



Assessment Committee Minutes for April 17, 2024

9:00- 10:30 am
Operations Center (OC) 116

Meeting Participants

Committee Members Present

Hayley Ashby (zoom), Greg Aycock (co-chair), Caitlin Busso, Tami Comstock, Eric Doucette, Ashlee Johnson (co-chair), Stephany Kyriakos, Zayed Hannan (ASNC rep.), Jethro Midgett, Lisa Martin, Timothy Russell, David Schlanger, and Aldo Yañez Ruiz.

Committee Members Not Present

Daren Koch, Jesus "Gil" Vela, and Tim Wallstrom.

Recorder

Charise Allingham

1. Call to Order

- 9:03 am

2. Action Items

2.1 Approval of Agenda

- MSC (Stephany Kyriakos / Tim Russell)

2.1 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus.

2.2 Approval of March 20, 2024, Minutes

- MSC (Stephany Kyriakos / Tami Comstock)

2.2 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus.

2.3 Approval of the Report of Effectiveness 2023-24

The report of effectiveness was shared with the committee prior to the meeting and reviewed. (Attached)

- Is there an understanding that using Canvas is just the data collection piece? Some areas require additional information to ensure complete understanding.
- Counseling and Student Services are working in their area to better implement the use of Canvas for collecting outcomes data.
- Now that the college has started collecting the data in Canvas, we can start rolling out Assessment V2.

- The updated Student Services assessment approach is a bit uncomfortable because it is a different process than they are used to. The uneasiness about defining area goals for assessment and not relying on existing data is being addressed.
- Training, support, and resources are needed for all areas.
 - Future agenda items: How to provide support for all areas.
- Do associate faculty have access to the canvas data in Nuventive?
 - Not unless access has been requested for them from the department chair.
 - We need to create a plan to provide guidance on how to address gaps and improvements for disciplines with a high percentage of part-time faculty.
 - One focus of Assessment V2 will be on how to incorporate qualitative discussions based on experiences in the analysis.
- MSC (Stephany Kyriakos /Eric Doucette)

2.3 Conclusion

- Approved by Consensus

2.3 Follow-up Items

2.3 Task of

2.3 Due by

2.3 Follow-up Items	2.3 Task of	2.3 Due by
Submit Report of Effectiveness to IEGC and Academic Senate	chairs	Next meeting

3. Discussion Item

3.1 GELO/ILO Update (District)

The process to change the language of the GELO/ILOs has been approved by the academic senates at district and the three colleges.

- The Process for updating the GELO/ILOs was shared and reviewed (attached).
- The workgroup is in the process of being convened. Assessment committee chairs will be bringing information back to the committee along the process.
- Critical Thinking is the first area of focus.
- Question – is the workgroup incorporating the needs of the workforce?
 - Suggestion to include regional workforce groups such as the chamber of commerce in some of the discussions.
- Anyone interested in participating in the workgroup, please contact the co-chairs.
- GELOs were geared towards the general education pattern, so there needs to be awareness of any implications on accreditation with any changes and updates.
 - Suggestion an accreditation representation should be included in the membership of the workgroup.
- Suggestion to include a cycle for review.
 - Is anything stopping us as a committee from reviewing the GELO/ILOs?
 - No, we can review as a college.
 - Suggestion to include it in the assessment cycle, once every six years.

3.2 Assessment Review Feedback Check-in

Assignments were sent out to the committee before spring break and are due May 10th.

- How do we want to reply when there is no response (blank) in the assessment section?

- Suggestion to remind the college that assessment is not optional. Failure to do so is out of compliance with institutional expectations and accreditation standards.
- Request for a blanket statement. Co-chairs will develop a blanket statement.
 - Suggestion to make a request to Program Review to consider returning any program reviews that the assessment section was left blank to the authors or not accepting. Co-chairs will make a request to the Program Review Committee.
- Suggestion to include a link to the available Canvas Outcomes resources on the assessment committee webpage.
- There is still a bit of confusion around how to actually complete the observation even if data was collected and in the Canvas dashboard.
- Suggestion to reach out individually to areas that left it blank and offer support.
- Homework-committee members please discuss with departments and schools:
 - Should we and when do we phase out old data (data collected outside of Canvas)?
 - Should we provide a place to include data collected outside of Canvas?
 - Concern that data collected outside of Canvas will not be disaggregated.
 - This will be a future agenda item.

