essence, an assessment of the evaluation processes.

Student learning and achievement are fundamental topics for dialog at Norco College. Issues of student learning are discussed in standing committees of the Academic Senate. One primary example is in the Norco Assessment Committee (NAC), as shown on the committee's webpage (1-14_NAC-Webpage-2019). Since assessment of student learning is primary to the purpose of this committee, dialog around student learning abounds. One newly added agenda item which has increased dialog in NAC to an even greater degree is "assessment highlights." The purpose of this section is to highlight a topic of interest that is related to assessment but brings up a larger issue rather than dealing with only logistical tasks. An example of this can be found in the May 2018 discussion surrounding the Ensuring Learning pillar of the Guided Pathways model promoted by the state chancellor's office (1-15 NAC-Minutes-5-24-2018). Educational Master Plan/Strategic Planning goals and objectives have been assigned to various strategic planning committees, and these goals are discussed routinely by each of the committees (1-16_SP-Goals-Committees-Map-2013-18). This discussion culminates in a report made to ISPC each semester on progress made on assigned objectives, such as reports found in the ISPC minutes of March 6, 2019 (1-17_ISPC-Minutes-3-6-19, 1-18_DEI-Handout-3-6-19).

Analysis and Evaluation

As shown in committee and council minutes as well as College policies and procedures, dialog and discussion are firmly integrated into the evaluation procedures and committee structure of Norco College. This is further evidenced through the tri-chair committee structure and the inclusion of students on each of the strategic planning committees. Issues on student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and student learning and achievement receive robust dialog through committees and summits. Ultimately, each of the committees reports to ISPC on progress made on EMP/SP Goals each semester as a feedback and accountability loop for this communication.

2.   The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. (ER 11)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Student learning outcomes are defined for each program at the College, as shown in the College Catalog and Nuventive Improve, the program that houses assessment information (2-01_PLOs-Catalog-2019-20 , 2-02_All-PLOs-Nuventive-7-2019). As part of each program and course outline of record, learning outcomes are required in order to complete the

curriculum process. Evidence of this process can be seen in the Nuventive Improve software reports showing all courses and programs with updated SLOs (2-03_SLO-PSY-Nuventive-2019, 2-04_PLO-PSY-Nuventive-2019). All courses and programs are on a six-year cycle of assessment, and appropriate disciplines are keeping assessment current, as shown on the SLO spreadsheet (2-05evidence: SLO spreadsheet). This cycle was approved by the Norco Assessment Committee and requires that all course outcomes (SLOs) and program outcomes (PLOs) must be assessed at least once during the assessment cycle (2-06_NAC-Minutes-3-22-18). General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs), which are also the College's institutional learning outcomes, are included as part of the six-year cycle since the general education is considered a program. Assessment results for each of the GELOs are included in the Annual Assessment Report on the assessment website (2-07_GELO-AssessmentReport_18-19).

> **Commented [AK1]:** Evidence needed. Need to provide pdf in Sept-Oct of most recent list

Student services and learning support services (Learning Resource Center, or LRC) are regularly assessed and used for improvement. Evidence for assessment of these areas is found in the Student Services Program Review documents (2-08_SS-PeerReviewAssessment-Spr18). An example can be found in the spring 2018 comprehensive program review for Student Employment (2-09_SS-PR-Report-StudentEmp-Spr18) and the Career Center (2-10_SS-PR-Report-CareerCenter-Spr18). In addition to program review, student learning and support services, specifically library and LRC, are assessed each semester, as described in Standard II.B.3.

Analysis and Evaluation

College assessment documentation shows that student learning outcomes for programs (including general education) are on a six-year cycle, and the appropriate disciplines are keeping assessment current to date. Student services and learning support also maintain a rigorous and frequent assessment of student outcomes and satisfaction. Library services are also assessed using both quantitative and qualitative measures.

3.   The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information. (ER 11)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Norco College has set standards in student achievement at both aspirational and floor levels. These institution-set standards (ISS), which are based on metrics used in the USDE College Scorecord, focus improvement efforts and guide strategic planning. The aspirational standards are most clearly observed in the 2013-2018 (extended to 2019) Strategic Plan Goals One and Two and, as mentioned in Standard I.A.2 and Standard I.A.3, all of these goals were designed to be the operationalization of the mission, vision, and values. The goals, and associated objectives, that are most focused on student achievement are Goal One, Increase Student Achievement and Success, and Goal Two, Improve the Quality of Student Life (3-01_SP-Goals-2012).

For each of the above goals and objectives, clear and measurable five-year aspirational benchmarks or standards have been set as a focus for institutional improvement. As mentioned Standard I.A.3, progress toward these five-year standards is assessed each year, and a report, the Annual Progress Report on Educational Master Plan Goals, Objectives, and "Dashboard Indicators" (3-02_NC-ReportEMPGoals-2018) is written, posted, and presented to the constituencies outlined in the Policy and Procedures for Regular Evaluation of Integrated Institutional Planning, Budgeting and Decision-making Processes (3-03_BP-2010-01).

Floor standards, or the benchmark that indicates a need for significant intervention, are established each year for areas of student achievement and are posted on the Institutional Research (IR) website (3-04_ISS-Report-2018), as well as submitted in the Annual ACCJC Report (3-05_NC-ACCJCReport-2019). Floor ISS were considered and established after input from several sources including ISPC and recommendations from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, as shown in ISPC minutes from April 3, 2019 (3-06_ISPC-Minutes-4-3-19, 3-07_ISS-PPT-ISPC-4-3-19). From these discussions, it was decided that the floor ISS would be set at one-half standard deviation below the previous five-year mean. This methodology was adopted because it takes into account previous institutional history on the metric in question, but since it is at one-half a standard deviation, downward trends in any metric will be seen promptly. If any of the metrics goes below the floor ISS for two years in a row, an institutional response is to be drafted by the Academic Senate to ameliorate this substandard performance, as shown in the Senate Recommendation Regarding Institutional Set Standards—Procedural Response (3-08_ISS-Procedural-Response-2017).

Analysis and Evaluation

As documented by the reports, minutes, and procedures outlined above, the College establishes institution-set standards (both floor and aspirational) for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, and assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information.

4.   The institution uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The use of data is integral to Norco College's institutional processes which, in turn, are focused on supporting student learning and achievement. All instructional, student services, and administrative units utilize program review as their primary tool for needs assessment, planning, and resource allocation, as shown in the Strategic Planning Cycle, as shown in the Norco College Strategic Plan, 2013-2018 (4-01_SP-p6-2013-18) and the Resource Allocations Process from Program Review, revised in_____ (4-02_evidence). Data on student achievement are central to the program review process. As evidence of the centrality of data to this process, a review of any program review documents shows that all units

Commented [AK2]: Document is in process, spring 2019.

Commented [AK3R2]: Flow charts going to PR Committee in September

4

review longitudinal trend analyses of student success, retention, completion of degrees, and numbers of students still in progress toward completion. Examples can be found in the instructional program review for anthropology (4-03_ANT-PR-Data-Analysis-2018) and in the student services program review for SSS-Rise (PR-SSS_Rise-Assessment). In addition, instructional program reviews must summarize student learning outcome data, and units use both SLO and achievement data in justifying requests for resources, as illustrated in the responses to the program review template question regarding the impact of resources requested that is found in the 2018 comprehensive program review in anthropology (4-04_INST-PR-Report-ANT-Spr18). This example of data-centric institutional processes is indicative of the data-guided culture at Norco College as a whole.

