NORCO ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

April 28, 2016 CSS 219 | 12:50-1:50pm

MINUTES

Present:

Khalil Andacheh, Associate Professor, Sociology
Greg Aycock (Co-Chair), Dean, Institutional Effectiveness
Quinton Bemiller, Assistant Professor, Art
Sarah Burnett (Co-Chair), Associate Professor, Early Childhood Education
Tami Comstock, Associate Professor, English
Araceli Covarrubias, Assistant Professor, Spanish
Diane Dieckmeyer, Vice President, Academic Affairs
Siobhan Freitas, Associate Professor, Chemistry
Alexis Gray, Associate Professor of Anthropology
Stephany Kyriakos, Associate Professor, History
Daniela McCarson, Assistant Dean, CalWORKS & Special Funded Programs
Jethro Midgett, Assistant Professor, Counseling
Judy Perry, Associate Professor, Simulation and Game Development

Guests:

Carolyn Rosales, Adjunct Faculty, English

Absent:

Laura Adams, Assistant Professor, Psychology
Robbie Bishara (Student Representative)
Gerald Cordier, Associate Professor, Engineering
James Finley, Assistant Professor, Simulation and Game Development
Kevin Fleming, Dean of Instruction, Career & Technical Education

I. Approval of Agenda and Additional Item
Motion to Approve/Alexis Gray
Seconded/Khalil Andacheh
Approved

Add - Fall Flex Needs/Ideas

- II. Approval of Minutes

 March 24, 2016

 Motion to approve/Siobhan Freitas
 Seconded/Alexis Gray
 Approved
- III. Norming the current scoring rubric to the assessment section of the APR

 A good portion of the meeting was devoted to norming and practice scoring.
 - Sarah presented the ECE APR to be used for sample scoring.
 - The scoring rubric was distributed to the committee.
 - The committee will be reading discipline reports out of TracDat.
 - NAC members have permission to access all disciplines in TracDat.
 - Sarah will be emailing out a list of the assignments.
 - Sarah to send an email out to members as the reviews get posted.
 - If you are reading for Program Review, you will be scoring the same assessments.
 - A brief review of how to score/total the rubric was presented.
 - The most you can score on the rubric is a 3.3.
 - The committee proceeded to score the ECE review.
 - What we are looking for are completed assessments in 2014-2015.

Handouts

<u>Discussion</u>: The question was raised, "What does it mean to have a complete assessment?" Sarah stated it means they have a course plan and results. To verify if there is an initial assessment and results you can run a 4-column report from TracDat. This is about if we can score the rubric, and initial assessment(s).

Review, explanation, and discussion following the boxes on the rubric:

Initial SLO assessments

The main question will be, can this assessment be scored?

- 0 No evidence provided.
- 1 Limited evidence of on-going SLO assessment
- o 2 Clear evidence of ongoing SLO assessment
- o 3 Clear and robust evidence of on-going SLO assessment
- Loop Closing Assessments
 - 0 No evidence provided.
 - Can we score the rubric?
 - 1 Limited evidence of Loop-closing assessment.

- 2 Clear evidence of loop closing. For at least one initial assessment.
 - This column has to be taken very seriously. Faculty have been told if they determined within their assessment that no changes were made, that the loop was considered closed. What we are looking for is language/conversation as to what determined the loop was closed. Disciplines need to have a discussion on setting benchmarks for success rates.
- 3 Clear and robust evidence of loop-closing. Two possibilities: 1) Multiple change made plans in place, or 2) a very clear justification for "loop closed" for multiple initial assessments.
 - No questions.

Assessment input into TracDat

- 0 No assessments in TracDat format or Repository.
 - This should be easy now that you have a row on the rubric for scoring.
- 1 Assessment completed are in word/pdf in document Repository.
- o 2 Assessments identified have Assessment Plan, but not all have Results.
- 3 All identified assessments have a complete report (Plan and Results) in TracDat data field)
 - You might need to look at previous SLO's which are available for viewing in a 4-column report.

Attempts to improve student learning

- 0 No indication of any changes made to any courses and no clarification provided.
- 1 No attempts to change any courses, teaching approaches, and no clarification or reasoning as to why not.
- 2 Evidence of an attempt to implement a change in a course or teaching approach provided or simple clarifying statement regarding why no specific improvement is needed.
- 3 Multiple attempts made to implement changes to courses or teaching approaches, or clear and supported clarification why no improvement is needed.

Dialogue across the discipline

- o 0 No dialogue or attempt to communicate results.
- 1 Limited demonstration of dialogue or communication within the discipline, department, or college.
- 2 Clear demonstration of dialogue and sharing of assessment within discipline, departments, or college.

- 3 Robust and systematic dialogue and communication demonstrated within discipline, department, or college.
 - Further discussion to take place in the fall to clarify the scoring all boxes.
- Participation in PLO assessment (bonus points averaged into total score)
 - 0 Blank
 - 1 Engagement in at least 1 initial PLO assessment and/or Engagement in at least 1 PLO closing-the-loop assessment fall '14 spr.'
 - 2 Blank
 - o 3 Blank

<u>Discussion</u>: As you are scoring the rubric, take notes on what is working and what might need revisions or further discussion. Please bring your notes to the next meeting or forward them to Sarah.

- IV. Update from each Department regarding on-going-assessment
 - Tabled for next meeting.
- V. Fall Flex Needs/Ideas
 - Introduction to TracDat
 - Grit

If you hear of any ideas for fall flex, please forward them to Sarah.

VI. Good of the Order

Adjournment 1:50 p.m.