



10/25/2016

# Annual Assessment Report

2015-2016



**Dr. Sarah Burnett**  
NORCO COLLEGE, ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR

## ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

2015-2016

### CONTENTS

Introduction.....	2
Norco College Instructional Outcomes Assessment .....	3
• Addressing ACCJC College Recommendation 2 .....	3
Assessment of Student Learning at the Program Level .....	4
• Revision of Rotation Schedule .....	4
Results of Program Level Assessment in ADT, AOE, CTE, and GE Programs .....	8
• Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) .....	8
• Area of Emphasis (AOE).....	10
• Career Technical Education (CTE) .....	12
• General Education Assessment.....	12
• Key Indicators Analysis .....	20
Compiled by Dr. Greg Aycock, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness	
Course Level (SLO) Assessment .....	23
TracDat.....	24
Additional Annual Goals .....	24
Assessment in Student Services.....	25
Compiled by Dr. Monica Green, V.P. Student Services	
Institutional Assessment.....	29
Compiled by Dr. Greg Aycock, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness	
Administrative Unit Assessment .....	33
Compiled by Dr. Diane Dieckmeyer, V.P. Academic Affairs	
Summary.....	34

## **ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT**

### **INTRODUCTION**

In August 2015, Norco began the school year with a flurry of activity in the area of assessment. The college received a letter from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) indicating that, in order to avoid enhanced monitoring, significant gains needed to occur in the quantity of course and program level assessment taking place at the college.

Consequently, the 2015-2016 academic year began with an intense focus on ensuring that as many courses and programs as possible would be assessed. This report will outline these efforts and will also indicate how the outcome of these efforts supported the Institutional Follow-up Report for the ACCJC.

The past year also focused on moving forward to improve existing processes, expand accessibility to tools that enhance assessment, and fine tuning assessment cycles already in existence. TracDat V played a prominent role on the campus to support and enhance the assessment process. Additional attention is given to the on-going evaluation of the existing assessment cycle. To end, this report will provide a review of assessment in Student Services and Administration.

### **ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING AT THE PROGRAM LEVEL**

Norco continues to boast a multitude of programs that require assessment. The college offers 24 Associates Degrees for Transfer (ADT), an increase of 11 from the prior academic year; 7 Area of Emphasis degrees (AOE), an Honors program, a General Education (GE) program, and 26 state approved (more than 18 units) Career and Technical Education programs, and 18 CTE locally approved certificates. Many disciplines are involved in these various programs, making it a challenging endeavor to be aware of when an assessment is due, and to engage in assessment in an on-going and systematic basis.

### **REVISED ASSESSMENT ROTATION SCHEDULE**

This year the Norco Assessment Committee (NAC) made some minor adjustments to the rotation schedule for assessment, mostly in response to discontinued CTE programs, and additional ADT programs.

**PLO ASSESSMENT IN ADT, AOE, CTE, AND GE PROGRAMS**

To provide support, lead faculty in each of the programs scheduled for assessment in 2015-16 were contacted at the start of the semester, reminded of the timeline for completion, offered assistance in designing an authentic assessment, and invited to attend specific trainings to assist them with designing assessments and publishing their assessments in TracDat V. Table 1. provides information on the programs that were due to conduct PLO assessment in fall 2015 or spring 2016, and current progress towards those goals.

Table 1. *Programs conducting PLO assessment fall 2015 and spring 2016*

	<b>Fall 2015</b>	<b>Spring 2016</b>	<b>Progress</b>
<b>Area of Emphasis Assessment</b>	Analyze data and write report from SBS AOE – <b>Completed</b>	Collect data on Admin & Info Systems, Math & Science, Kinesiology, Health and Wellness – incomplete; <b>carried over to fall 2016</b>	50%
<b>Associate Degree for Transfer</b>	Collect data on Anthropology, Math, Physics, Com Studies and any newly approved ADT	Analyze data and write reports – <b>none completed</b>	0%
<b>CTE Programs</b>	Group B – Business Admin Logistics and Real Est., Com Music Performance, Digital Elec, Drafting Tech, Game Art character modeling, and programming, Logistics management, Mobile App Dev	Analyze data and write reports – <b>none completed</b>	0%

**Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT)**

Over the last 12 months, ADT assessments should have been completed in Anthropology, Math, Physics, and Communication Studies. While Anthropology and Communication Studies have input assessment plans into TracDat there are no results identified. The remaining ADT’s have not identified an assessment plan or results in TracDat.

ADT	Disciplines included in the ADT	Total Number of Courses in the ADT	Total Number of Courses with at least 1 SLO assessment completed	% of Course in ADT with some form of assessment
Anthropology	ANTH, GEG, MATH	14	7	50%
Math	MATH, PHY	8	4	50%
Physics	MATH, PHY	6	3	50%
Communication	ANTH, COM, JOU, PSYCH, SOC	18	8	44%

Each of the ADTs identified this year are comprised of multiple disciplines; this presents a logistical issue when organizing a combined and collaborative assessment plan. The reality is that in this one semester Anthropology, Math, and Physics were involved in multiple assessments across three different degrees. The Communication ADT involved five different disciplines. It would appear that this year the ADT assessment may have been a matter of “who’s on first” – it is apparent after this year that we need to do a better job of planning and organizing how to conduct ADT assessments that involve multiple disciplines. It might even be necessary to reorganize the rotation schedule to best support specific disciplines so that they don’t have multiple ADT assessments in a given semester.