Another example of data mobilizing and transforming the institution as a whole is the "9.8 Story" (4-05_DataStory-CI-2015). Briefly, back in 2015, a college team attended a High Impact Practices Institute and was shown that, of all students who walked through our door for the first time, only 9.8 percent of them received a degree or certificate within four years. When including transfer, the percentage went up to a little over 14 percent. For various reasons, completion rates in previous metrics had never included all first-time college students. When it was realized that only one in 10 students earned a degree or certificate, the College was inspired to act. Through a college completion summit and subsequent brown-bag meetings over the next two years, an initiative known as the Completion Initiative was born, as documented in minutes for the Committee of the Whole and the Institutional Strategic Planning Council (4-06_COTW_Minutes-5-24-16, 4-07_ISPC-Minutes-9-7-16, 4-08_COTW-Minutes-3-23-17). Implementation of this initiative included, in an effort to raise the completion rate, a massive reorganization into Schools. As of July 1, 2018, Norco College completely reorganized the process from onboarding to college completion so that students would belong to one of four Schools: Social and Behavior Sciences; Arts and Humanities; Business and Management; and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM). This reorganization was based on research that showed significantly increased completion rates in colleges that have this institutional structure. The purpose and process are described in a March 14, 2018, email from President Bryan Reece sent to the college through the Norco College listserv as well as institutional reorganizational draft of April 23, 2018, also distributed to the College listserv (4-09_DrReeceReorgEmail-3-14-18, 4-10_NCReOrg-Chart-4-23-18). Through this comprehensive reorganization, it is hoped that students will find a less impersonal and more program-focused environment that will encourage increased completion and change the "9.8 Story."

Analysis and Evaluation

The College's institutional processes, program review being central, all utilize student achievement data as a guide for institutional improvement, especially as connected to resource requests. Assessment was more easily identified in program reviews in 2016 and 2017, but in transitioning to an electronic program review form for 2018, the College realized at the end of the first iteration of the cycle that assessment data was not connected. The College had moved forward with the new software for program review because the same software was used for assessment, and the College was told by the software creators that we would have better integration than in the past. But the new software did not connect

5

assessment data in program review in a meaningful way. The College is in the process of working with software to establish a clearer connection for assessment within program review and expects to have this completed before the next program review cycle in 2021, as shown in minutes from the Assessment Committee in fall 2018 (evidence: Assessment Committee minutes spring 2018 to fall 2018. Discussed in fall 2018 meetings). Although assessment data was imported into the 2018 program review documents only as a pdf attachment, faculty commented on their assessments over the previous three years, and that section provided an opportunity to record a summary of assessment activities. Also, the Assessment Committee produced its annual assessment report as usual. As an example of data-guided decision-making is found in the College's Completion Initiative. This level of commitment to data is indicative of the data-guided culture at Norco College.

Commented [AK4]: Need to add evidence. Laura Adams will look for specific meeting minutes.

Commented [AK5]: Perhaps move to another Standard? I.B.5?

Institutional Effectiveness

5. The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

To assess accomplishment of the college mission, all academic, student services, and administrative units engage in program review on a three-year cycle. Program review involves both long-term and annual planning. Standard I.A.3 shows that, as part of the planning process, units are asked to show how goals and resource allocation requests support the Educational Master Plan goals, thereby explicitly linking each unit's requests and proposals to the stated goals of the College's mission. In fact, the program review template begins with presentation of the college mission and vision (5-01_INST-PR-WebPage-2019, 5-02_StudentS-PR-WebPage-2019, 5-03_AdminS-PR-WebPage-2019). Program review documents from any of the College's units provide solid evidence of this connection. For example, unit goals in the 2018 comprehensive program reviews for psychology, the Assessment Center, and College Safety and Police show how an instructional, student services, and administrative unit completes the program review template by providing links to strategic planning goals and objectives (5-04_PSY-PR-Report-2018, 5-05_ASSE_CTR-PR-Report-2018, 5-06_CollegePolice-PR-Report-2018). Also, the resource requests for the psychology instructional unit show how these requests are mapped to strategic planning goals and objectives (5-07_PSY-PR-ResourceRequest-2018).

Additionally, as described in Standard I.B.7, the College as a whole evaluates its progress through various surveys and data presentations, including the Annual Progress Report on Educational Master Plan Goals, Objectives, and "Dashboard Indicators," the Institutional Effectiveness and Planning Survey, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), and the Student Success Scorecard (5-08_EMPAnnualReport-2018, the 5-09_IEP-Survey-2018, the 5-10_CCSSE-NC-2017, and the 5-11_SSScorecard-2018).

Commented [AC6]: Will need to update to the 2019 survey results when available

Student learning outcomes (SLOs) and student achievement are assessed by all instructional

faculty and are recorded within the Nuventive Improve assessment software, as shown in a screen shot of assessments for game development (GAM) courses (5-12_Nuventive-GAM-2019). The Norco Assessment Committee (NAC) is the body within the College that oversees all policy and practices related to assessment of SLOs, as described on its webpage (5-13_NAC-WebPage-2019). NAC provides numerous resources to support the collection and analysis of SLO data, including online guides, such as the SLO Assessment Guidelines (5-14_SLO_Assessment_Guidelines-2015) and in-person assessment workshops conducted by NAC members, such as the weekly assessment drop-in hour (5-15_Email-AssessmentDropIn-2019). NAC also produces an Annual Assessment Report that summarizes the state of assessment at the College (5-16_AssessmentReport_17-18). Student achievement is additionally evaluated at the college level as part of publications, including Institution-Set Standards and the Annual Progress Report on Educational Master Plan Goals, Objectives, and "Dashboard Indicators" (5-17_NC-ISS-Report-2018, 5-18_EMPAnnualReport-2018).

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness provides to all faculty conducting course assessments and instructional program review data disaggregated by program type and mode of delivery. This information is available on the Institutional Research webpage (5-19_IR-WebSite-PowerBI-2019); data can be accessed by discipline through use of a pull-down menu. Faculty are presented with success and retention rates for face-to-face, hybrid, and online modalities and use this data as part of course and program evaluation. An example is found in the 2018 comprehensive program review for Political Science (5-20_POL-PR-Metrics-2018, 5-21_IR-WebSite-PowerBI-POL-2019).

Analysis and Evaluation

Documents and reports show that the College engages in regular program review as well as assessment of SLOs and student achievement. Findings from program reviews are published and made accessible to multiple stakeholders within the College through the College's website. In fact, with the College's new three-year cycle for program review, begun in spring 2018, there was 100 percent submission of program reviews from units at the College. Program review data are disaggregated by program type and mode of delivery.