3.2 Follow-up Items	3.2 Task of	3.2 Due by
Create a blanket statement for blank assessment sections	Co-chairs	ASAP
Make a request for Program Review to return program reviews with blank assessment sections	Co-chairs	Next PR committee meeting
Discuss data collected outside of Canvas with department and schools	Committee members	By next meeting

4. Information Items

4.1 Area Updates

- Accreditation-no report
- Schools- no-report
- Counseling- no report
- IE/Administrative- Idea about evaluating CAP events: are we capturing any data or evaluating the events? Suggestions for using Canvas and some future planning. There is a lack of data for assessing Guided Pathways, and we currently have no outcomes data.
- Library-no report
- LRC-no report
- Student Services – no report

4.2 Assessment Review Common Themes

Request that members note any common themes (gaps, ideas, etc.) or observations in general as they are reviewing the program reviews.

4.3 Accreditation Kick-off April 26th 9 am-noon

- The Accreditation team sent out a nor-all on Monday with a link to register. Registration is not required to attend but is highly encouraged.

5. Good of the Order

- Assessment review feedback due May 10th.

6. Future Agenda Topics

- Assessment V2 (PLO)
- Assessment Schedules
- Accreditation Alignment (next meeting)
- Assessment Data collected outside of Canvas

7. Adjournment

- 10:30 am

Next Meeting

Date: May 15, 2024



Report of Effectiveness 2023-2024

Governance Entity:

Norco Assessment Committee

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.

Sponsoring Council/Senate:

IEGC/Academic Senate

Co-chairs:

Ashlee Johnson and Greg Aycocock

Members:

Hayley Ashby, Greg Aycocock (co-chair), Caitlin Busso, Tami Comstock, Eric Doucette, Ashlee Johnson (co-chair), Daren Koch, Stephany Kyriakos, Zayed Hannan (ASNC rep.), Jethro Midgett, Lisa Martin, Stephen Park, Timothy Russell, David Schlanger, Jesus "Gil" Vela, Tim Wallstrom, and Aldo Yañez Ruiz.

Evaluation of the Survey of Effectiveness:

The purpose of the survey of effectiveness is to provide a mechanism by which members of Norco Assessment Committee (NAC) could self-evaluate the effectiveness of the committee's planning and decision-making processes. In addition to one (1) open-ended question, the survey also requested feedback on each participant's level of agreement with thirteen (13) statements regarding the Committee's effectiveness. The feedback was measured on a Likert Scale from the following options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, and Does Not Apply.

The survey received a total of ten (10) participants, all of whom responded to 100% of the Likert Scale questions and two of whom responded to the open-ended question.

Results of the 2024 NAC Survey of Effectiveness indicated that 100% of members who participated in the survey either agree, or strongly agree, with twelve (12) of the thirteen (13) Likert Scale questions. As a result, there is evidence to suggest that,

(1) [the] agenda and minutes are provided far enough in advance of meetings, (2) agenda items are completed within the meeting time, (3) members are given adequate information to make informed recommendations or decisions, (4) all members are encouraged to be actively involved, (5) discussions

are collegial, (6) differing opinions are respected, (7) participation is meaningful and important, (9) the charge is understood by the members, (10) members work toward fulfilling the charge, (11) the work has made an impact on its assigned EMP Goals, (12) the purpose of the governance entity aligns well with the college mission, and that (13) overall [members are] satisfied with [NAC's] performance.

However, when considering whether (8) [they] regularly communicate with members of [their] constituent group regarding key issues discussed and actions taken during meetings, one (1) member disagreed and two (2) indicated the statement did not apply, while the other seven (7) either agreed or strongly agreed. A discussion by the committee suggested this result is partially due to the fact that, while some areas have multiple members, it is often only necessary for one of them to communicate back to the larger group.

