



Norco Assessment Committee

Minutes for May 21, 2025

9:00 am – 10:30 am

Occupation Center (OC) 116

Meeting Participants

Committee Members Present

Hayley Ashby, Caitlin Busso, Eric Doucette, Bani Ghosh, Ashlee Johnson (co-chair), Stephany Kyriakos, Bibiana Lopez, Roger Perez (co-chair), Timothy Russell, Jude Whitton, and Aldo Yañez Ruiz.

Committee Members Not Present

Ted Jackson, Jethro Midgett, and David Schlanger.

Guest(s)

Carla Stout

Recorder

Charise Allingham

1. Call to Order

- 9:00 am

1.1 Welcome

1.2 Comments from the Public

Introduced by the Academic Senate, this time will be provided at the beginning of our meeting to allow for comments from the public going forward.

2. Action Items

2.1 Approval of Agenda

- MSC (Stephany Kyriakos/ Tim Russell)
- Postpone items 2.3 and 2.4.

2.1 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus with revisions

2.2 Approval of April 23, 2025, Minutes

- MSC (Stephany Kyriakos/Hayley Ashby)
- Incorporated revised language for clarity around the discussion 3.5 GELO revision.

2.2 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus with revisions.

2.3 Report of Effectiveness 2024-25

- Postponed to the 1st meeting of the 2025-26 year

2.4 Assessment Report 2023-24

- Postponed to the 1st meeting of the 2025-26 year

2.4 Follow-up Items	2.4 Task of	2.4 Due by
Prepare the ROE and the Assessment Report for the 1 st meeting of the 2025-26 year.	Co-chairs	1 st meeting of the 2025-26 year

3. Discussion Item

3.1 Fall FLEX

- The committee submitted an application for a session during Fall FLEX.
- Topics and suggestions:
 - Utilize the same format as the accreditation worksheet to evaluate and review assessment data and observations using a rubric.
 - Further suggestions to use the rubric to facilitate the discussion. Utilize FLEX time to practice applying the prompts and rubric in a manner that can be adopted by the discipline for both course and program-level outcomes.
 - Review assessment schedules and program ownership.
 - Presentation format should include a short 'state of assessment' and an overview of where assessment resources can be found on the website.
 - Suggested details for the activity
 1. Develop new observations.
 2. Review observations and move them forward to an action plan with a goal to improve.
 3. Mapping courses to program PLOs.
 - a. Suggestion to create a master Excel spreadsheet with all courses included in programs and printout sheets for each discipline to facilitate mapping and capture.
 - Suggestion to also hold a break-out session to provide training on how to import and collect data in Canvas.
 - Suggestion to request RSI and assessment breakout sessions at FLEX not be scheduled at the same times.

Members interested in hosting or facilitating sessions at FLEX, please reach out to the chairs.

3.2 Assessment Schedules

CHIL and SPS have submitted their assessment schedules. Please submit your schedules at your earliest convenience. The template was provided at the last meeting. If needed, please reach out to the chairs or Charise.

3.3 Project Team Updates (Standing Item)

3.3.a Legacy Team

Updates

- Status of assessment schedules.

- Need to identify mapping courses to programs, including identifying level mapping alignment.
- Courses that are directly related to a PLO will use direct assessment in Canvas.
- During the summer, developing direct assessment infrastructure for programs in Canvas that will mimic the course outcomes process to be implemented in the Fall.

3.3.b AV-1 Training and Support Team

Updates:

- The members have been reviewing and updating resources (training documents) that are available on the website.
- Will bring updated resources to the next meeting.
- The future goal is to create small to the point videos that will also be available on the website.