6.   The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Student learning outcomes data can be disaggregated by subpopulations of students via Nuventive Improve. Due to the need for large sample sizes in order to produce meaningful outcomes, disaggregated analysis is usually accomplished at the program level with general education learning outcomes (GELOs) and on larger programs such as the Area of Emphasis (AOE) degree, as shown in a GELO summary and a Communications, Media, and Languages

7

AOE PLO assessment summary from spring 2018 (6-01_GELO_SDGA-summary, 6-02_AOE-CML-PLO3-report). The process for assessing these programs is by selecting faculty who are teaching courses that map to the GELO or AOE program learning outcomes (PLO). These faculty are then sent rosters of their classes where they score students on a rubric. Faculty choose the appropriate artifact in their class that maps to the GELO or AOE. After all faculty have evaluated their students on the rubric, the scores are automatically uploaded to Improve. Since the roster includes student ID numbers, analysis including disaggregation by student subpopulations is performed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Faculty leads are then sent these data and a dialog session is conducted by the NAC, as shown in workshop notes from November 28, 2018 (6-03_GELO-Workshop-notes), and faculty input is

Individual academic departments and student services units disaggregate and examine achievement data (both student and institutional) for subpopulations of students. This information is made available online by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (6-04-IE-Website-PowerBI-2019). The institution regularly evaluates student success and student services using disaggregated data, including in the Annual Progress Report on Educational Master Plan Goals, Objectives, and "Dashboard Indicators" and the Integrated Plan, 2017-2019 (6-05_EMPAnnualReport-2018, 6-06_IntegratedPlan-2017-19).

In responses to this analysis, the College has implemented strategies to address equity gaps, primarily via the Guided Pathways/Completion Initiative, as this significant restructuring of the College was, in part, motivated by performance gaps identified in student success data, as described in Standard I.B.4. Reforms include the restructuring of academic units into meta-majors or Schools, the development of Guided Pathways, including "trailheads," for all majors, and the development of stronger student support mechanisms, as shown in the Guided Pathways Self-Assessment (6-07_GP-SelfAssessment-2017). As Guided Pathways is fully implemented, the College will regularly evaluate success in these reforms of as part of the annual cycle of evaluation and assessment. In addition to Guided Pathways, the College engages in planning and assessment of equity programs via the Student Equity Plan (6-08_Student-Equity-Plan-2015-18).

In the 2018-2019 academic year, the College initiated additional data-driven measures to provide greater focus on and support for student equity. For example, in fall 2018, a retreat for recently hired faculty focused on equity-minded teaching, as reported in the College's newsletter, the Regular Update (6-09_RegularUpdate-11-16-18). In spring 2019, faculty who had attended training at the Center for Urban Education at USE led workshops on equity-minded teaching, and guest speakers visited the College for a series of equity presentations in May, also reported in the Regular Update newsletter (6-10_RegularUpdate-3-8-2019, 6-11_RegularUpdate-5-17-2019). Also in spring 2019, a Professional Development Plan was put in place as the result of a team of College personnel who participated in the RP Group's Leading from the Middle program. This plan includes a number of activities related to dissemination of disaggregated data as well as initiatives to employ data in the service of greater equity (6-12_PD_Data-2019).

Analysis and Evaluation

The institution as a whole regularly uses disaggregated data in its decision-making processes. In response to equity gaps identified by disaggregated data, the College has, through Guided Pathways/Completion Initiative, significantly revised its structures and procedures to better meet the needs of disadvantaged communities. In addition, through initiatives such as equity-minded workshops and the new Professional Development Plan, more work is in process to support the use of disaggregated data to continually monitor for performance gaps and implement strategies to mitigate those gaps. The College engages in ongoing assessment of these efforts.

7.   The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Norco College regularly evaluates its policies and practices through review of strategic goals and objectives as well as surveys.

Two main institutional evaluation reports are the Annual Progress Report on Educational Master Plan Goals, Objectives, and "Dashboard Indicators" and the Report on Annual Evaluation Cycle. The Annual Progress Report on Educational Master Plan Goals, Objectives, and "Dashboard Indicators" reports on evaluation of the College's policies and practices, how policies and practices are affecting student success, and whether the College's goals are being met (7-01_EMPAnnualReport-pgs-2018). Also, as described in Standard I.B.1, the College employs the Policy and Procedures for Regular Evaluation of Integrated Planning, Budgeting and Decision-Making Processes (7-02_Policy-2010-01-2015). The Report on the Annual Evaluation Cycle presents the activities during the academic year that fulfilled the procedures and ensured regular evaluation of the established College decision-making structure (7-03_AnnEvalReportP-2017-18).

In addition, the Institutional Effectiveness and Planning Survey, sent to Norco College staff, faculty, and administrators, is a self-evaluation to determine whether the College is achieving the goals, as stated in its mission statement, through its current policies and practices (7-04_IEP-Survey-pg1-2018).

The process of completing instructional, student services, and administrative program review also provides an opportunity to review policies and practices. As described in program review documents, program reviews are conducted on a triannual basis and include analysis of changes within the unit as well as new resource needs as part of the College's strategic planning process (7-05_INST-PR-WebPage-2019, 7-06_StudentS-PR-WebPage-2019, 7-07_AdminS-PR-WebPage-2019). In addition, the Program Review Committee regularly evaluates program review processes. For example, in April 2019, the committee reviewed a

Commented [KA7]: For evidence, we should cite the PR process (a document?) that explains these steps.
--Also resource allocation process

Commented [AK8R7]: PR process document draft—check PR Committee minutes for April 25, 2019
→As of August 2019, PR process graphics in process. Follow up after September PR Committee meeting

first draft of a document titled Resource Allocations Process through Program Review (7-08_PRCminutes-April 25, 2019), a discussion that continued into the fall 2019 committee meeting (7-09_PRC-mins-fall2019).

> **Commented [AK9]:** Will need to add evidence when available

Analysis and Evaluation

Norco College takes several steps to evaluate its policies and practices, in particular, reports on Educational Master Plan strategic goals and objectives as well as surveys and utilization of the program review process, to assure that policies and practices are effective in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of the College's mission.

8. The institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

In order to ensure Norco College employees and students have an understanding of assessment and evaluation results, as well as the institution's strengths, weaknesses, and priorities, information is presented through several venues. For example, program review dashboards are posted on the Institutional Research website (8-01_IR-StudentDataDB-2019). These interactive dashboards enable the user to filter across various parameters (for example, year, discipline, ethnicity) to evaluate course efficiency and student success rates by student service program, among other metrics. In addition, Norco College publishes evaluation reports on the Institutional Research webpage (8-02_IR-Webpage-Reports-2019). These reports include the annual Institutional Effectiveness and Planning Survey, which evaluates the governance processes; the Annual Progress Report on Educational Master Plan, Goals, Objectives, and "Dashboard Indicators." Institutional Research reports are discussed with the Institutional Strategic Planning Council (ISPC), as shown in ISPC minutes of November 7, 2018 (8-03_ISPC-Minutes-11-7-2018), and may also be presented at the Committee of the Whole, as indicated in minutes from the December 7, 2017 meeting (8-04_COTW-Minutes-12-7-17).

The Norco Assessment Committee (NAC) communicates the results of learning assessments. To ensure accessibility of assessment reports, they are available on the College's website, on the Assessment Committee webpage (8-05_NAC-SupportingDocuments). In addition, faculty from all Academic Departments sit on the Assessment Committee (8-06_NAC-FacultyMembers-2019), and these faculty are charged with reporting out to their academic departments. The Assessment Committee reports to the Academic Senate, as shown in minutes from December 3, 2018 (8-07_NAS-Minutes-12-3-18). Assessment activities also are shared with the College community via nor-all email, as in the June 7, 2019 nor-all listserv email from Laura Adams, faculty assessment coordinator (8-08_NOR-allAssessmentE-mail-Spr19). Other opportunities for communicating with the College community include Flex Day activities, such as those scheduled for spring 2019 (8-09_FLEX-Agenda-Spr19).