To better facilitate this kind of assessment it will be important to have an organized plan for coordinating the assessment. We might need to utilize a similar organizing

## 2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report

approach as the Area of Emphasis and General Education PLO assessment. It may require a meeting to identify a lead discipline or faculty member in each discipline that will work to collaborate on the assessment plan. It would certainly be beneficial if assessment were conducted in all SLOs in each course aligned with the identified ADT in the four year time period currently allocated for SLO assessment. This would provide sufficient evidence over time of the effectiveness of the identified program.

### Area of Emphasis (AOE)

In the spring of 2016 Norco College should have conducted AOE degree assessment in Administration and Information Systems, Math and Sciences, and Kinesiology, Health and Wellness programs. None of these assessments were completed due to simple oversight and significant focus on all other areas of assessment. All of these programs will be assessed in the fall and reviewed in the spring 2017.

### Career Technical Education (CTE)

In the fall of 2014, nine CTE programs were scheduled to be assessed. Only Business Administration with a focus in Logistics and Logistics Management have any kind of assessment plan in TracDat – neither have any results from their assessment plan. Table 2. Shows the number of disciplines involved in each Program, the total number of courses, courses with at least 1 SLO assessment, and the percentage of the courses in the program with some form of current assessment.

Table 2. CTE Program Level Assessment

Program	Disciplines included	Number of courses	Number of courses with SLO assessment	% of Course in Program with some form of assessment
Business Administration: Logistics	ACC, BUS, CIS,	14	12	86%
Business Administration: Real Estate	ACC, BUS, CIS, RLE,	15	10	66%

## 2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report

Commercial Music Performance	MUS	9	6	66%
Digital Electronics	ELE, ENE, MAN	14	5	34%
Drafting Technology	ARE, ENE, MAN	13	7	43%
Game Art: Character modeling	CIS, GAM	13	8	62%
Game Art: Programming	CSC, GAM, MAT	13	7	43%
Logistics management	BUS 87	1?	1	100%
Mobile App Development	CIS, CSC, GAM	11	3	27%

The same kind of issue as the ADT PLO assessment appears in the CTE PLO assessment – multiple disciplines involved within a single Program outcome. The same kind of due diligence regarding training, meetings, identifying faculty leads will need to take place as with the ADTs. It is obvious that more specific focus needs to be placed on PLO assessment and on assisting faculty to coordinate the analysis of collected evidence.

### General Education Program

At present, four General Education Learning Outcomes (GELO) comprise the General Education program: 1) critical thinking, 2) information competency and technology literacy, 3) communication, and 4) self-development and global awareness. These GE learning outcomes have been assessed authentically since they were adopted by the Board of Trustees in fall 2013.

The procedure used to assess GELOs begins by selecting a representative sample of courses that have an assignment/test/project that authentically assesses the selected GE learning outcome. In TracDat, faculty are provided a roster for each class to be

## 2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report

assessed, along with a rubric on which they can score each student according to the following scale:

- 1: Little or no evidence of competency
- 2: Limited evidence of competency
- 3: Adequate evidence of competency
- 4: Strong evidence of competency

Faculty rubric scorings on the identified GELO for each student are then exported from TracDat into a spreadsheet for analysis. GELO scores for students are then merged with student enrollment data, and total units of successfully completed general education coursework are then calculated for each student. Once this student-level data is derived, significance testing analysis (through statistical models called analysis of variance, or ANOVA) is applied to three groups of students:

- Group 1: fewer than 12 units of GE
- Group 2: 12-24 units of GE
- Group 3: more than 24 units of GE

Through the results of ANOVA, significant differences among the mean GELO competency scores of the three groups can be derived. If Group 2's scores are significantly greater than those in Group 1, and Group 3's scores are significantly greater than those in Group 2, learning for the GELO can be attributed to increased exposure to general education courses. In other words, general education courses appear to be making a difference in learning for that outcome. This linear relationship is occasionally found, but sometimes the relationship is not so clear. Thus, faculty are called together to help explain data patterns and also to make plans for improvement in learning, if warranted. In addition to the ANOVA data, learning outcomes were disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, and age for the 2015-2016 academic year, and a disproportionate impact analysis was conducted to determine if any of these groups are experiencing learning gaps.

In the future, this type of approach to PLO assessments might be beneficial for the aforementioned ADT and CTE program level assessment.



### GE Assessment Project Fall 2015 – Information Competency and Technology Literacy

In fall 2015, 16 disciplines were invited to participate in the GE PLO assessment for Information Competency and Technology Literacy (Appendix B). The specific aspect of the PLO identified for assessment was as follows:

*Students will be able to communicate effectively in diverse situations. They will be able to create, express, and interpret meaning in oral, visual, and written forms.*

The following table delineates the disciplines and instructors invited to participate.

