



## **Norco Assessment Committee**

### **Minutes for October 16, 2024**

9:00 am – 10:30 am

Occupation Center (OC) 116

## **Meeting Participants**

### **Committee Members Present**

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

### **Committee Members Not Present**

Tami Comstock

### **Recorder**

Charise Allingham

## **1. Call to Order**

- 9:06 am

### **1.1 Comments**

Happy Birthday, Greg!

## **2. Action Items**

### **2.1 Approval of Agenda**

- MSC (Stephany Kyriakos / Tim Russell)

### **2.1 Conclusion**

- Approved by consensus

### **2.2 Approval of September 18, 2024, Minutes**

- MSC (Tim Russell / Tim Wallstrom)
- Add Effectiveness to 3.2a for clarity; update 4.2 SBS report to reflect a new practice.

### **2.2 Conclusion**

- Approved by consensus

## **3. Discussion Item**

### **3.1 Assessment Focus Areas**

The co-chairs reviewed, organized, and prioritized the focus areas for the committee to work on. The committee was asked to identify which focus area they would like to contribute to. The updated focus areas are:

- Training and Support (AVI)
  - Need support for providing training
- PLOs, GELOs, AOEes
  - Many of these programs do not have identified owners; because of this, these areas often get overlooked when it comes to assessing.
  - Possible ways to assess
    - mapping to SLOs.
    - Direct assessment through Canvas
  - How would this work? Dashboards would be available in Nuventive, pulling in either the direct assessment data or the SLO data for the mapped courses.
  - Suggestion for each discipline to link program outcomes in their courses and discuss how those courses impact the program, based on specific prompts.
    - Note: Someone would still need to take ownership of programs to pull together all the discussions into one area for an aggregated discussion.
  - Suggestion- If we move to a more robust annual review report, this can be accomplished in program units during the annual update.

#### AV2- Frequency, Modality, Participants

- Frequency – How often do we need to do these activities, observation, analysis, and monitoring? Suggestion to have 1-3 active observations that we are working on at a time.
- Modality- What is the mechanism to drive the discussion and collect the discussion, for example, in a department meeting or an ad-hoc meeting?
  - Participants- who needs/ should be included in these discussions.

#### AV2- Observation Types/Guidelines and Documentation/ Nuventive Fields

- Technical (Canvas dashboard in Nuventive): What are we going to look at and click on? What field and prompts narrative need to be included to make this process effective?
- What types of observations will be required or suggested, i.e., equity?
- Develop clear guidelines for how we conduct our observations.
- Moving assessment away from being all about data collection. Now, we need to focus on making informed decisions, evaluating, and making changes.
- There will be a need to identify training and support for AV2 once implemented.
- We need to make an assertive effort to get part-time faculty involved. They are not contractually obligated to do so, but having assessment experience is helpful in obtaining a full-time position.
- Note that many colleges require part-time faculty to participate in assessment as part of the contract.

- SBS uses OER textbooks and has developed a shell for these courses; a framework for the shell has already been developed, and the outcomes can be programmed into the shell.
- There is discussion about changing the term GELOs to ILOs districtwide; there is also discussion about having college-level outcomes.
- Confusion with the general ed patterns influenced the change from GELOs to ILOs

Co-chairs will be involved in all the groups to provide support and guidance.

3.1 Follow-up Items	3.1 Task of	3.1 Due by
Identify the focus area to participate in and email co-chairs	Committee members	ASAP

### 3.2 Meeting Modality

The committee discussed providing a Zoom link for non-members to view the meetings. Providing a link will provide visitors with an option to view the meeting and be more informed about the assessment.

- Concern that the use of Zoom in a hybrid format has a tendency to divide and lessen the quality of the meeting.
- Desire to make the meeting accessible to more people but don't want to lessen the quality of the meeting.
- Zoom will provide the possibility for alternates and non-voting members to attend virtually.
- The hybrid option is beneficial for new faculty to learn about assessment..
- Question about the level of participation of the participants on Zoom: Would they be able to ask questions? Suggestion to provide full participation.
- Suggestion to reserve time on the agenda for Zoom participants who are non-members, to make public comments.
- Suggestion to start with full participation for Zoom attendees, but if it becomes a problem, we could implement a public comment time.
- In other meetings, the biggest issue is usually admitting people and addressing raised hands; Zoom participants don't tend to ask or comment much during the conversation

Conclusion: Going forward, the meeting will be held in Hybrid.

### 3.3 Accreditation Discussion

The Accreditation team led a discussion on how the committee supports accreditation standard 2.9. A handout with the standard, substandard, college mission statement, review questions, review criteria, possible sources of evidence, and development stage rubric was provided to the committee before the meeting and reviewed during the meeting.

Standard 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.

Questions to consider for standard 2.9:

What do we do to align with the Standard?

- The process of including assessment during program review, this last comprehensive review can provide evidence.
- Still working on the process for V2, continuous improvement.
- Assessing the assessment data and taking time to discuss the data.
  - Departments are discussing SLOs in their department meetings.
- According to the review criteria, there is consensus that the committee and the college as a whole are doing a good job at following established processes, which include analysis of student learning with disaggregated data. In addition to assessment-related discussions, the college has discussions around KPIs, the Faculty Impact Survey, and success and retention data in program reviews, which are other good examples.
  - The Strength of this committee is that we include student services, academic support, and other departments.
  - Student services have worked extensively on their assessment plans, process, and implementation.