> **Commented [AK10]:** Need screen shot once page has been updated with reports

Beginning November 2017, the Regular Update newsletter has provided information to the college community, organized around the College's strategic goals. In particular, regular features, often titled Communicating Quality, provide updates about assessment and evaluation activities. The newsletter is distributed via the "nor-all" email listserv every two weeks during the fall and spring semesters (less frequently during winter and summer) and archived on the president's webpage (8-10_RegUpdateWebpage-2019). An example can be found in a GELO assessment report on page 5 of the December 14, 2018 Regular Update (8-11_RegUpdate-GELO-12-14-18) and a Communicating Quality item on the one-year completion rate of transfer-level English and math appears on page 8 of the April 19, 2019 issue (8-12_RegUpdate-4-19-19).

The College's new Educational Master Plan and Strategic Plan, developed during the 2018-2019 academic year and approved by the Board of Trustees in fall 2019, indicates ways that the institution utilizes shared understanding of results of evaluation activities to set appropriate priorities (8-13_evidence/example?). In addition, the College's early participation in Guided Pathways has provided opportunities to utilize this shared knowledge and understanding to set institutional priorities for improvement of student learning and achievement (8-14_evidence-GP report?).

Commented [AK11]: Need to follow up/update as needed here

Analysis and Evaluation

As shown in reports and other communications, the institution broadly communicates to Norco College stakeholders about its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities. Discussions in college councils and committees ensure this shared understanding, and resulting actions include development of the new Educational Master Plan and Strategic Plan as well as the College's participation in Guided Pathways.

9.   The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources. (ER 19)

Commented [AK12]: Team: I don't think we've adequately addressed this yet—especially to document our application of the process

Commented [AK13R12]: Maybe refer to Standard IV.A also

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The Strategic Plan and Process combines program review, key planning processes, and resource allocation to provide institutional goals spanning multiple years. As documented in the Strategic Plan 2013-2018 (extended to 2019), steps in the comprehensive planning cycle arise from the College's mission, vision, and values, and are driven by institutional goals and evaluations (9-01_SP-PlanningCycle-2013-18). This process enables the College to evaluate its progress towards achieving its mission and provides a transparent platform of Norco College's targets and goals.

To accomplish its mission and improve institutional effectiveness and academic quality, the College conducts program review on a regular basis. Beginning in the 2017-2018 academic year, the College implemented a three-year cycle, with optional annual updates primarily for resource requests, as shown in the Program Review Committee minutes of March 23, 2017 (9-02_PR-Minutes-cycle-3-23-17) . The combination of the instructional, Student Services, and administrative program reviews engages all major units of the College to assess each program's strengths, weaknesses, planning, and resource allocation. As explained in Standard I.A.3, each unit aligns its goals with strategic planning goals. Program review also requires units to state the program's personnel, equipment, technological, and facility needs and anticipated costs for the next two or three years. Each unit is also required to state the justification for the need and how it aligns with the Educational Master Plan, as explained in Standard I.A.3 and shown in the resource requests for [insert example here] program review (9-03_evidence: highlight showing alignment of PR requests with EMP goals). Units are also expected to list any long-term needs (two-three-five years out) that are anticipated to cost more than $20,000 (9-04_evidence: example/request from one PR). Program review enables the College to have short- and long-term budget and resource allocation planning.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College's Strategic Plan and Process has supported broad-based, systematic evaluation and planning through integration of program review, institutional planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive document that aims to achieve the College's mission and improve institutional effectiveness and academic quality.

Conclusions on Standard I.B. Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

Academic quality and institutional effectiveness are core themes at Norco College, as demonstrated through robust and pervasive dialog regarding student achievement and student learning outcomes. SLOs have been defined and are on a cycle of assessment which provides feedback to instructional and student support services. SLOs and student achievement data are part of program review and integral to the assessment of mission accomplishment. In order for the College to continuously improve, institution-set standards are set at both floor and aspirational levels, and these data are used to organize institutional processes. In order to identify potential gaps at a more granular level, SLO and achievement data are disaggregated by student subgroups. In addition, policies and procedures related to services, resource allocation, and governance processes are assessed on an annual basis. Planning processes and resource allocation decisions, both current processes and those undergoing revision in 2019, are based on program review, and results of all processes, including student learning and achievement are communicated broadly to the College at large and to the local community.

Improvement Plan(s)

None

Commented [AK14]: Evidence will be added (Kris): Maybe three here (suggested by Alexis):
A&R or Counseling for SS
Instruction from DoIs for Administration
ECE or Business for instructional

Commented [AK15]:

Commented [AK16R15]: Need further info for this Standard re: improvements in progress and working on right now.
--Processes being evaluated and revised in September, e.g., APC prioritization for faculty, departmental review of resource requests returned to the larger requesting unit. Group discusses in dept. meetings and rank what has been submitted among disciplines within the department (spring). Then came back to PR Committee Chair and ranked lists are submitted to VP AA, which informs how resources are allocated. Evidence: department and discipline minutes – SBS May minutes (in reverse order). (May not need to show all steps. See Standard language.)

Commented [AK17]: To account for discussion that may be added to I.B.9

Standard I.C.3

3.   The institution uses documented assessment of student learning and evaluation of student achievement to communicate matters of academic quality to appropriate constituencies, including current and prospective students and the public. (ER 19)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Norco College documents assessment of student learning and evaluation of student achievement and communicates findings on the College website and in reports to the Board of Trustees.

Program review documents are available on the College website and are accessible to the public (3-01_PublicPR-Data-2019). In addition, the Program Review Committee communicates with disciplines and individual faculty via a SharePoint site (3-02_PR-SharePoint-2019). As detailed in Standard I.B.1, faculty assess student learning outcomes (SLOs) at the course level, and substantial dialog around assessment occurs college-wide. Nuventive Improve is the College repository for the work of assessment, and this data is used to extract information for reports that are available on the Assessment Committee website (3-03_NAC-WS-SupportingDocs-2019) and accessible to the public, as described in Standard I.B.8.

Norco College collects data on degree and certificate completion rates, student transfer rates, and student demographics, and publishes the data on the publicly accessible college website in the annual Progress Report on the Strategic Planning/Educational Master Plan Goals, Objectives and "Dashboard Indicators" (3-04_NC-ReportEMPGoals-2018) and updated data is available on the Institutional Research website (3-05_IR-WebSite-PowerBI-2019). The Career and Technical Education homepage provides a link to gainful employment information for each of its programs (3-06_NC-CTE-WebSite-2019), which is accessible to current and prospective students and the public.

The Institutional Strategic Planning Committee (ISPC) oversees the Institution-set Standards based on regular review of data, as discussed in Standard I.B.3, and receives annual presentations of data (3-07_ISPC-Minutes-9-19-18) to assess institutional progress towards its goals.

The College regularly presents reports on matters of academic quality to the Board of Trustees, with reports such as Guided Pathways implementation (3-08_RCCD-BOT-minutes-5-1-18, 3-09_BOT-GP-Presentation-5-1-18) and alignment with the Vision for Success (3-10_RCCD-BOT-minutes-5-7-19, 3-11_BOT-LGA-VS-Presentation-5-21-19). These presentations occur during open meetings and are recorded in minutes publicly accessible on the Board of Trustees webpage (3-12_RCCD-BOT-Minutes-Webpage-2019).

