Norco Assessment Committee
Draft-Minutes for October 13, 2021
9:00 am-10:30 am
Zoom

Meeting Participants

Committee Members Present

Laura Adams, Greg Aycock (co-chair), Courtney Buchanan, Tami Comstock, Eric Doucette, Ashlee Johnson (co-chair), Stephany Kyriakos, Bibiana Lopez, and Caitlin Welch.

Committee Members Not Present

Evangelina Christine Abeyta (student rep.), Daren Koch, Jethro Midgett, David Schlanger, and Tim Wallstrom.

Guests

Lindsay Owens

Recorder

Charise Allingham

1. Call to Order
- 9:01 am

2. Action Items

2.1 Approval of Agenda
- MSC (Stephanie Kyriakos /Courtney Buchanan)

2.1 Conclusion
- Approved with Correction
    - Add Laura Adams to the membership

2.2 Approval of September 8, 2021 Minutes
- MSC (Stephanie Kyriakos /Courtney Buchanan)

2.2 Conclusion
- Approved

2.3 Approval of 2021-2022 Charter
- MSC (Courtney Buchanan, Stephanie Kyriakos)

Addition of Equity Section was added by Academic Senate. Equity prompt was removed. A small change under 'Scope and Expected Deliverables'
    - #3 Change from 'Develop' to 'Facilitate'

2.3   Conclusion

- Approved with changes

3. Discussion Item

3.1   SLO Training

In a response to recent Student Service trainings some tools were developed to help write SLOs.

Two tools were shared with the committee:

Outcome Development Tools

Committee discussed the benefits of the tools 5 questions.

- o Prompt for SLOs currently in CurriQunet:
    - ▪ Upon successful completion of the course, students should be able to demonstrate the following skills:
- Because SLOs apply to all three colleges, benefit to keep tools and technologies open/generalized in the outcome so the instructor has freedom to choose.
- Suggestion that these questions would be beneficial for the creation of COR overall, but where do they belong? Suggestion to use this tool in a backward course design training.
    - o Benefit to identify the SLOs first, although when SLOs are updated the overall COR may not be addressed.
        - ▪ Major areas of COR -Content, Objectives and Outcomes.
    - o Suggestion to start a sub-group with a Canvas modular design and training focus.
        - ▪ Start by taking the 'Assessment in Digital Learning Course'.
        - ▪ Dr. Adams and Dr. Buchanan volunteered to serve on the sub-group.
        - ▪ Send an email to committee with details about the sub-group.
- Career and Transfer are beneficial to think about when developing a Course Outline of Record (COR).
- Mapping between SLOs and GELOs is being done when a new or modified Course Outline of Record is created.
    - o Suggestion to provide training for CTE courses in the value of mapping SLOs to GELOs.
    - o Possible future discussion in the benefits of General Education Outcomes being referred to as Institutional Learning Outcomes. It's been over 10 years since the GELOs have been revised/reviewed.
- Outcome Development Tool works really well for Student Services.
- Question: Would it be helpful to identify introducing, reinforcing and mastery of outcomes when mapping? Nuventive now has a feature that will allow for this when mapping. Suggestion that this would only benefit mapping of skills building/ capstone courses.

Outcome Smart tool
- o Overview of draft-SMART rubric was shared (attached).
    - ▪ Can be used when creating and updating SLOs.
- o Question- Will the committee be providing training on how to map SLOs to PLOs?
    - ▪ Yes, but currently Nuventive is in the process of an update, suggestion to wait to do training until the new platform is rolled out to the college.

3.1 Follow-up Items	3.1 Task of	3.1 Due by
Establish a Canvas sub-group	Co-chairs	Next meeting

3.2 Improvements and Suggestions to Assessment Portion of Program Review Going Forward

Program Review suggestions that pertain to assessment gathered so far were shared with the committee which included:
- o Gaps-
    - o Mapping gap-not all disciplines own programs.
    - o Suggestion to increase awareness of courses alignment to programs not owned by the program such as the AOEs.
- o Shortcomings in the software-
    - o Sections of Program Review would have benefited from having the ability to include charts, screenshots, images etc.
- o Misalignment-
    - o Example in Student Services PR units- Assessment Review repeats question in EMP goal alignment.
    - o Assessment terminology- aligning Instruction and Student Services terminology will help align the process especially for trainings (in process in the new Assessment section of Nuventive).
- o Scoring-
    - o Mapping was difficult to score
        - ▪ Suggestion to provide training on mapping.
        - ▪ Suggestion to provide more clarification in the norming session on how to score.
- • Please provide any suggested improvements to the [Program Review Feedback form](#).

