



**Norco Assessment Committee
Minutes for September 18, 2024**

9:00 am – 10:30 am
Occupation Center (OC) 116

Meeting Participants

Committee Members Present

Hayley Ashby, Greg Aycock (co-chair), Caitlin Busso, Tami Comstock, Eric Doucette, Bani Ghosh, Ted Jackson, Ashlee Johnson (co-chair), Daren Koch, Stephany Kyriakos, Bibiana Lopez, Timothy Russell, David Schlanger, Jude Whitton, and Aldo Yañez Ruiz.

Committee Members Not Present

Jethro Midgett and Tim Wallstrom.

Guest(s)

Araceli Covarrubias

Recorder

Charise Allingham

1. Call to Order

- 9:00 am

1.1 Welcome

Welcome new members, Ted Jackson and Jude Whitton.

2. Action Items

2.1 Approval of Agenda

- MSC (Tim Russell/ Stephany Kyriakos)

2.1 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus

2.2 Approval of May 15, 2024, Minutes

- MSC (Stephany Kyriakos /Hayley Ashby)

2.2 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus

3. Discussion Item

3.1 Membership

The committee reviewed membership and requested areas to establish who the voting members are and alternates when more than one member represents each school.

Need representation from two schools:

- School of Visual & Performing Arts
- School of Applied Technologies & Apprenticeships

3.2 State of Assessment

Assessment V1 -Data collection in Canvas, which includes Canvas outcomes maintenance, actual data collection, and data displayed in Nuventive.

Assessment V2 -Clarifying the process of analyzing, discussing, and continuously improving.

- How do we use the data to improve continuously, and how do we include PLOs and GELOs?

3.2.a Assessment V2

- Ten focus areas (attached) were developed to establish the work that needs to be defined and completed by the committee.
- The goal is to align members with focus areas to review and bring suggestions to the committee.
- An overview and explanation of the focus areas and sub-categories with expectations of the members were shared.
- Assessment V1 is addressed in focus areas 1-3.
- Assessment V2 is addressed in focus areas 4-10. These have not yet been developed.
 - Note: Part-time faculty are allotted 3 hours of pay for assessment if they choose to do it. It cannot be used for training.

PLOs, AOE's and GELOs

- No one currently has ownership of the GELOs and the AOE's; so far, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has been responsible for evaluating these areas.
- There is a district group working on drafting a procedure to identify the owners of the AOE's. This procedure can inform us about the ownership of the AOE's here at Norco.
- Suggestion that in the meantime, a workgroup could be developed to assess the AOE's; faculty from across the college who represent the courses could be collected to coordinate the assessment. It is preferable to have faculty lead the evaluation of learning.

Continuous Improvement Cycle

- Assessment can be considered to have four main steps.
 - 1. look at dashboards and make observations.
 - Suggestion to have 1-3 observations open at once.
 - 1- equity related observation.
 - Question: are faculty expected to review data from courses outside their discipline? No, not necessarily only their own disciplines.
 - 2. Root cause analysis

- 3. Develop an action plan, make decisions, and design changes to improve.
- 4. Implementation, effectiveness monitoring, and closure.

3.2.b Assessment Schedules

- The suggestion is that frequency will need to be somewhat flexible for areas such as CTE, which needs to be assessed more frequently.
- Suggestion to establish guidelines or minimums for assessment schedules.

3.2.c Assessment VI

- The committee reviewed the current assessment form and tabs in Nuventive.
 - **Observation** tab: Completed while program review was open.
 - **Actions** tab: Under development, may need to be updated to the 'analysis' tab to capture root cause analysis and discussion.
 - **Monitoring and Progress** tab: Under development, which currently includes changes made, implementations, and results from actions.
- Suggestions include having the availability to allow individual faculty to assess and make improvements, but there is also addressing the need to review and assess as a discipline or program. Both individual and discipline-level assessments are needed.
- Suggestion that program-level assessment discussions can be held at school meetings.
- What are the specific tasks that the focus area groups will be expected to complete? The committee will need to determine this.
 - Realize that all this work will require training and will probably take years to fully implement.
 - In the past, it was rare to have coordination across disciplines when assessing. Assessment was done more on the individual level, and this new approach will address this need.
 - Some areas are dependent on part-time participation, especially for courses that are only taught by part-time faculty; we will need to figure out how to collect that data.
 - Recognize that this request of the committee seems overwhelming. The Co-chair's role is to support the committee.
 - Suggestions to review the focus areas and simplify them before they are shared with the college.
 - It is helpful to prioritize items that need to be completed in a timely manner and gaps identified for accreditation.
 - Suggestion to add roles: What is done at what level? By which group?
 - Suggestion to group 5-10 by subcategories.
- Co-chairs will review focus areas, reorganize, and prioritize before the next meeting.
 - Suggestion for developing an assessment handbook and guidelines.