Analysis and Evaluation

Commented [AC18]: Will want to update WS is currently being updated.

Through student learning assessment, program review, and other institutional research, the College collects data on student achievement and student learning and makes determinations regarding their meaning. The institution communicates these matters of academic quality to appropriate constituencies, including current and prospective students and the public, primarily via the college website.

Standard II.A.2-3, 9, 11-12, 16 _Left off here last meeting_

2.   Faculty, including full time, part time, and adjunct faculty, regularly engage in ensuring that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. In exercising collective ownership over the design and improvement of the learning experience, faculty conduct systematic and inclusive program review, using student achievement data, in order to continuously improve instructional courses and programs, thereby ensuring program currency, improving teaching and learning strategies, and promoting student success.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The District's Curriculum Handbook specifies the rigorous curriculum development, approval, and modification process followed by the College to ensure that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. Curriculum development is faculty driven (2-01_CurriculumHandbook-pg21-25_2014), and a workflow process indicates the participation of faculty disciplines and departments, library, articulation officer, the vice president of Academic Affairs, College and District curriculum committees, and the Board of Trustees (2-02_CurriculumHandbook-pg25-27,33-34_2014). The same process is followed for courses and programs. All course outlines of record (CORs) that are developed or modified through this process include course descriptions, student learning outcomes, and course content at the appropriate level, whether precollegiate or transfer level, as shown in the CORs for Psychology 9 and for Math 35 (2-03_COR-PSY9-12-11-18, 2-04_COR-MAT35-11-13-18) .

Distance education courses also follow the curriculum development, approval, and modification process in the Curriculum Handbook (2-05_Handbook pages referencing DE). The handbook provides important materials such as regulations and best practices for achieving substantive and regular interaction with students (2-06_CurriculumHandbook-pg61-66-2014), as well as a thorough process for adding distance education mode of delivery to a course outline (2-07_CurriculumHandbook-pg67-72-2014).

Faculty also participate in program review and ==assessment==. Faculty conduct regular program reviews following a triennial process. As shown in the Program Review Committee minutes of March 23, 2017, instructional program review is conducted by academic disciplines every three years, with optional annual updates (2-08_PRC-Minutes-3-23-17). This new process for 2017-2018 replaced the previous three-year cycle during which the timeline for comprehensive program reviews was staggered among the disciplines, with annual program reviews submitted in the intervening years. Academic departments are given the freedom to determine the most effective method of conducting program review for their disciplines. A

> **Commented [AK19]:** By fall 2019, we may have a PR Timeline document, which we can use instead of PRC minutes.

14

history of instructional program reviews, available on the Instructional Program Review webpage, shows that the process is consistently followed. Links to program review documents are available on this page (2-09_INST-PR-Webpage-2019).

Through the program review process, faculty conduct regular reviews of their curriculum. An example of curriculum review can be seen in the 2018 instructional program reviews for world languages (2-10_INST-PR-WOR-COR-Review-2018) and administration of justice (2-11_INST-PR-ADJ-COR-Review-2018). In addition, faculty conduct regular assessment of student learning outcomes using achievement data that informs curriculum revisions, improvement of instruction efforts, and support services necessary to improve student learning, as shown in the review and update section of the 2018 program review for early childhood education (2-12_INST-PR-EAR-SLO-Prog-2018). Assessments of student learning outcomes and the subsequent faculty responses are maintained in the Nuventive Improve database (2-13_Nuventive-SLO-EAR-2019).

Results of program reviews are used in planning. For example, math and English faculty identified the need for a math lab/center and a writing support center; both disciplines included these data-supported needs in their program review documents (2-14_MAT-RR-ProgramReview-2019, 2-15_ENG-RR-ProgramReview-2019). Math faculty also discussed their proposal in person with College administrators and English faculty submitted a written proposal (2-16_WritingCenterProposal-2018). In response, as an interim step, the College expanded services for math and English students in the Learning Resources Center, as described in Standard II.B.1, including expanding tutoring services to the STEM Center on campus, as shown on the Math and Science Success Center Tutoring page (2-17_MathScienceCtr-Webpage-2019).

Analysis and Evaluation

Through the curriculum process and program review, faculty regularly engage in ensuring that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. Faculty use program review, assessment, and the curriculum processes to continuously improve instructional courses and programs, ensuring program currency, improving teaching and learning strategies, and promoting student success. In fact, at the start of the current three-year program review cycle in 2017-2018, the College experienced 100 percent of all units submitting their program reviews. Program review, as a procedure at the College, undergoes continuous review and revision for improvement to support program and discipline needs. As part of these improvement efforts, in spring 2019 the Program Review Committee began developing an updated document describing the program review process (2-18_PRC-minutes-20190425), and the discussion continued into fall 2019, with introduction of descriptive templates (2-19_evidence: templates). Furthermore, the curriculum process and document was revised with input from the colleges' distance education committees, as shown in the revised Curriculum Handbook (2-20_evidence).

Commented [AK20]: Add minutes when available

Commented [AC21R20]: Emailed Nicole Brown for the minutes- She was not in attendance for this meeting. She is attempting to track down the minutes. FOLLOW UP

Commented [AK22]: Check after the PRC September meeting.

Commented [AK23]: May want to describe DE revisions in Curriculum Handbook once revised handbook is available—fall 2019

3.   The institution identifies and <mark>regularly assesses learning outcomes</mark> for courses, programs, certificates and degrees using established institutional procedures. The institution has officially approved and current course outlines that include student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that includes learning outcomes from the institution's officially approved course outline.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

All course outlines of record, housed in CurriQunet (3-01_CurriQunet-NCWebsite-2019), include student learning outcomes that are to be assessed, as exemplified in Standard I.C.1. The College Catalog identifies program learning outcomes for degrees and certificates (3-02_Catalog-PLOs-2019-20).

A six-year assessment cycle, called the Rotation Plan for Outcomes Assessment, is developed and periodically modified by the Norco Assessment Committee, showing regular assessment of learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees (3-03_LO-RotationPlan-2018). This plan includes timelines. Department chairs, as part of their duties outlined in the CTA-RCCD contract, provide oversight of assessment efforts in their departments (3-04_DepartmentChair-CTA-Contract_2015-18). The Norco Assessment Committee (NAC) provides an annual Assessment Report that tracks assessments within the cycle (3-05_AssessmentReport-17-18).

A Student Learning Outcomes Report, developed by the Assessment Committee, provides a template to guide faculty in assessing course and program learning outcomes (3-06_LO-ReportForm-2019). Assessment methods, or instruments, are listed on the report to provide options for faculty. Written instructions regarding the expectation of SLO assessment are found in the Faculty Guide under discussions of assessment and syllabi (3-07_Assessment-FacultyGuide-2019).