3.2 Follow-up Items	3.2 Task of	3.2 Due by
Create a folder in SP to share items with the committee	Charise	Next meeting

4. Information Items

4.1 Nuventive Update

The draft Assessment section of Nuventive was shared with the committee.
- • LFM group is currently working with Nuventive and district to pull assessment data from Canvas.

5. Good of the Order

- Committee was asked to think about what the benefits are of aligning Assessment and Program Review cycles with the other colleges. This would change the Assessment cycle from 6 to 5 years.

6. Future Agenda Topics

- Alignment to Chancellors Request to Change Program Review Cycle from 3 to 5 Years

7. Adjournment

- 10:30 am

Next Meeting

November 10, 2021

NORCO COLLEGE

Charter for Assessment Committee (NAC)

2021-2022

This Charter is established between the Assessment Committee and the Academic Senate to structure the process and planned outcomes included herein during the one-year period of the 2021-2022 academic year.

Purpose
The Norco College Assessment Committee is a standing committee of the Academic Senate. The purpose of the Assessment Committee is to support and encourage assessment of student learning in all instructional programs, and student and learning support services. Assessment is defined as the process by which data are used to ensure students are learning the outcomes set by the institution, and the use of those data for the purpose of improving student learning, faculty pedagogy, and student and learning support services. When necessary, the Assessment Committee will make recommendations to the Academic Senate to facilitate improvements in the assessment process and in student learning overall.

Charge
The charge of the Assessment Committee is to facilitate assessment of student learning in instructional programs, and student and learning support services to support the assessment of Guided Pathways.   The Assessment Committee is primarily responsible for assessing and coordinating the listed Educational Master Planning objectives below: 2030 Goal 8: (Effectiveness, Planning, and Governance) Develop institutional effectiveness and integrated planning systems and governance structures to support ongoing development and continuous improvement as we become a comprehensive college.   • 2025 Objective 8.1   Make program, student, and effectiveness (including assessment) data available, usable, and clear so critical data is visible in real time.

Guiding Principles and Assumptions
The guiding principles for the Assessment Committee are: 1. Improvement of student learning should be the primary focus of any assessment effort.   2. Assessment should occur anywhere student learning is occurring, including instructions, student services, library & learning resources center and any other area involving student learning.

Guiding Principles and Assumptions

3. Faculty, as subject matter experts, are given freedom to choose the manner in which they assess the learning outcomes associated with their courses or programs.
4. The Assessment Committee is the primary governance structure overseeing the process of measuring student learning at the college.
 	
Accreditation Standards guiding the Assessment Committee:
 	
  • I.B.2 and 5
  • I.C.2 and 4
  • II.A.2, 3, 9, 10, 11 ,12 and 16
  • II.C.2
  • III.A.2

Equity
Our role is to assess student learning and support and guide improvements in pedagogy and practices that will result in closing student learning gaps.

Scope & Expected Deliverables
The scope of work is to oversee student learning in instruction and student and learning support services so that all faculty will achieve their learning outcomes benchmarks and students become prepared for the next step in their education or employment. Provide assessment support to institutional groups. Specific deliverables for the 2021-22 academic year are: 1. Update committee charter and submit to Academic Senate for approval. 2. Update Assessment structure of the Nuventive platform. 3. Facilitate training for integrating SLO assessment in Canvas. 4. Map SLOs to PLOs/GELOs in Nuventive.

Membership

The Assessment Committee will be ideally be comprised of faculty members that are representative of the department structure and or schools.
 	
  • Faculty Chair – (Academic Senate) Voting Member
 	
     o Member of Program Review Committee
     o Member of Guided Pathways Workgroup
     o Member of Governance and Institutional Effectiveness Council
     o Attend Academic Senate to report on Assessment Committee
 	
  • Administrative Chair - (Administration) Voting Member
 	
     o Member of Program Review Committee
     o Member of Guided Pathways Workgroup
     o Member of Governance and Institutional Effectiveness Council

Membership

- Faculty Committee Members – At least 1 faculty member from each department and/or school. One of the faculty should represent CTE programs and one faculty should be a counselor (Voting Members)
- Student Services Representative (Non-voting member)
- Learning Resource Center Representative (Non-voting member)
- Institutional Effectiveness Representative (Non-voting member)
- Student Representative (Non-voting member)

Meeting Time/Pattern

Meetings are held on the second Wednesday of the month from 9:00am - 10:30am during the Fall and Spring semesters. Contact the Chair/Co-Chair(s) or designated facilitator to place an item on a future agenda.