<b>Course Instructor(s) of Record (IOR) in Class Schedule</b>	
Anthropology 7	Gray
Anthropology 8	Gray
Art 6	May, Skiba (on-line)
Biology 11	Moore
Biology 36	Finnern
Communications 1	Cruz-Pobocik, Dhallwal, Lewis, Muto, Norris, Rihan, Stinson
Communications 1H	Olaerts
English 1B	Capps, Cortina, Hogan, Mills, Mull, Tschetter
English 1B H	Tschetter
Geography 1	Eckstein, Jacobson
History 1	Kyriakos
Hum 4	Palmer
Hum 10	Heimlich, Lape, Palmer, Sentmanat, Westbrook,
Political Science 1	Brown, Kehlenbach, Madrid, Makin, Synodinos,
Political Science 4	Brown
Theater 3	Stevens

An initial meeting was held on 11/18/2015 to set the parameters for the assessment. Only members from two disciplines, English and Philosophy were in attendance. The following results were obtained from the assessment.

**2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report**

**Results**

The data for the GE assessment project in information competency and technology literacy (ICTL) was comprised of 270 students who were enrolled in English 1A & Philosophy 11. As can be seen in the tables below, the sample approximated the demographic distribution of the college as a whole in ethnicity, age, and gender. Based on this, the sample can be assumed to be representative of the college on the basis of these factors.

**Age**

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	19 or less	97	42.5	42.5
	20-24	102	44.7	87.3
	25-29	14	6.1	93.4
	30-34	6	2.6	96.1
	35-39	4	1.8	97.8
	40-49	4	1.8	99.6
	50+	1	.4	100.0
	Total	228	100.0	
Missing	System	42		
Total		270		

**Ethnicity**

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Asian	22	9.6	9.6
	African American	12	5.3	14.9
	Hispanic	132	57.9	72.8
	Pacific Islander	2	.9	73.7
	White	54	23.7	97.4
	Two or more races	4	1.8	99.1
	Unreported/Unknown	2	.9	100.0
	Total	228	100.0	
Missing	System	42		
Total		270		

**2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report**

**Gender**

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	119	52.2	52.2
	Male	108	47.4	99.6
	Unknown/non-respondent	1	.4	100.0
	Total	228	100.0	
Missing	System	42		
Total		270		

The analysis used to determine if learning demonstrated significant increases based on number of GE units successfully completed was analysis of variance (ANOVA). Students were placed in one of three groups (Group 1: below 12 GE units, Group 2: 12-24 GE units, Group 3: Above 24 GE units) and means for these groups were calculated as indicated below.

**ICTL Mean Scores by GE Units Completed**

Units GE Completed	N	Mean
Below 12 GE units	58	2.88
12-24 GE units	45	2.89
Above 24 GE units	122	2.86
Total	225	2.87

As may be intuited by viewing the data, no significant differences were observed between any of the groups. This indicates that mastery of ICTL was not evident as students completed more GE units in this study. One explanation for this is the large number of students in the study who were in ENG-1A (n=160) which may have affected the lack of variance in this GE outcome. Since over 70% of the sample were in a class that requires certain minimum writing standards in order to enroll in the class, this could have a homogenizing effect on the sample. To investigate whether this was the case, a subanalysis of PHI-11 students was conducted using ANOVA. Although their overall scores were somewhat lower, there still were no differences observed between groups. This subanalysis continued to support the assertion made for the entire sample that mastery of ICTL was not observed as the number of completed GE units increased.

### ICTL Subanalysis for PHI-11

	N	Mean
Below 12 GE units	13	2.62
12-24 GE units	9	2.00
Above 24 GE units	32	2.50
Total	54	2.44

### 2015-16 GE PLO Loop Closing Assessment

Meetings were held with faculty from disciplines that participated in the 2013- 2014 and 2014 - 2015 GE PLO assessments to discuss the corresponding data from each assessment. This type of discussion did not take place when the original assessments were conducted and so no conversation regarding on-going needs was held. The first meeting was with the faculty that participated in the most recent PLO assessment in fall 2014. The group was comprised of one full time faculty member from English, who was also responsible for coordinating the assessment for all participating English sections, three part time English faculty instructors, and one part time Philosophy instructor, the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, and the Norco College Assessment Coordinator. The data was shared with the group and the following discussion topics emerged:

1. Is it time to realign the GE SLOs to the current GE PLOs? It seems that more than just two courses in a given semester should provide an opportunity for students to engage in the identified PLO skill. Should it all be left to English 1A and Philosophy to really get to try this component of Information Competency and Technology Literacy? Are we certain that no matter the combination of courses a student takes at any time in there GE courses, are they being exposed to each of the PLOs, or do we rely on them to take only certain classes to get this opportunity?
2. What other courses in the English sequence could provide an opportunity to introduce students to these concepts? Should the discipline take a look at how individual sections might be able to scaffold some of this behavior into the expected outcomes for the course?
3. Do instructors in the GE Program understand that they have a responsibility to not only help students meet the SLOs for the course, but the PLOs for the GE

program? Are instructors incorporating the GE PLOs into their teaching methodology, assignments, and subsequently assessment measures?

4. Does everyone understand what each of the GE PLOs mean, and how they might be operationalized into a classroom format?