Syllabi for all courses, regardless of method of delivery, are required to include established SLOs, as explained in the Faculty Guide (3-08_SyllabusSLO-FacultyGuide-2019). To ensure that correct SLOs appear on each syllabus, in 2015, Norco College began providing syllabus shells for all courses with SLOs preloaded, as described in Standard I.C.1. These are available on a webpage linked to the Faculty page of the website (3-09_SyllabusShell-Webpage-2019). The syllabus shells webpage also is linked in the Faculty Guide (3-10_SyllabusLink-FacultyGuide-2019). The Faculty Guide instructs faculty to distribute syllabi to all students (3-11_SyllabusDistribute-FacultyGuide-2019). In addition, all faculty submit syllabi each semester to the Course Syllabi Repository, as directed in the Faculty Guide (3-12_SyllabusRepository-FacultyGuide-2019).

Analysis and Evaluation

As evidenced by curriculum and assessment documents, Norco College identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees. Institutional procedures for assessment ensure that course outlines and syllabi include learning outcomes. Syllabi are distributed to students in every class.

16

9.   <mark>The institution awards course credit, degrees and certificates based on student attainment of learning outcomes</mark>. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education. If the institution offers courses based on clock hours, it follows Federal standards for clock-to-credit-hour conversions. (ER 10)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Board policies and administrative procedures guide the awarding of course credit, degrees and certificates. BP/AP 4020: Program, Curriculum, and Course Development (9-01_BP-AP4020-1-17-17) defines a credit hour to align with federal financial aid requirements, which indicates consistency with generally accepted norms in higher education. AP/AP 4100: Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates (9-02_BP-AP4100-5-16-17) provides District policy for the awarding of degrees and certificates based on students' demonstrated competence in general education and learning in their program of study. BP/AP 4230: Grading and Academic Record Symbols (9-03_BP-AP4230-7-30-18) explains the meaning of grades. This information about the grading system also appears in the College Catalog (9-04_GradSystem-Catalog-19-20).

All course outlines of record (CORs) must include student learning outcomes (SLOs) as part of the curriculum process, described in the Curriculum Handbook (9-05_CurriculumHandbook-pp.21-25). CORs include methods of instruction and methods of evaluation, which the curriculum process requires to align with SLOs (9-06_<mark>CurriculumHandbook-pp.23-24</mark>). Standard I.B.2 discusses faculty assessment of their courses to ensure students are meeting SLOs.

All programs and certificates have explicit program learning outcomes, periodically reviewed and, as necessary, revised by faculty workgroups, and made explicit in the College Catalog (9-07_<mark>CurriculumHandbook-pp.36-38,highlight p. 37 under Step A2</mark>), and PLOs are listed in the College Catalog (9-08_PLOs-Catalog-19-20). Assessment of SLOs and PLOs in Nuventive Improve shows the use of faculty assignments for direct learning outcomes assessment, for example as shown in SLO 3 of PSY-9 Developmental Psychology (9-09-SLO-Assesment-Nuventive-2017). Course SLOs are mapped to PLOs, as shown in Nuventive Improve (9-10_Mapping-Nuventive-2019).

To ensure that the achievement of stated learning outcomes is the basis for awarding course credit as well as degrees and certificates, assessment follows a six-year cycle, including SLO assessment at the course level, PLO assessment, and general education learning outcome (GELO) assessment (9-11_6-YearRotationPlan-2017-23).

Analysis and Evaluation

As shown through curriculum development as well as in the work of SLO and PLO assessment, in alignment with District policies, the College awards course credit, degrees, and certificates based on student attainment of learning outcomes. The College does not offer courses based on clock hours.

17

Commented [AK24]: Check highlighting on AP. May have too much highlighted.

Commented [AK25]: Here and elsewhere in II.A.9, use new Curriculum Handbook if available in fall.

11.   The institution includes in all of its programs, ==student learning outcomes, appropriate to the program level==, in communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, the ability to engage diverse perspectives, and other program-specific learning outcomes.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College sees its general education learning outcomes (GELOs) as tantamount to institutional learning outcomes and as a proxy for the UC/CSU intersegmental general education learning outcomes. The Catalog explains the College's Philosophy of the Associate Degree, which includes general education learning outcomes to develop "the ability to think and to communicate clearly and effectively, both orally and in writing; to use mathematics; to understand the modes of inquiry of the major disciplines; to be aware of other cultures and times; to achieve insights gained through experience in thinking about ethical problems; and to develop the capacity for self-understanding" as well as outcomes related to in-depth knowledge in a subject area (11-01_GELO-Philosophy-Catalog-19-20). The Catalog identifies program learning outcomes for all degrees and certificates (11-02_PLOs-Catalog-19-20). Course outlines of record (CORs) include one or more general education student learning outcomes along with course-specific learning outcomes, as shown in COM-1 and ENG-2B (11-03_COR-ENG2B-COM1-18-19).

In the assessment process, student learning outcomes (SLOs), which are linked to general education learning outcomes (GELOs), are mapped to program learning outcomes (PLOs) (11-04-SLO-PLO-GELO-SOC1-2019).

Analysis and Evaluation

As shown in the Catalog and in the learning outcomes mapping on Nuventive Improve, the College has adopted general education and program-specific learning outcomes, including those for communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, and the ability to engage diverse perspectives. These learning outcomes are regularly assessed, as described further in Standard I.B.2.

12.   The institution requires of all of its degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy for both associate and baccalaureate degrees that is clearly stated in its catalog. The institution, relying on faculty expertise, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum, ==based upon student learning outcomes== and competencies appropriate to the degree level. The learning outcomes include a student's preparation for and acceptance of responsible participation in civil society, skills for lifelong learning and application of learning, and a broad comprehension of the development of knowledge, practice, and interpretive approaches in the arts and humanities, the sciences, mathematics, and social sciences. (ER 12)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

In alignment with District Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 4025: Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education (12-01_BP-AP4025-12-2-14), the College's general education (GE) philosophy is described in the Graduation Requirements section of the Catalog (12-02_GE-Philosophy-Catalog-19-20). Each degree program requires a student to complete either the RCCD GE program, CSU GE, or IGETC (12-03_DegreeProgramReq-Catalog-19-20). Any course in the District's GE pattern will have at least one student learning outcome linked to a GE learning outcome. For example, Math 5: Calculus for Business and Life Science, includes the general education critical thinking learning outcome among the student learning outcomes for the course (12-04_COR-MAT5-11-30-18).

Courses meeting CSU general education requirements or IGETC are detailed in the Catalog (12-05_CSU-IGETC-Catalog-19-20). The Catalog also provides educational templates that include all required courses for a degree (12-06_ED-Templates-Catalog-19-20), ADTs (12-07_ADTs-Catalog-19-20), and curricular patterns (12-08_CurricularPatterns-19-20). Lists of courses that will fulfill CSU general education and IGETC requirements also are available on the College's Transfer Center/Transfer Requirements webpage (12-09_TransferCenter-Webpage-2019)

If a discipline feels that one of its courses belongs in the GE pattern, it follows the same step-by-step process as any curriculum proposal or course revision, as outlined in the Curriculum Handbook, beginning with a faculty member, then discipline and department approval. The course then goes to the Curriculum Committee, which reviews the course to see if it is appropriate for general education, and then must be approved by two of the three colleges in the District (12-10_CurriculumHandbook- pp. 33-34, 5).

