

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, Tim othy 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 do/GS8



- o 3. Develop an action plan, make decisions, and design changes to improve.
- o 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 V1

- The committee reviewed the current assessment form and tabs in Nuventive.
 - o Observation tab: Completed while program review was open.
 - o Actions tab: Under development, may need to be updated to tab to capture root cause analysis and discussion.
 - o 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.
 - o Realize that all this work will require training and will probably take years to fully implement.
 - o 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.
 - o 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.
 - o Recognize that this request of the committee seems overwhelming. The Cochair's role is to support the committee.
 - o Suggestions to review the focus areas and simplify them before they are shared with the college.
 - o It is Helpful to prioritize items that need to be completed in a timely manner and gaps identified for accreditation.
 - o Suggestion to add roles: What is done at what level? By which group?
 - o Suggestion to group 5-10 by subcategories.
- Co-chairs will review focus areas, reorganize, and prioritize before the next meeting.
 - o Suggestion for developing an assessment handbook and guidelines.



- 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. DocTuppent@tioionellnheveentive
 - 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

Standard 2: Student Success

In alignment with its mission, the institution delivers highquality 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:

Χ

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:

- x 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.
- x 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 goalsetting.
- x The institution's dialogue about disaggregated learning and achievement data informs institutional goal-setting.

Possible Sources of Evidence Could Include:

- x Documentation of processes for design and evaluation of curriculum
- x Documentation of processes for program review and outcomes assessment, including consideration of how disaggregated data are incorporated, analyzed, and used for improvement
- x 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