The debriefing session with the participants from the 2013 assessment led to similar, more college-based concerns. The session took place in a routine NAC meeting in order to involve more members of the committee in the process. The discussion included discipline members from Art, Psychology, Kinesiology, English, Math, Early Childhood Education, Anthropology, Sociology, and History. The data and main findings were shared with the group and the following discussion topics emerged.

1. Do the current GE PLOs truly represent the Institution? Is the institution more than just the GE program? Can the GE PLOs continue to be recognized as the college ILOs when many of the paths of study available to students at Norco involve certificate programs that are not currently incorporated into the GE program? Do we need to create separate GE PLOs and ILOs?
2. Are CTE courses responsible to support students in obtaining the 4 ILOs? Each newly revised CTE Course Outline of Record has to show alignment to the 4 GE PLOs/ILOs and yet it is unclear as to the actual responsibility or acknowledged contribution that CTE makes to supporting students attaining global awareness and self-identity, critical thinking, communication skills, and information competency and technology literacy.
3. Are all of the current GE PLOs actually appropriate for each of the GE courses offered at the college, for example, do the sciences have a GE outcome that clearly aligns with their content?
4. Is faculty actually aware that they need to include the GE outcomes in the planning of their courses? Hence they need to account for the content of the course, supporting the SLOs, and the GE PLOS. Should the syllabus list both the SLOs and the GE PLOs for the aligned courses?

This information was shared with the Norco Assessment Committee and the Academic Senate to determine if any action needs to be taken. It would seem that further discussions about the GE Program level Outcomes are warranted, especially with regard to SLO-PLO alignment, level of faculty understanding regarding their role in helping students attain the four GE PLOs, and whether the current GE PLOs should also serve as

## 2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report

the ILOs. This information was also shared and discussed with the District GE Work Group and has led to a project this coming academic year (2016-17) to ensure that all GE courses have accurately aligned the corresponding SLOs to the new GE PLOs.

During 2016-2017, the critical thinking GELO is scheduled to be assessed, and this will complete the second full cycle of GELO evaluation as identified in the recommendation.

### **COURSE LEVEL (SLO) ASSESSMENT 2015-16**

At the back to college Flex day in August, discipline specific faculty and the Department Chairs were provided with **Assessment Focus** (Appendix A) overview sheets. The sheets were intended to provide clarity on the breadth and depth of assessment that was needed in each discipline in fall 2015. The sheets identified the discipline involved, the NAC representative for the department, the courses and programs that needed to be assessed in fall 2105 and the responsible parties. The document also included a TracDat training schedule. The faculty were then emailed a comprehensive spreadsheet identifying the courses and programs, which also included a section for tracking input into TracDat of the assessments. As of spring 2016, 88.9% of eligible courses were engaged in ongoing assessment, as indicated in the College's [2016 Annual Report to ACCJC](#).

### **TRACDAT V**

During the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years, a new assessment software program, TracDat V, was piloted and then fully implemented with all faculty. Authentic course level assessment continues at the college, with the added support of TracDat. Faculty continue to be offered training in how to use the system, a training video has been disseminated and posted on the website, and a training guide is available. Full time faculty are able to earn FLEX credit for attending trainings and part time faculty can submit time cards for payment up to three hours per year for assisting with assessment, and three hours per year for attending professional development activities, including assessment training. In the winter semester (2016) all pre-existing assessment (assessment completed in word document or pdf form prior to the installation of TracDat) was transferred into the TracDat data fields so that disciplines can now run comprehensive reports showing assessments that were conducted from fall 2011 to the current semester.

## KEY INDICATOR ANALYSIS 2015-16 – DR. GREG AYCOCK, DEAN OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

As part of the evaluation of the assessment process, the Norco Assessment Committee (NAC) reviews all assessment sections of the Annual Program Reviews (APRs) and assigns a score between 0-3 based on a rubric (see chart on p.15). Each area of the rubric captures a vital area of assessment, or key indicator, for each discipline that submitted an APR. The result of this process is a set of key indicators that quantitatively summarize the state of assessment at Norco College during 2014-15 (the time frame specified on the APR). The key indicators are: Initial Assessment, Loop-Closing, Improvement of Learning, TracDat Input, Dialogue on Results, and Participation in Program Assessment. Below is a table of the 26 disciplines that were scheduled to submit APRs and scores in each of the key indicators.

<b>Disciplines</b>	<b>Initial</b>	<b>Loop-closing</b>	<b>Improve Learning</b>	<b>TracDat Input</b>	<b>Dialogue</b>	<b>PLO</b>	<b>Discipline Average</b>
Accounting	3	3	3	3	2	1	3.0
Administration of Justice	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Anatomy and Physiology	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Anthropology	3	2.5	3	2	1	0	2.3
Biology/HS/Micro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Commercial Music	3	3	3	3	2	0	2.8
Communication Studies							
Early Childhood Education	3	3	3	3	2	1	3.0
Economics							
Engineering (includes Architecture)	3	3	3	3	0	0	2.4
Geography							
Guidance	2	2	0.5	3	2	0	1.9
Honors	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Humanities	3	3	3	3	3	1	3.2
Journalism							
Kinesiology	2	1	3	1	1	0	1.6
Library	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.1
Mathematics							
Music	3	3	3	3	2.25	0	2.9
Philosophy	2.5	2.5	2	2	0.5	1	2.1
Political Science	2.5	2	3	2	2	0	2.3
Psychology	3	3	3	3	2	1	3.0