3.3.c AV-2 Frequency, Modality, Participants Team

- The members are currently reviewing and drafting prompts for the action plan and monitoring tabs in Nuventive.
- The team shared some concerns about not being able to drill down to the course level to review disaggregated data and the complications for courses only taught by one faculty member.
- A draft on how to look at the data resources will be shared with the team.
- Concerns have historically centered around assessment data being used for evaluations, but its true purpose is for improvement.
 - How do we balance the need for privacy and make the course-level disaggregated data available?
 - More important to have the data visible?
- Discussed the possibility of providing a qualitative narrative form outside of Nuventive that can be utilized by part-time faculty to capture their assessment progress.
- Discussion on the issues with the dashboards and limits with technology.

Question:

- How frequently are faculty required to assess each SLO?
 - Currently, the cycle requires the assessment loop to be closed for each SLO once every 6 years. Frequency is currently being addressed by the AV2 team. A current suggestion is to assess at least once every three years.
- There is a need for clarification on the process and the cycle; there is a need for an assessment manual.
- It has been clarified that the standing committees of the academic senate have the authority to make decisions on behalf of the academic senate.
- Program review is currently considering moving to a five-year cycle.
- Discussion around establishing a master assessment schedule and a possible process for maintaining.

3.3 Follow-up Items	3.3 Task of	3.3 Due by
Send Canvas Data review document to AV-2 team	Chair	Next meeting

4. Information Items

4.1 Program Ownership

- The identified program ownership document will be moved forward to use as a map for which courses PLOs will be uploaded into Canvas.

4.2 New Strategic Planning Cycle

- There will be some governmental items that we will need to complete, such as updating our Charter.

4.3 Area Updates

4.3.a Accreditation-no update

4.3.b Schools, Counseling-no update

4.3.c IE/Administrative-no update

4.3.d Library-

- Completed open house assessment and shared the results at the last Library and Learning Resource (LLRC) meeting. Improvements are being made.
- The LLRC Equity focus group is meeting with student groups to identify how to make the library a more welcoming and accessible space for students.
- Conducted a qualitative analysis of the scavenger hunt activity forms. Will share the results and analysis with the committee.
- The library is also exploring the use of Canvas for assessments, similar to how advising has utilized it.

4.3.e LRC- no update

4.3.f Student Services -no update

5. Good of the Order

- Congratulations to Stephany for 25 years and Jude for 10 years of service.

6. Future Agenda Topics

- Assessment qualitative narrative form collected outside of Canvas

7. Adjournment

- 10:21 am

Next Meeting

Date: September 17, 2025

[illegible]

[illegible]

1. RCC's Academic Senate rejected the revised wording for ILO #1 that has been approved at NC and MVC.
2. They asked us to bring it back to our colleges to discuss the *new* suggestions for revision. They see that there's a grammatical error in the language.
3. MVC said their vote stands.
4. NC has been asked to share our perspective now.

In the interest of assisting with a possible solution, I have included my clarification first, followed by some possible revision ideas. Please share with your committee members.

1. Here is the SLO as brought to us:

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

The issue with clarity is in the first sentence. The word group “for which multiple solutions exist” is modifying all three previous nouns (“issues,” “explanations,” and “problems”). Therefore, the sentence is claiming that multiple solutions exist for issues, multiple solutions exist for explanations, and multiple solutions exist for problems. Now, obviously, the last claim makes perfect sense. But the claim that multiple solutions exist for explanations makes no sense. A second problem is that the pronoun “them” could refer to the four possible antecedents (“issues,” “explanations,” “problems,” and “solutions”). This error causes less confusion, I believe, than the first one, but would disappear with certain revisions for clarity.

2. Here are a few possible revisions I drafted to address the clarity issue while staying true to the SLO’s main ideas.

1. Students will be able to demonstrate higher order thinking skills about problems for which multiple solutions exist. Students will be able to construct sound arguments and develop, test, and evaluate rival hypotheses and explanations.

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

3. Students will be able to demonstrate higher order thinking skills to address, explain, or solve issues and problems when multiple solutions may exist. Students will be able to construct sound arguments and develop, test, and evaluate rival hypotheses.

Please let me know what you think. Whatever the committee ends up deciding, thanks to all of you again for your concentration on this SLO update and for permitting me the time to clarify my concern and assist with a possible solution.