> **Commented [AC26]:** Waiting on new handbook

The office of Institutional Effectiveness, in partnership with the Norco Assessment Committee, compiles an Annual Assessment Report (12-11_GELO-AssessmentReport-17-18). These reports are linked on the Supporting Documents webpage of the Assessment Committee (12-12_NAC-SupprotingDocs-Webpage-2019). In addition, general education assessment and findings are summarized in the Annual Assessment Report, which contains reports from 2006 to the present (12-13_NAC-SupportingDocs-Webpage-2019).

Analysis and Evaluation

As described in the College Catalog, Norco College requires a component of general education for all of its degree programs. Faculty expertise drives the inclusion of courses in the general education curriculum through the processes practiced by the Curriculum Committee, based on student learning outcomes and competencies appropriate to the degree level. As described in the Catalog, the four RCCD general learning outcomes—critical thinking, information competency and technology literacy, communication, and self-development and global awareness—prepare students for responsible participation in civil society, provide skills for lifelong learning, and lead to broad comprehension of the

development of knowledge, practice, and interpretive approaches in the arts and humanities, the sciences, mathematics, and social sciences.

16.   The institution regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, pre-collegiate, career-technical, and continuing and community education courses and programs, regardless of delivery mode or location. The institution systematically strives to improve programs and courses to enhance learning outcomes and achievement for students.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

As described on the Program Review Committee's webpage, program review is conducted on a regular basis "to facilitate intentional self-evaluation and planning in order to support program quality, improve student success and equity, enhance teaching and learning, and connect resource allocation to strategic planning" (16-01_PR-Committee-Webpage-2019). shows the College's three-year program review process.

Standard II.A.2 explains how faculty exercise collective ownership in utilizing program review to continuously improve instructional courses and programs. Program reviews follow a three-year process; faculty conduct triennial instructional program review by academic discipline with optional annual updates (16-02_PR-3yrProcess-Minutes-3-23-17). In 2017-2018, this process replaced the previous three-year cycle during which the timeline for comprehensive program reviews was staggered among the disciplines, with annual program reviews submitted in the intervening years. An archive of instructional program reviews since 2015, available on the Instructional Program Review webpage (16-03_instructional-PR-webpage), shows that program review is a regular process.

Program assessment, course-level assessment, and general education learning outcomes assessment are also part of the process of regularly evaluating and improving the quality and currency of instructional courses and programs. As explained in Standard II.A.2, assessment for course-level outcomes (SLOs) and systematic program learning outcome (PLO) assessment occur every six years; every SLO for every course and PLO for every program has an initial assessment and closes the loop within six years (16-04_evidence: assessment rotation).

For program review, units must plan systematic updates to their curriculum/programs and submit modifications (major/minor) to the Curriculum Committee at least every six years, which is described in Standard II.A.2. As described in Standard II.A.1, all new programs and classes are vetted by the Curriculum Committee through a faculty-directed process, both at the College and District levels. Major modifications also must be approved through the curriculum process, a process detailed in the Curriculum Handbook (16-05_CurriculumHandbook).

Commented [AG27]: Program Review should probably be highlighted here, especially the focus (with examples) on continuous improvement.

Commented [AK28R27]: Note: Will add examples of improvement (maybe English or ECE from 2016 and/or 2018 CPRs?). May need to obtain suggestions of PRs to use from Alexis/Sam.

Commented [AK29]: This should already be in the SharePoint for II.A

Commented [AK30]: Pages 28-29 of 2014 Curriculum Handbook. Update when new CH is available.

20

Continuous improvement is the goal of program review and assessment. As a result of these processes, faculty in a discipline submit modifications to curriculum, which are vetted by the College and District Curriculum Committee. This response is shown in the example of the Curriculum/COR Review report for English in the 2018 program review document (16-06_PR-ENGLISH-CurriculumRPT-2018), which reflect faculty members' collaboration to assure relevancy, appropriateness, and currency of courses and programs. Instructional units also present goals in their program reviews, based on the unit evaluation. Planning for the future as well as changes and improvements in programs as a result of assessment and program evaluations can be seen, for example, in the 2018 program review for psychology (16-07_PR-psychology-2018). Institutional changes and improvements that have occurred as a result of program reviews are discussed in Standard II.A.2.

Analysis and Evaluation

Through program review, curriculum, and assessment, the College regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs at the institution, regardless of delivery mode or location. Although the College meets the Standard, further work is in progress to strengthen the program review process in the ongoing work of continuous improvement. In spring 2019 the Program Review Committee began developing an updated document describing the program review process (16-08_PRC-minutes-20190425), and the discussion continued into fall 2019, with introduction of descriptive templates (16-09_evidence: templates). Stronger clarification of the connections between program review and institutional planning will be a key goal of the fall 2019 strategic plan and governance process development. These processes show how the College systematically strives to improve programs and courses to enhance learning outcomes and achievement for students.

Standard II.C.1-2, 7

1.   The institution regularly evaluates the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, support student learning, and enhance accomplishment of the mission of the institution. (ER 15)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Consistent with the College mission, the Student Services division is committed to empowering students by enhancing personal and educational achievements through comprehensive programs and services. As described in Standard I.B.2 and Standard I.B.5, the College regularly evaluates the quality of support services through the triennial program review process (SS-PR-webpage) and produces data-driven recommendations to increase the effectiveness of student services programs regardless of location or means of delivery. Through the program review process, each program evaluates goals, reviews assessments, and provides improvement recommendations as needed. Student Services goals and outcomes are mapped to one of more strategic goals of the College, showing alignment with the College's mission. For example, student services program review for Admissions and

---

Commented [AK31]: Add minutes when available

Commented [AK32]: Available after the PRC September meeting.

Commented [TK33]: Request sent to Lenny on 8/20 to update with new 2018 PRs.

Commented [AK34R33]: 2018-2019 SS PRs are on the website. PR evidence here—and throughout Standard IIC—will be updated soon.

Records, Counseling and JFK/Dual Enrollment show the evaluation of quality of services for in person, online and off-site locations respectively (evidence: 2019 PRs for these areas).

Student Services utilizes student/customer satisfaction surveys as the primary means of assessing the quality of and identifying areas of improvement of programs, services, and activities provided at all locations. In spring 2019, based on improvement recommendations in the Admissions and Records program review, the Student Services division introduced an online chat feature to help students in enrollment and onboarding (Enrollment-2019-LiveChat-BOT-presentation). For example, based on the student satisfaction survey for the online orientation, Student Services did not change the online orientation for 2018-2019 (Student-Orientation), but will look at revising the orientation now based on students' requests for more information in some areas, such as athletics. Student Services also utilizes student satisfaction surveys for projects such as Summer Advantage, a key onboarding program (SA-Exit-Survey-2019) which is evaluated annually (SA-Report-2018).

To ensure a thorough evaluation, student support services data are disaggregated for special programs and services and available on the Institutional Research webpage (need screen shot of IR page/Special Programs data). Programs and services use this data to have a better understanding of the student population being served, as seen in the 2019 EOPS program review (PR-EOPS).

In addition to the program review process, the evaluation of services delivered in all locations and modalities can be seen through the college's participation in external survey tools such as the biennial Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), which provides further information to help in evaluating student support services (CCSSE-2017) and the 2017-2018 California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Distance Education Survey (DE-surevy-CCC-20172018), which assists in evaluating services available to distance education students.