## 2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report

Real Estate	2.5	1	1	0.5	1	0	1.2
Retail management							
Sociology							
World Languages	3	3	3	3	3	1	3.2
<b>Average</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>28.9%</b>	<b>1.8</b>
<b>Average (without 0's)</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>36.7%</b>	<b>2.3</b>

Out of the 26 disciplines who were in the cycle for annual program review, 19 submitted documents in time to be scored by NAC. In addition, four disciplines handing in program review documents left the entire assessment portion blank. The result was that 15 disciplines provided evidence that assessment was completed which is a participation rate of 58%. This is markedly lower than the previous year which had a participation rate of 72%. Reasons for this may be varied, but one possibility is that the program review process for 2015-16 included a significant increase in the amount of discipline data that needed to be summarized. This probably doesn't account for all of the decrease in participation, but it may be a factor.

Although the rubric only allows a maximum score of 3 to be assigned for each area, there are some disciplines that received an average score higher than 3. This was due to the "bonus point" that was added to the total score if disciplines were involved in the program assessment area. As can be seen upon review of scores, the range was 0-3.2. In general, for each key the following scores represented a certain level of evidence that activity had occurred:

- 0-indicates no evidence of assessment activity completed.
- 1-indicates limited evidence of assessment activity completed.
- 2-indicates clear evidence of assessment activity completed.
- 3-indicates robust evidence of assessment activity completed.

The average scores for the first five key indicators were 2.0, 1.8, 1.9, 1.8, and 1.3 for Initial Assessment, Loop-Closing, Improvement of Learning, TracDat Input, and Dialogue on Results, respectively. The overall average was 1.8. These scores indicated that as an institution, Norco College was producing mostly clear evidence of engagement in the assessment process with some instances of limited evidence. To some degree these scores are not an accurate depiction of the quality of assessment activity since four disciplines didn't produce anything in assessment and received scores of 0. If we extract the disciplines that received 0's to determine the quality of actual of assessment work conducted, the key indicators scores increased to 2.6, 2.3, 2.4, 2.3, and 1.6, respectively. The overall average without zeros was 2.3. These scores indicate that for those



## 2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report

disciplines that engaged in assessment, there were clear to robust levels of evidence that the assessment process was ongoing and resulting in improved learning. The final key indicator was participation in program assessment. Six out of 19 disciplines (31.6%) indicated they were actively involved in program (PLO) assessment during the previous academic year. Given the 3-4 year cycle of program assessment, this is adequate participation to maintain these cycles.

In summary, though there is room for improvement, the Key Indicators Analysis produced evidence that the quality of assessment occurring is quite good. However, there was a clear decrease in participation for the program review cycle during 2015-16 which created the perception that assessment activity was also decreased. It is hopeful that participation in program review and assessment will increase in the future due the addition of TracDat, and the hiring of additional faculty in disciplines that did not have a full-time faculty member.

Annual Program Review Rubric for the Assessment Section

## 2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report

	0	1	2	3	Score	Notes
<b>On-going SLO assessment and Loop-closing activity</b>	No evidence provided 0	Limited evidence of on-going SLO assessment (1 initial assessment, no loop-closing) 1	Clear evidence of on-going SLO assessment (at least 1 initial and or 1 loop-closing) 2	Clear and robust evidence provided of on-going SLO assessment (2 initial, and one loop-closing ) 3		
<b>Attempts to improve student learning</b>	No indication of any changes made to any courses, and no clarification provided 0	No indication of any changes made to any courses and limited clarification regarding discipline standards 1	Evidence of an attempt to implement a change in a course provided, or simple clarifying statement regarding why no specific improvement is needed 2	Multiple attempts made to implement changes to courses, discipline, institution, or state specific standards, or clear clarification why no improvement is needed 3		
<b>Dialogue across the discipline</b>	No dialogue or attempt to communicate results 0	Limited demonstration of dialogue or communication within the discipline or department 1	Clear demonstration of dialogue and sharing of assessment within discipline or department 2	Robust and systematic dialogue and communication demonstrated within discipline 3		
<b>Participation in PLO assessment (bonus points averaged into total score)</b>		Engagement in at least 1 initial PLO assessment and/or Engagement in at least 1 PLO closing-the-loop assessment fall '13-spr '14 1				

### ASSESSMENT IN STUDENT SERVICES

#### COMPILED BY DR. KOJI UESUGI, INTERIM V.P. STUDENT SERVICES

Student Services approaches program review as a continuous, ongoing process. For ten years, or since 2006, Norco College has actively engaged in a campus-based program review process in student services. Prior to 2006, the Norco campus participated in a district-wide student services program review process. All 21 Student Services areas are required to complete annual program reviews. Student Services Program Reviews contain three sections:

## **2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report**

- (1) Area Overview
- (2) Assessing Outcomes
- (3) Needs Assessment

The *Area Overview* includes the area's mission, philosophy statement, summary, strengths, and students served. The *Assessing Outcomes* section includes: (1) a snapshot of the prior year's objectives and assessment plan along with a description of how the area used their outcome data for programmatic modifications; (2) the current year's objectives and assessment plan; and (3) a detailed description of the outcomes assessment findings, data analysis, and improvement recommendations. The *Needs Assessment* section includes current staffing levels, a 5-year staffing profile with projected staffing needs, improvement areas, and staffing and resource needs tables. As the documents are finalized in the summer, the program reviews are posted on the Student Services Program Review webpage.