Roles of Chairs and Members

The Assessment Committee Co-Chairs are accountable to the Academic Senate to ensure continuity of dialogue between governance tiers. Chairs are responsible for preparing agenda and facilitating meetings based on best practices and guidelines for effective facilitation. The co-chairs do not typically vote on action items, but in the case of a tie the faculty co-chair would vote to break the tie.

Members are recognized as stakeholders with important expertise and perspectives relevant to the strategic charge of the Assessment Committee that can help to achieve the stated deliverables. Members are expected to actively attend and participate in all meetings, deliberations, and decision-making processes of the Assessment Committee. While representing the perspectives of the constituency group to which they belong members are expected to engage in effective dialogue with Assessment Committee peers with the intention of finding consensus on all issues that come before the Assessment Committee. Since this is a standing committee of the Academic Senate, only faculty are voting members of the Assessment Committee.

In addition, members may be asked to participate in and /or lead trainings. Also part of the responsibilities of being an assessment committee member is to take the lead for their department and/or school for any initiatives or decisions made by the committee.

Meeting Procedures and Expectations

The co-chairs and members of the Assessment Committee will adhere to participatory governance best practices as follows:

- Meeting agendas are issued in advance of meeting times.
- Meeting agendas are organized to achieve milestones established in the charter and prioritize actions pending, actions required, and problem solving to move the work of the group forward.
- Members endeavor to:
  - appropriately prepare for meetings based on the meeting agenda.

Meeting Procedures and Expectations

o arrive promptly and stay for the duration of entire meetings.
    o participate in a problem-solving approach where the interests of all participants are considered in developing proposals and recommendations and, where appropriate, distinguish between constituency versus college-wide perspectives.
• welcome all ideas, interests and objectives that are within the scope of the charter.
• actively listen to engage in respectful and constructive dialogue.
• work with a spirit of cooperation and compromise leading to authentic collaboration.
• move forward once a consensus-based decision has been made.
• continue to progress with the members who are present at each meeting.
 	
    • follow through on tasks that are committed to outside of scheduled meetings.

Outcome Development Tool

Directions: Answer each of the five questions by writing either statement "a" or "b." Combine each of the five statements to create your outcome.

1. Who is expected to learn? _____
    a. State which students are included
        i. Example: Students (generally)
        ii. Example: Special Program Students (UMOJA students, DRC students, Honors Students, etc.)
        iii. Example: Students by program of study (Engineering students, Ethnic Studies students, Psychology students).

2. What learning is expected? _____
    a. State what students should learn.
        i. Example: Select highest level of Bloom's Taxonomy applicable.
        ii. Example: Construct a model, create a plan, analyze a study, etc)

3. How learning is expected to occur? _____
    a. State what tools and technologies the student will engage with.
        i. Examples: instruction, demonstration, software, chemicals, etc.
    b. State where the student will engage at.
        i. Examples: Classroom, laboratory, internship, etc.

4. What length of time that is necessary to support learning? _____
    a. State the number of classes or semesters.
        i. Examples: After completing a full semester, after completing the program
    b. State the frequency or number of activities.
        i. Examples: After practicing once per week, after demonstrating five times

5. Why is this particular growth/learning important/expected?_____
    a. State the value of growth
        i. Example: to clarify the path, to enter the path, to stay on the path, to ensure learning, to prepare for career and transfer, to establish independence, etc.

Outcome:_____

Example:

"Imagine you are an academic instructor who teaches math. You want to ensure that students can apply different rules of algebra to solve single variable linear algebraic equations by the end of

the semester. In order to ensure learning, students participate in weekly class lectures and spend a minimum of twenty hours per week practicing the content on their own.

Who is expected to learn? Students (generally)

What learning is expected? Recognize methods for solving algebraic equations.

How does learning occur? Using classroom instruction and independent practice.

What length of time that is necessary to support learning? By the end of the semester, after weekly class lectures and a minimum of twenty hours per week practicing.

Why is this particular growth/learning important/expected? to ensure learning

 Students will recognize methods for solving algebraic equations using classroom instruction and independent practice, after a full semester of weekly class lectures and a minimum of twenty hours per week of independent practice to ensure learning.