In response to the open-ended question, which asked about any recommendations to help the committee function more effectively, one participant suggested that the committee is great while another commended its leadership. Additionally, the third participant provided a recommendation for the committee to consider several areas of focus in the next academic year including, collaboration with its sister colleges on ILO (Formerly GELO) updates, regular progress updates, direct ILO assessment, assessment frameworks for skills and abilities, new accreditation standards, and current process gaps. A discussion by the committee on the open-ended responses resulted in a general consensus on all three responses. As a result, the responses shall be considered in NAC's strategic planning & decision-making efforts in subsequent academic years.

In Summary, results indicated that NAC's planning and decision-making processes were highly effective throughout the 2023- 2024 Academic Year. It also provided both encouragement and guidance for ongoing continuous improvement efforts which shall be reflected in the committee's subsequent charter once fully considered and decided upon by the group.

EMP Goal Alignment and Objective Alignment:

The purpose of this section is to report on progress made towards the committee's EMP objectives and evaluate the appropriateness of objective assignments.

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.

Progress:

The committee continued to make progress toward this goal during the 2023-2024 academic year. While the previous academic year focused highly on instructional areas, this academic year the committee focused on providing training and support to instructional areas, while making steady improvements to its tools and technologies, and making significant improvements to the assessment process for Administrative and Student Services areas.

Alignment:

It is the opinion of this committee that Objective (8.1) is still in alignment with NAC's scope and purview and should remain throughout the next academic year as its work in this area is ongoing.

Assessment of Scope and Deliverables:

The purpose of this section is to self-assess the completion of deliverables defined by NAC's charter during the academic year.

According to the charter, NAC worked towards the completion of three main deliverables throughout the 2023-2024 Academic year. A self-assessment of the progress made on each deliverable is described below:

1. Create Assessment V2 Plan of Action.
 - Status: Ongoing
 - Rationale: Some features of v2 were implemented during Assessment Review, however, additional features and processes are needed to fully define the system.
2. Increase participation in Canvas assessment.
 - Status: Complete/Ongoing
 - Rationale: Although there has been an "increase" in participation for Canvas assessment, this area has room for continuous improvement in future years.
3. Implement an approach for PLO Assessment.
 - Status: Tabled
 - Rationale: Although the group recognized this is an important area of assessment, the focus was placed on thorough implementation of the new assessment processes more than development. This deliverable is expected to remain for the next academic year.

GUIDELINES FOR FEEDBACK ON ASSESSMENT SECTION OF PROGRAM REVIEW 2024-27

INSTRUCTIONAL

- Are there at least 1-3 observations with one focused on disaggregated (equity) data?
 - Are the observations based on data?
 - If there is a noticeable gap that wasn't addressed, it should probably be noted.
 - Are screenshots of these data and/or other supporting evidence attached?
 - If not, remind them that the data they were viewing when they made their observations has probably changed since then.
 - Do the observations make sense?
 - If there is an observation that is not supported by data, is there an explanation why that observation was chosen by the discipline?
 - For instance, an observation could be that more data needs to be collected in order to make generalizable observations.
- Keep in mind the following:
 - We are in the first stage (V1) of implementation of this new assessment framework
 - Be gracious with feedback. In general there will probably be more positive than negative feedback.

STUDENT SERVICES

- Is there at least one Continuous Improvement Goal in each area of the SSIPP (Strategic, Sustained, Integrated, Proactive, Personalized)?

ADMINISTRATIVE

- For each EMP Objective assigned there should be:
 - An assessment method with a clear plan for how they will assess it over the next 3-year cycle.
 - (Optional) Progress/findings that include a clear explanation for the data (quantitative) or progress (qualitative) that summarizes the previous year (2022-23)
 - A Score between 0-Beginning and 4-Completed.
 - Any necessary dashboard/data to support the explanation of progress should be attached via screenshot or external documents.