For the last three years, each student services area submitted assessment plan proposals that were then reviewed and ranked through a peer review and dialogue session held during a special Student Services Planning Council meeting. Before the end of fall, student services area assessment plans were finalized and areas began assessing outcomes. In mid-June, areas submitted their entire program review document. In late June 2016, the service area leaders participated in another peer review session that included the use of a rubric and dialogue focusing on outcomes assessment only. After the peer review process, leaders were able to revise their program reviews and submit for administrative review. Each program review document was reviewed, the outcomes assessment ranked, and suggested modifications were provided by an administrative team that includes the vice president and deans within student services. The area leaders were given a final opportunity to finalize their entire program review document by the end of July in preparation for the summer Student Services Planning Council's prioritization process.

### **2015-2016 Outcomes Assessment Summary**

This outcomes assessment summary includes data for the 21 student services areas that successfully completed the annual program review process. For 2015-

## 2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report

2016, our service area goals were to continue to have three assessments per area, of which at least two outcomes should demonstrate authentic assessment. Authentic assessment is defined as directly examining performance and direct learning with the use of pre- and post-tests. Of the 21 student services areas, there were 83 outcomes measured during this academic year. The total outcomes for 2015-16 is two less than the prior year since one of the programs (T3P) no longer submits their program review through the Student Services Program Review process.

All 21 Student Services areas (100%) achieved the goal of measuring at least three outcomes. Ninety percent (90%), or 19 of 21 service areas measured at least two authentic assessment outcomes. All 21 areas measured at least one authentic assessment outcome for a 100% completion rate. Overall, among our 21 service areas, there were 20 general Service Area Outcomes (SAO's), 0 satisfaction surveys (SAO's), 40 Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's) using direct learning measurement, 5 SLO's using indirect learning measurements, 18 SLO's using student success measures (retention/persistence/ GPA/academic standing, etc.), and a total of 58 authentic outcome assessments. For the past three years, the number of authentic assessments has consistently been 58 for all student services areas combined. A table mapping the assessments by service area is available at the end of this report.

With the use of the assessment outcome rubric, Student Services provides an overall estimate as to where we are with obtaining proficiency to sustainable continuous quality improvement for assessing outcomes. The areas for evaluation on the rubric included SLO/SAO method, use of data for programmatic modifications, and the use of data to close the assessment loop. The ranking of each evaluation area is based on a scale from Awareness (1) to Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement (4) generated peer review scores from 1.5 to 4.0, for an overall average of 3.61. Based upon the peer review rubric process, Student Services for 2015-2016 is between proficiency and sustainable continuous quality improvement. The final administrative review score represents consistency in score from last year (3.61). This year's average peer review score represents an increase of 0.02 (3.59 to 3.61) from last year. While there is a nominal increase, it suggests continued gradual movement from proficiency to sustainable continuous quality improvement within Student Services.

**Outcomes Assessment Discussion and Next Steps**

In 2015-2016, our two primary assessment objectives were to continue to demonstrate advancement from proficiency to sustainable continuous quality improvement and, where appropriate, continue to incorporate authentic assessment into our assessment practice. In this last year, Student Services maintained sustainable continuous quality improvement and demonstrated authentic assessment in all 21 service areas accounting for a total of 58 authentic assessments.

In regards to achieving proficiency and/or sustainable continuous quality improvement in all areas of program review and student learning outcomes, student services continues to make improvements in both our process and outcome every year. Based upon the student services peer review rubric, student services as a whole, appears to be between proficiency (3) and sustainable continuous quality improvement (4), with an average of 3.61 this year. Program review is part of an ongoing dialogue within student services staff meetings, department meetings, and council meetings. Student services approaches program review and outcomes assessment as a developmental process whereby every year improvements are made as we continually refine and improve our practices.

Outcomes assessment goals each year are established in the student services administrative program review and vetted in early fall through dialogue in the Student Services Planning Council. Assessment goals for 2016-2017 will continue to include authentic assessment for at least two outcomes.

As part of the student services administrative unit program review in 2015-16, we again sought to have 100% of our areas link their outcomes with the college mission. In our second year of implementation, 90% (or 75 of 83) of the outcomes were linked to the college mission statement, which represented an increase from 75% in the prior year. In this next year, our goal is to reach 100% participation for this criteria.