Bloom's Levels of Cognitive Behaviors

Knowledge	Comprehension	Application	Analysis	Synthesis	Evaluation
define	classify	apply	analyze	arrange	appraise
identify	describe	compute	appraise	assemble	assess
indicate	discuss	construct	calculate	collect	choose
know	explain	demonstrate	categorize	compose	compare
label	express	dramatize	compare	construct	contrast
list	identify	employ	contrast	create	decide
memorize	locate	give examples	criticize	design	estimate
name	paraphrase	illustrate	debate	formulate	evaluate
recall	recognize	interpret	determine	manage	grade

Outcome SMART Rubric

Metric	Yes	No
Specific	The outcome clearly and concisely describes the goal	The outcome does not clearly and concisely describe the goal
Measurable	Evidence can be collected and analyzed to clearly indicate outcome attainment (success or failure, AND Why)	Evidence cannot be collected and analyzed to indicate outcome attainment (success or failure, AND Why)
Achievable/Ambitious	The outcome is both realistic and challenging	The outcome is either not realistic or not challenging
Relevant	The outcome is closely connected to student and institutional needs	The outcome not connected to student and institutional needs
Timely	Outcome data can be fully collected and analyzed within the defined cycle*	Outcome data cannot be fully collected and analyzed within the defined cycle*

Definitions:

Clearly: in such a way as to allow easy and accurate perception or interpretation.

Concisely: in a way that is brief but comprehensive.

Realistic: having or showing a sensible and practical idea of what can be accomplished or expected.

Challenging: testing one's abilities; demanding.

Powered byOxfordDictionaries© Oxford University Press

*Defined cycle: The current standard at Norco College is to fully assess (collect, analyze, initiate change) each outcome at least once per cycle. However, assessing more often is strongly recommended as it increases the quality of assessment. Departments may choose to collect and analyze assessment data for each outcome several times per assessment cycle. The appropriate frequency of this process should be determined by each department themselves.

Example from Presence:

Undergraduate students will be able to identify courses for their schedule to meet program requirements after meeting with an academic advisor at least once.

Metric	Yes	No	Outcome
Specific	The outcome clearly and concisely describes the goal	The outcome does not clearly and concisely describe the goal	Sure, answers all five questions directly.
Measurable	Evidence can be collected and analyzed to clearly indicate outcome attainment (success or failure, AND Why)	Evidence cannot be collected and analyzed to indicate outcome attainment (success or failure, AND Why)	Sure, allow students to draft their own course plan and assess their ability to properly identify
Achievable/Ambitious	The outcome is both realistic and challenging	The outcome is either not realistic or not challenging	Debatable, "identify" is not a very high level of understanding. Possible achievable but not ambitious.
Relevant	The outcome is closely connected to student and institutional needs	The outcome not connected to student and institutional needs	Sure, assuming students identifying their own courses aligns with needs
Timely	Outcome data can be fully collected and analyzed within the defined cycle*	Outcome data cannot be fully collected and analyzed within the defined cycle*	Sure, although student meetings towards the end of the cycle may not make it in the dataset. A cutoff date would be helpful.

Updated Outcome:

Undergraduate students will be able to **design** their course schedule to meet program requirements after meeting with an academic advisor at least once.

Program Review Suggested Improvement

Need to clarify Assessment sections, make sure to ask for % of mapping to align with the rubric. (Add question on Assessment Review Section 2: Mapping Status that asks for percent).
Should we add a question that says is the percent reported here different than on the dashboard and why? There are some discipline's that do not have an ADT or CTE program.

There is not an awareness that programs may be part of PLOs in other programs or that they are part of AOEs or GE.

Add section for screenshots or to upload evidence to Assessment Review Section.

Are the comments under Assessment Review, Section 2, Mapping Status correct - Can Instructional Units access their assessment unit from within the PR platform and complete? Comments are correct but if you don't have a program you will be unable to access any PLOs except for GELOs. In the new platform this should be addressed.

Authors who do not have programs (ADTs) have a hard time responding to Assessment Review Sections 2, 3 or 4. There is a lack of understanding by faculty of their inclusion in AOE degrees and the GE as programs. Need to address this before next cycle in Spring 2024.

In Student Services program review under Assessment Review Q#3 seems to be a repeat of Program Review Pt 1 that has them choose EMP Goals with which to align. Delete #3 or should we replace with another Q?

Separate ITEM: Technology so items can be pulled separately from the other ITEM requests.

Data used for resource allocation at the council level does not align with data used/ provided in program review. Data used to support resource requests needs to be available/used by councils when ranking. Example: data/evidence put in program review by authors is not the same data used by APC when ranking faculty.

Request to use common language and process between Student Services, Instructional and Administrative units. This can help align trainings.

Themes from Suggestions

- Gaps- for disciplines that do not own programs – difficulty answering Assessment Review, Section 2 Mapping Status; Increase awareness for those programs of their inclusion in AOEs & GEs.
- Shortcomings in the software – need ability to upload evidence in Assessment Review Section
- Misalignment – SSV Assessment Review repeats EMP goal alignment, data needed for prioritization (rubric?) are not the same as what is required in program review, assessment terminology between SSV & Instruction (Nuventive)