Where do we think we align with the Rubric for Institutional Alignment and Transformation?

- The committee feels we are highly developed conceptually; we have a plan. As far as implementation is concerned, we have just started, so we are more aligned with emerging. Overall, the committee feels like we are developing and implementing the use of Outcomes in Canvas well. We are going to continue to grow and develop rapidly.

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

- Overall, the development and implementation of V2 will address this area.
- Is there a time frame when V2 will be open? We plan to finish development in this academic year and start using and implementing it in Fall 2025. Timing is good because it can be introduced and trained during fall flex.

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

- The hiring faculty prioritization process was based on quantitative data, as well as the incorporation of qualitative data.
- Suggestion that there are important missing elements in department meetings.
  - Currently, faculty are implementing changes in their classes to address equity gaps in the assessment data, but these changes are not based on evidence of what is proven to work.
  - During department meetings, part-time faculty are usually not in attendance, and a large portion of the Canvas outcomes data comes from their courses. Concerns arise when discussions lack the complete context of the provided data.
- Effectiveness monitoring will be a part of V2 and is envisioned to be used to determine if implemented strategies are effective.

- Currently, the V2 structure includes an observation, action plan, effectiveness monitoring, and closure- the idea is to determine if implemented practices and changes are working or not.

Questions:

- How are we going to measure the evaluation of assessment, how many outcomes are being assessed, and identify areas in which we need to make progress?
- How many SLOs have data been collected in Canvas? As of Spring 2024, 395 have collected data in Canvas.
- What are we looking for in terms of evidence, from what timeframe? If we can provide evidence of our past and future, they want to see ongoing improvement. Specifically, during the accreditation cycle, especially anything that has been done since the midterm, which was submitted in February 2024.
- What is the timeline for accreditation? The draft institutional self-evaluation report is due by December 2025, and the final report is in Spring 2026, followed by the new formative feedback process in which the review team will review the ISER and give us an opportunity to provide further information and evidence.

## 4. Information Items

### 4.1 Area Updates

#### 4.1.a Accreditation

No update

#### 4.1.b Schools, Counseling

SBS

- Stephany is voting, and Aldo is the alternate member

Science and Kin

- Request for assessment VI training
- A new template for the syllabus, which includes assessments for labs and assignments.
- Bani is the voting member, and Tim Wallstrom is the alternate.

CHL

- Suggestion for the committee to add an accreditation representative to the charter.
- Members are discussing who will be voting and alternate members.

Business-no update

Counseling

- We have two counselors, and it is possible that one will represent the School Human and Public Services and one will represent Counseling.

Motion to extend the meeting by 10 minutes (Stephany Kyriakos, Jethro Midgett)

#### 4.1.c IE/Administrative

The faculty Impact Survey was presented at the Strengthening Student Success Conference, and it received good feedback and interest in participating. Please share and complete the survey; representation from part-time faculty is requested.

**4.1.d Library-** no report

**4.1.e LRC**

LRC Received some extra funding for tutoring and is actively recruiting new tutors; please share with disciplines. Please reassure faculty that tutoring is the process of successful students sharing skills to help other students to be successful. There is a vetting process, and tutors do not engage in any teaching practices.

**4.1.f Student Services**

An assessment survey has been developed and is being used by about 30 programs.

**5. Good of the Order**

- There is some confusion about whether outcomes linked in Canvas are automatically graded when the assignments are graded. Some faculty are unaware that the outcome rubric also needs to be completed when grading. Suggestion to add further information in the already existing training documents to clarify.
- An ILO district-level workgroup is working on revising the current critical thinking general education student outcome. The goal of revising is to address the current difficulty of assessing. The revisions only focus on the language, and the content is not being updated. A suggested revision handout was provided. A request was made for committee members to share with departments and schools and bring back feedback.
- There is currently no existing process for updating, adding, or removing the GELOs. The district workgroup is also testing this process.

Homework shared on board:

- AVI request support
- Faculty Impact Survey
- Tutoring recruitment
- Focus area selection
- Voting member/ alternate selection
- ILO revision review and provide feedback

**6. Future Agenda Topics**

- Assessment Focus Areas
- ILO revision feedback

**7. Adjournment**

- 10:36 am

**Next Meeting**

Date: November 20, 2024

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



1. Training and Support (AV1)
2. PLOs, GELOs, AOE
3. AV2- Frequency, Modality, Participants
4. AV2- Observation Types/Guidelines and 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
<b>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.</b>	The institution reviews its assessment results to ensure the quality of its academic, learning support, and student services programs.	The institution conducts systematic review and assessment to ensure the quality of its academic, learning support, and student services programs and implement improvements.	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.	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.

### Accreditation 2027 Standard 2 Activity Form



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

## Current GE ILO #1: Critical Thinking

Students will be able to demonstrate higher order thinking skills about issues, problems, and explanations for which multiple solutions are possible. Students will be able to explore problems and, where possible, solve them. Students will be able to develop, test, and evaluate rival hypotheses. Students will be able to construct sound arguments and evaluate the arguments of others.

## Suggested Revision

Students will be able to demonstrate higher order thinking skills about issues, problems, and explanations for which multiple solutions are possible, and, where possible, solve them. Students will be able to construct sound arguments and develop, test, and evaluate rival hypotheses.