**2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report**

The following is a breakdown of the 2015-2016 Outcomes Assessment Summary by service area:

NSSV Department	SAO		SLO			Number of Outcomes	Authentic Assessment	Outcomes Linked to Mission
	General	Satisfaction Survey	In-Direct	Direct	Student Success Measure			
Admissions & Records	3			4		7	4	7
Assessment Center			1	4		5	4	5
CalWORKs				1	2	3	3	3
Career/Job Placement Center	1		1		1	3	1	3
Counseling/SSSP	3			2		5	2	5
Disability Resource Center (DRC)	1				3	4	3	4
EOPS/CARE	2				3	5	3	5
Health Services				3		3	3	3
JFK	1			1	2	4	3	4
Outreach	2		1	1		4	1	4
Puente Program	1				4	5	4	5
Student Employment	1			2		3	2	3
Student Financial Services	1			2		3	2	3
Student Life	1		1	2		4	2	4
Student Support Services (SSS)				4		4	4	0
Student Support Services/RISE				1	3	4	4	0
Transfer Center	1			3		4	3	4
Upward Bound - Centennial	1			2		3	2	3
Upward Bound - Corona	1			2		3	2	3
Upward Bound – Norte Vista			1	2		3	2	3
Veterans Services				4		4	4	4
<b>TOTALS -</b>	<b>20</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>75</b>

**ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT ASSESSMENT**

**COMPILED BY DR. DIANE DIECKMEYER, V.P. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

Business Services comprises four departments: College Safety and Police, Facilities (including Administrative, Custodial, Grounds, and Maintenance), Food Services, and Technology Support Services. Since 2008, units within Business Services have conducted annual program reviews (due by August 31 each year) that provide analysis of changes within the unit over the previous year as well as

## 2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report

significant new resource needs. A central component of the program review process is outcomes assessment. Each unit is expected to describe its previous year's outcomes assessment (service area outcomes addressed, assessment method or methods used, target or benchmark, results, expected use of results) as well as the current year's assessment plan. In addition, each unit responds to the question, "What did you learn that will impact your unit for the future?" The rigor and the cyclical nature of the College's administrative and instructional unit program review processes ensure that service area outcomes assessment is systematic for all Business Services departments.

Service Area Outcomes (SAO) assessment is also a regular agenda item at monthly Business Office Administrative Team (BOAST) meetings. BOAST develops the agenda and identifies the activities for Business Services' annual open house and retreat, ensuring that assessment is a key topic for both events. The open house provides an opportunity for new faculty and staff to become acquainted with Business Services personnel and familiar with processes and procedures of the office, including the need for regular SAO assessment. The annual retreat (mandatory for all Business Services staff), held at the end of each fiscal year, focuses on team building, program review, SAO assessment results of the previous year, and SAO assessment plans for the upcoming year. The retreat includes sharing of thoughts and ideas, with discussion time facilitated by the Vice President of Business Services. Survey results indicate that it is especially helpful for department managers in their preparation of their program reviews, allowing for more comprehensive goal setting.

Business Services is committed to the process of defining measurable service area outcomes, evaluating the extent to which they are achieved, and using results to improve. This process will continue to be refined and documented in the annual program reviews. For example, one of Business Services' goals was to improve coordination of information technology functions within the College. As a result of dialogue within the District's Information Technology Strategy Council (ITSC), Business Services advocated for the decentralization of microcomputer support, moving from a District-based to a College-based system. Instructional Media was combined with Microcomputer Support to form a new division called Technology

## 2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report

Support Services. With this decentralization, the College gained a Technology Manager and 2.5 FTE of Microcomputer Support staff. As a result, Norco College has a team of technicians, along with a technology supervisor, that is able to provide more immediate delivery of services to the College.

In the area of College Safety and Police, a Norco College Cadet program was implemented, with several cadets being added to this department. Facilities Department (Maintenance) was able to implement an automatic feedback survey on all work orders to maintain and improve their service delivery and customer satisfaction. Furthermore, the Food Services department was able to increase their delivery and options by opening a coffee cart and a coffee bar in the cafeteria area. These and other improvements are the result of the ongoing outcomes assessment process.

Similarly, the academic affairs team met in a focus group forum to discuss a phenomenon they were encountering during the program review and prioritization process. As the number of administrators has grown, the level of collaboration and integration has decreased. Also, the growing unit was concerned over redundancies in resource requests, goals, and assessment efforts. The academic affairs team evaluated its services and aspects of its various contributions and determined that the unit could be served by merging seven administrative program reviews into the following three: academic support services, instruction, and institutional effectiveness.

Because this was a new approach, the academic affairs unit had to consider how to combine several elements of their previous program reviews. For example, the units had to combine or merge their goals in a unique manner. This provided considerable opportunity for colleagues to have an increased understanding and appreciation of the services being provided by other areas, but it also provided opportunities for collaboration and synergistic support which had not occurred previously. Another aspect of the program review process in which the unit members had to consider how to move forward a combined effort was in regards to their assessments. Since each area had been involved with a separate assessment and those areas were no longer going to be represented in the same manner in their program reviews, the academic affairs unit determined to report out on the assessment which most closely resembled that which was related to



## **2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report**

the newly formed category. When possible, they attempted to close the loop, but in some cases they were only able to report out on current year outcomes. In the upcoming year, the unit will evaluate the success of their new approach and determine how to move forward.

With a focus on the authentic assessment of service area outcomes being completed in a collaborative and reflective manner, the Administrative unit program reviews reflect a process that mirrors that of faculty. Administrative program reviews include Major Functions, Goals and Objectives, a report of the previous year's assessment, a reflection on what has been learned via the assessment process, the current year's assessment plan, and resource requests. The administrative unit program review process has become an increasingly meaningful aspect of the institution's overall planning processes and has now been fully integrated into the overall planning structure of the college. The quality of assessments completed by administrative units has improved strikingly as the process has become a college-based endeavor. The increased level of collaboration and review occurring within the administrative unit program review process has provided accountability as well as opportunities for future refinement.

