Norco Assessment Committee

Meeting Minutes

October 27, 2016

Present: Jose Sentmanat, Araceli Covarrubias, Laura Adams, Jethro Midgett, Kara Zamiska, Jeff

Warsinski, Courtney Buchanan, Tami Comstock, James Finley, Alexis Gray, Barbara

Moore, Stephany Kyriakos, Sarah Burnett, Greg Aycock,

Absent: Khalil Andacheh, Diane Deckmeyer, Kevin Fleming, Judy Perry, Rodolfo Suarez,

Daniela McCarson, Quinton Bemiller, Dan Reade

Approval of Agenda

o Motion to approve: Jose Sentmanat

Seconded: Stephany Kyriakos

Approved

Approval of Minutes

Minutes approved from 10/13/16 meeting. Minutes for 9/8 still tabled to be approved in a future meeting.

Academic Senate

- Survey of effectiveness: Greg Aycock- According to the survey needs were very clear as follows: Minutes
 and Agenda's out prior to meeting and Agenda items completed within the meeting time.
- Issues were also discussed such as recommending more time to meet as well as communication in between meetings to help complete agenda items.
- Also suggested having department representatives for the committee.
- There is also a concern from faculty that not all faculty know how to do the SLO mapping and tracking of data. Suggested that getting faculty trained in each department so that they can then assist and train others will help with compliance.

Key Indicators Analysis

- o We use the assessment portion of program review and derive indicators to see how well we are doing in the assessment cycle. On a 0 − 3 scale we scored a 1.8. Low submission rate for program review is possible explanation for above scores.
- o Key indicator scores are higher this year than last years except in the dialogue indicator.
- o To increase intuitional dialogue it was suggested to use NAC as an avenue for this purpose.

• Rotation Cycle for assessment

- A vote on the Rotation cycle tabled for the first meeting in spring. The following dialogue ensued-
 - Every SLO in every course needs to be completed.
 - School is being judged by a set of standards from the ACCJC, but we set the assessment cycle for our institution. It must be ongoing and systematic.
 - Determined that to have all SLO's completed an 8-year time frame is feasible since program review is every 4 years.
 - Suggested to do half of the SLO's in 4 years and the other half completed in the next 4 years after
 - Procedures will be sent out in email to all members to clarify policy and standards from the accreditors.