3.2 Follow-up Items	3.2 Task of	3.2 Due by
Review, organize, and prioritize focus areas.	Co-chairs	Next meeting

4. Information Items

4.1 Accreditation Discussion

The accreditation reflection worksheet and Standard 2.9 will be discussed at the next meeting.

- The goal is to collect evidence and to guide the committee in planning going forward. This will also help the committee address gaps in the short term and create long-term goals.
- In response to the Accreditation FLEX presentation, SBS has already implemented accreditation-focused discussion during their department meetings.
 - Assessment and Equity discussions have been added to the agenda.
 - One discipline shares at each meeting and the department has a discussion that is captured in the minutes.

Accreditation provides guidelines for what we need to prioritize and what we should be focusing on, not only for compliance but also for continuous improvement.

4.2 Area Updates

- Accreditation: The ILO workgroup is being developed to update the GELOs. Jude was an assistant coordinator at RCC and will be representing Norco. Greg will be the administrative representative in the workgroup.
- Schools
 - SBS- reported on an instructor who has started doing weekly essay objective questions before completing the essays. Intent is to help students be more specific and less general.
 - B&M- Developing a common ZTC course shell for BUS-10; this shell will already have assessment built in for faculty who choose to use it.
- IE/Administrative- Faculty impact survey- please spread the word, especially to part-time faculty. Practices correlate with Black student success.
- Library- no report
- LRC- LRC staff is available to attend discipline/department meetings to share available resources and address specific needs.
 - Request to also use assessment data to determine a need for tutoring support.
- Student Services-
 - A new student services survey that is aligned with the SSIPP framework will be embedded into 30 different areas. For standardized data collection, the survey will be prefilled with the area and will be accessible in person or electronically with a link or QR code. Being implemented next week, we will not have any real reflective data until next spring.

- o Santa Ana sent a group of administrators to Norco to learn about the Norco Student Services assessment model that is focused on the SSIPP framework.

4.2 Follow-up Items	4.2 Task of	4.2 Due by
None	None	None

5. Good of the Order

- Let us know of any future agenda items.
- We are not currently offering Zoom for guests; we will add it as a future agenda item.

6. Future Agenda Topics

- Meeting modality

7. Adjournment

- 10:30 am

Next Meeting

Date: October 16, 2024

DRAFT

1. Focus Area 1: Canvas Assessment Setup
 - a. Documenting Current Process
 - b. Evaluating Areas of Improvement
 - c. Implementing Improvements
2. Focus Area 2: Canvas Data Collection
 - a. Clarifying assessment Frequency Expectations
 - b. Assessment Schedules
 - c. Training/Support
 - d. PT Faculty Participation
3. Focus Area 3: Data Display
 - a. Clarify Protected Data Rules
 - b. Solve Calculation Method Issue
 - c. Review/Improve Displays
 - d. Add Requested Variables
4. Focus Area 4: PLO/GELO/ILO/AOE
 - a. AV.1 Draft
5. Focus Area 5: Av2 Observation/Analysis
 - a. Frequency
 - b. Modality
 - c. Participant Requirements
 - d. Observation Types/Guidelines
 - e. Documentation/ Nuventive Fields
6. Focus Area 6: Av2 Root Cause Analysis
 - a. Frequency
 - b. Modality
 - c. Participant Requirements
 - d. Investigation Types/Guidelines
 - e. Documentation/ Nuventive Fields
7. Focus Area 7: Av2 Improvement/Action Plans
 - a. Frequency
 - b. Modality
 - c. Participant Requirements
 - d. Types/Guidelines
 - e. Documentation/ Nuventive Fields
8. Focus Area 8: Av2 Implementation
 - a. Frequency
 - b. Modality
 - c. Participant Requirements
 - d. Types/Guidelines
 - e. Documentation/ Nuventive Fields
9. Focus Area 9: Av2 Monitoring
 - a. Frequency
 - b. Modality
 - c. Participant Requirements