Analysis and Evaluation

Student Services, regardless of location or means of delivery, regularly evaluates the quality of services by utilizing program review data and outcomes, student surveys, and other reports to ensure continuous improvement. In addition to participating in the revised triennial program review process beginning in 2017-2018, all Student Services units conducted a 2018-2019 program review update for closing the loop and updating information. Moving forward, Student Services will continue alignment with instructional and administrative program review on the three-year cycle.

2.   The institution identifies and assesses learning support outcomes for its student population and provides appropriate student support services and programs to achieve those outcomes. The institution uses assessment data to continuously improve student support programs and services.

Commented [AK35]: Greg: Do we have SS data disaggregated by location and means of delivery also? Also—please review the rest of this paragraph, especially the wording about CCSSE. Is there a section of CCSSE we can call out?

Commented [AK36]: https://www.norcocollege.edu/academicAffairs/ie/ir/Pages/ccsse.aspx

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The Student Services division regularly conducts assessments in each service area included in the annual program review documents. As evidenced by the template used for the 2018-2019 annual program review, each department is required to incorporate three assessments in a combination of learning or area outcomes. These assessments are developed, reviewed, and analyzed by each department to determine quality of services, identify improvement, and highlight accomplishments (SS-PR20182019-AssessmentOutcomes-PTII). Improvement plans are provided for each assessment (PR-Student Life-2019). Furthermore, Student Services program review assessments map to institutional goals and objectives related to student success and course completion, as shown in the 2018 program review for EOPS (PR-EOPS-assessment+mapping). Puente and Umoja are equity programs (learning communities) that provide instructional courses and counseling efforts that highlight direct connection between learning and student support services (PR- Puente-2019 and PR-Umoja-2019). As evidenced by the Student Services program review success and information data, special populations/programs are reviewed and compared to the general college population to gauge effectiveness of services based on success and retention (SSV Program Review Success and Retention info from IR website).

Student Services uses outcomes assessment to continuously improve programs and services. The 2018-19 program review for Assessment demonstrates the continuous improvement of the onboarding process. For example, in 2017-18 only 8% of students completed the onboarding process. The findings for 2018-19, show 92% of students completed OAC. A major contributor to the significant increase is due to the implementation of the AB705 Placement Survey in the application process and additional services available to first time college students (PR- Assessment). In fact, program reviews require improvement recommendations as part of analysis (evidence from PR template).

Analysis and Evaluation

Through the implementation and continuous evaluation of data reports as evidenced in program reviews, the College identifies and assesses learning support outcomes for its student population and provides appropriate student support services and programs to achieve those outcomes. Assessment data in program reviews is used to improve student support programs and services.

7. The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College uses the California community college-system adopted CCCApply, which is administered by the California Community College State Chancellor's Office, to facilitate the admissions process (CCCApply-about-us, CCCApply).

Commented [TK37]: Requested all PR's be uploaded on 8/21

Commented [AK38R37]: In process of updating evidence from SS PRs

Commented [AK39]: Special programs outcomes data https://www.norcocollege.edu/academicAffairs/ie/ir/Pages/ccsse.aspx

An example of the College's evaluation processes for admissions and placement is found in the adoption of the Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAP). As described in Standard II.A.7, Norco College was an early adopter of MMAP for placement, and evaluation of this method was captured in a 2016 report (MMAP-IR-report-2016). Since the implementation of AB705, the onboarding process eliminated assessment testing for math and English and replaced it with self-reported data located on the admission application (CCCCO-WhatIsAB705, Admission Application).

According to a memo from the state Chancellor's Office, "Some college courses outside of English or quantitative reasoning/mathematics may use instruments as part of a challenge process (for instance, chemistry or some languages). However, these instruments are not intended for placement but for measuring the completion of foundational competencies" (AB705-Memo-Placement+Diagnostic). Norco College provides three such diagnostic tests. [Add ESL test information.] The California Chemistry Diagnostic Test (Form 1997) (IIC.204_Approved-Assessment) is a paper and pencil test that is used to determine students' preparedness for Chemistry 1A. The Chemistry 1A course has a math prerequisite. The WebCape Spanish language test is an adaptive test completed online which places students into transfer level Spanish. The Spanish challenge is dependent upon self-reported background questions about the students' school and private experience in Spanish. Information about the test is also discussed in Standard II.A.8.

Triennial program reviews for Admissions and Records (PR-A&R-2018) and for the Assessment Center (PR-AssessmentCtr-2018) show evaluations of admissions and placement processes, as well as improvement recommendations for service area outcomes assessments.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College relies on the admissions application tool administered by the state Chancellor's Office. Norco College's evaluation of tools utilized for admission and placement, especially through the program review process, are periodic and demonstrate effectiveness.

Standard III.A.2

2. Faculty qualifications include knowledge of the subject matter and requisite skills for the service to be performed. Factors of qualification include appropriate degrees, professional experience, discipline expertise, level of assignment, teaching skills, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Faculty job descriptions include development and review of curriculum as well as assessment of learning. (ER 14)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The procedures for full-time faculty recruitment and hiring, in AP 7120c (2-01_AP7120c_FT-FacultyHiring) and Human Resources and Employee Relations Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty Recruitment Process (2-02_HR-FT-RecruitmentProcess), and for part-

---

Commented [AK40]: Need evidence?: admission's application page showing self-reported data –or something else?
ESL and Chem diagnostic and Spanish still happening --these placements are approved by chancellor's office

Commented [AK41R40]: Dr. Tarrant will look at Spanish placement + wholistic assessment being added to CCCApply

Commented [AK42]: Need to highlight p. 6

Commented [AK43]: Need to follow up: Do we use ESL placement?

Commented [AK44]: Need to highlight

Commented [AK45]: Need to say more about this and identify specific places in PRs where this is addressed
Emphasis in PR has been placed more on SLOs

Commented [AK46]: Seems we should add reference to placement here, too

time faculty recruitment and hiring in AP 7120d (2-03_AP7120d_PT-FacultyHiring), ensure that faculty selected for hire have adequate and appropriate knowledge of their subject matter. As described by AP 7211: Minimum Qualifications, and Equivalency (2-04_AP7211-MinQuaifications), academic employees possess the minimum qualifications prescribed for their positions by the Board of Governors in the Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges Handbook, published by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (2-05_CCC-MinQualHB-Faculty_2017). The process for full-time faculty hiring indicates that transcripts are verified by human resources at the time of hiring (2-06_HR-FT-Recuitment-TranscriptVerify). All job descriptions posted by the District for both full- and part-time faculty include state-mandated minimum qualifications as well as specifically required and preferred qualifications. This is evident, for example, in the 2016 full-time math faculty job posting (2-07_JD-FTMathFaculty-2016), the 2018 full-time math faculty job posting (2-08_JD-FTMathFaculty-2018), and the part-time math faculty job posting (2-09_JD-PTMathFaculty-2018). Current job announcements for faculty, written by subject matter experts, directly relate to the college mission and students served through, for instance, the Commitment to Diversity statement, basic function and professional responsibilities (2-10_JD-FTMathFaculty-2016, 2-11_JD-FTMathFaculty-2018). Faculty job responsibilities include curriculum oversight and student learning outcomes assessment.

Analysis and Evaluation

Through administrative procedures, Norco College has established and follows a consistent process to verify that faculty have adequate and appropriate knowledge of the subject matter. Job descriptions directly relate to the College's mission and include appropriate factors of qualification as well as responsibility for curriculum and assessment.