### **SUMMARY**

Assessment in all forms; instructional (including course and program-level), administrative, student services, and institutional; is robust, on-going, and systematic at Norco College. Significant gains in understanding assessment processes, collaboration and collegiality within the assessment committee, and comprehensiveness in evaluating student learning have increased over the past year. In addition, a new software program has been introduced, which has helped to organize, promote, and assist faculty in planning and conducting on-going assessment. Overall, assessment activities during 2014-15 have made significant gains toward identifying areas for ongoing growth, improving processes so that students can maximize learning, areas where faculty can grow in their understanding of assessment, and ways in which Norco College can continue to be an effective institution of higher education and learning.

Appendix A



## ASSESSMENT FOCUS - FALL 2015

**Discipline:**Math **Department:** Math and Sciences

**NAC Representative:** Siobhan Freitas

**Contact Info:** 951- 372-7164  
siobhan.freitas@norcocollege.  
edu

**Courses to be assessed:**

- MAT 1B
- MAT 2
- MAT 5
- MAT 10
- MAT 11
- MAT 36
- MAT 52
- MAT 65

**Programs to be assessed:**

- ADT Math

All assessment must be completed and input into TracDat V no later than 5 days after the end of the fall semester

**Faculty TracDat Training Schedule:**

- Friday 9/11/15 from 2:30 - 4 in IT 208
- Thursday 9/17/15 from 12:50-1:50 in IT 208
- Thursday 9/22/15 from 12:50-1:50 in IT 208
- Friday 9/25/15 from 2:30 - 4 in IT 208

For additional TracDat support please consult your NAC representative, the Assessment Coordinator, Sarah Burnett, 739-7872, [sarah.burnett@norcocollege.edu](mailto:sarah.burnett@norcocollege.edu), or the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Greg Aycock 739-7802, [greg.aycock@norcocollege.edu](mailto:greg.aycock@norcocollege.edu) .

## 2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report

### Appendix B

#### General Education Learning Outcome Assessment Plan Fall 2015

---

**GE PLO being assessed:**

# 3 Communication

**Specific skills being assessed:**

Students will be able to communicate effectively in diverse situations. They will be able to create, express, and interpret meaning in oral, visual, and written forms.

**Sections included and Coordinating Instructor:**

(If multiple sections are offered they will all be included in the assessment, including any hybrid or on-line versions)

Course Instructor(s) of Record (IOR) in Class Schedule	
Anthropology 7	Gray
Anthropology 8	Gray
Art 6	May, Skiba (on-line)
Biology 11	Moore
Biology 36	Finnern
Communications 1	Cruz-Pobocik, Dhallwal, Lewis, Muto, Norris, Rihan, Stinson
Communications 1H	Olaerts
English 1B	Capps, Cortina, Hogan, Mills, Mull, Tschetter
English 1B H	Tschetter
Geography 1	Eckstein, Jacobson
History 1	Kyriakos
Hum 4	Palmer
Hum 10	Heimlich, Lape, Palmer, Sentmanat, Westbrook,
Political Science 1	Brown, Kehlenbach, Madrid, Makin, Popiden, Synodinos,
Political Science 4	Brown
Theater 3	Stevens

**Coordinating Meeting:**

A meeting will be held on 10/6 from 12:50-1:50 in room **(TBD)**. All participating IOR will be invited to attend this meeting in order for the

## 2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report

assessment process to be explained and to identify the kind of data, format of data (charts etc.) they might be interested in receiving from the assessment. For Full Time Faculty, Flex credit will be available, for Associate Faculty this will serve as an assessment training that can be used towards your Professional Growth activities.

### Process for Assessment

- An email will be sent, to each faculty involved in the assessment, that links to a data entry screen in TracDat. The screen will display every student enrolled in each section of the courses being assessed.
- Each IOR involved in the assessment will identify an assignment from their section that most closely ties to the *identified specific skills being assessed*, namely:  
**Students will be able to communicate effectively in diverse situations. They will be able to create, express, and interpret meaning in oral, visual, and written forms.**
- A short statement (rationale) indicating how the assignment corresponds to the identified GE PLO skill should be provided to NAC - this will be used as part of the introduction section of the report that will be generated after the data is collected.
- Once the IORs have graded the identified assignment they will then identify in the TracDat data entry screen how well each student did in the assignment with regard to the *identified specific skills being assessed*, and will rate each student using the following 1-4 rating scale.  
1= Little or no evidence of competency was demonstrated in achieving the identified GE PLO skill  
2= Limited evidence of competency was demonstrated in achieving the identified GE PLO skill  
3= Adequate evidence of competency was demonstrated in achieving the identified GE PLO skill  
4= Strong evidence of competency was demonstrated in achieving the identified GE PLO skill

## **2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report**

- Data entry to TracDat should be completed no later than the 2<sup>nd</sup> week of the spring semester 2016.
- Results will be generated and disseminated to all faculty involved in the assessment and NAC members, for analysis and input prior to a report being generated.