- d. Types/Guidelines
 - e. Documentation/ Nuventive Fields
10. Focus Area 10: Av2 Closure
- a. Frequency
 - b. Modality
 - c. Participant Requirements
 - d. Types/Guidelines
 - e. Documentation/ Nuventive Fields



2024 Fall | Accreditation Reflection Worksheet

Standard 2: Student Success

In alignment with its mission, the institution delivers high-quality academic and learning support programs that engage and support students through their unique educational journeys. Academic and learning support programs promote equitable student success, and the institution evaluates student learning and achievement data to inform improvements and advance equitable outcomes.

2.9. The institution conducts systematic review and assessment to ensure the quality of its academic, learning support, and student services programs and implement improvements and innovations in support of equitable student achievement. (ER 11, ER 14)

Questions to consider for each standard:

- What do we do to align with the Standard?
(Refer to the review criteria and possible sources of evidence)

- Where do we think we align with the Rubric for Institutional Alignment and Transformation?
(Refer to the Rubric)

- What opportunities do we have to stretch ourselves to deepen our practices to impact equitable student outcomes?

- How does our reflection and learning inform our institutional plans for action, improvement, and/or innovation?

Resources

Norco College Mission:

Norco College inspires a diverse student body by an inclusive innovative approach to learning through its pathways to transfer, professional, career and technical education, certificates, and degrees. We are proud to be a pivotal hub for scholarship, arts and culture, dynamic technologies, and partnerships. Norco College encourages self-empowerment and is dedicated to transforming the lives of our students, employees, and community.

Standard 2: Student Success

2.9. The institution conducts systematic review and assessment to ensure the quality of its academic, learning support, and student services programs and implement improvements and innovations in support of equitable student achievement. (ER 11, ER 14)

Review Criteria and Possible Sources of Evidence

Review Criteria:

- The institution follows established processes that include analysis of data related to student learning (i.e., outcomes assessment results) and achievement (e.g., course completions and degree/certificate completions), disaggregated for student subpopulations and/or learning modalities as appropriate.
- Faculty and other educators engage in dialogue about learning and achievement data, disaggregated for student subpopulations and/or learning modalities as appropriate, in order to guide program improvement and curriculum development, address achievement gaps, and inform institutional goal- setting.
- The institution’s dialogue about disaggregated learning and achievement data informs institutional goal-setting.

Possible Sources of Evidence Could Include:

- Documentation of processes for design and evaluation of curriculum
- Documentation of processes for program review and outcomes assessment, including consideration of how disaggregated data are incorporated, analyzed, and used for improvement
- Examples of completed reviews and/or assessments outlining how results inform improvements in curriculum design, service delivery, and/or teaching and learning practices to support equitable achievement

Rubric

STANDARD	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
<p>2.9. The institution conducts systematic review and assessment to ensure the quality of its academic, learning support, and student services programs and implement improvements and innovations in support of equitable student achievement.</p>	<p>The institution reviews its assessment results to ensure the quality of its academic, learning support, and student services programs.</p>	<p>The institution conducts systematic review and assessment to ensure the quality of its academic, learning support, and student services programs and implement improvements.</p>	<p>The institution conducts systematic review and assessment to ensure the quality of its academic, learning support, and student services programs and implement improvements and innovations in support of equitable student achievement.</p>	<p>Through the use of systematic review and assessment, the institution achieves high-quality academic, learning support, and student services programs and creates innovations that lead to equitable student achievement.</p>

Accreditation 2027 Standard 2 Activity Form



<https://forms.office.com/r/EA9QFW8ndC>