Norco Assessment Committee
Minutes for September 16th, 2026
9:00 am – 10:30 am
Occupation Center (OC) 116

Meeting Participants

Committee Members Present Quorum: 7

Laura Adams, Hayley Ashby (co-chair), Quinton Bemiller, Cheryl Cox (via Zoom), Eric Doucette (co-chair), Stephany Kyriakos, Bibiana Lopez, April Mejia, Arinze Ogelle (ASNC Rep), Roberto F. Perez, Timothy Russell, Aldo Yañez Ruiz, David Schlanger, Carla Stout, and Jim Thomas.

Committee Members Not Present

Ted Jackson and Jethro Midgett.

Recorder

Charise Allingham

1. Call to Order

- 9:00 am

1.1 Comments from the Public

No comments from the public

2. Action Items

2.1 Approval of Agenda

- MSC (Stephany Kyriakos/Laura Adams)

2.1 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus

2.2 Approval of May 20th, 2026 Minutes

- MSC (Stephany Kyriakos/Bibiana Lopez)

2.2 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus

2.3 Alignment with the Strategic Plan (5-Year Cycle)

- MSC (Stephany Kyriakos/Laura Adams)

Second read of the proposal to move the Assessment Cycle to a five-year cycle in alignment with the Strategic Plan and Program Review Cycle.

The committee discussed when the new cycle would begin. If approved, the new cycle would begin in 2027–28. Because the college is currently in the second year of the Strategic Plan, the

Program Review cycle would be a four-year cycle initially, once approved, to align with the Strategic Plan and would then move to a five-year cycle for subsequent cycles. This year's assessments could be used for both the current cycle and toward the new five-year cycle aligned with the Strategic Plan.

Motion: Approve aligning the assessment cycle with the Program Review cycle, which would mean a move to a five-year cycle if Program Review moves to a five-year cycle to align with the Strategic Plan.

2.3 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus

3. Discussion Item

3.1 Membership

- The committee welcomed new members: Quinton Bemiller, Carla Stout, and Arinze Ogelle to the committee.

3.2 Assessment and Program Review Meeting Alignment

The Program Review Committee co-chairs presented a proposal to align Assessment and Program Review Meeting times. It was proposed to consider moving the Assessment Committee meeting to Thursday, potentially on an alternate Thursday from Program Review. The committee discussed the possibility of aligning the meeting schedules to allow for joint meetings when needed and to give committee members the opportunity to alternate attendance between the two committees.

If a schedule change is made, it would not take effect until the 2027–28 academic year. This would give both committees time to discuss the proposal, consider the impact on faculty participation, and determine whether any changes to the meeting schedule would be needed.

The committee also discussed keeping the current meeting times for each committee and scheduling joint meetings separately when needed at a mutually agreed-upon time, such as a Friday.

An alternate Program Review Committee member could attend the Assessment Committee meetings as an alternate to the co-chair. Another suggestion was to look at faculty teaching schedules to identify the times that are most utilized and those that may be more available for committee meetings.

The discussion will continue, and the Assessment Committee will have an opportunity to provide feedback and discuss alternatives to the proposed schedule change.

This is a discussion that will be ongoing.

3.3 Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO/GELO) Assessment Plan

The ILO Assessment Plan was shared with the committee. Traditionally, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has coordinated the collection of data and discussion of results, with assistance from department chairs and discipline leads in identifying the courses to include in the assessment.

The plans were developed with faculty workload in mind. The ILOs and Areas of Emphasis (AOEs) scheduled for assessment are spread out to help avoid overloading any one discipline or department. The plan also aims to include broad representation across disciplines and modalities to support more meaningful discussion of the assessment results and distribute the workload.

The committee asked whether the ILO Assessment Plan is coordinated with the other colleges. Assessment is conducted individually by each college; however, the results may be used to inform future ILO/GELO revisions. The colleges currently work together through the District ILO/GELO Revision Workgroup.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will send a request to committee members and department chairs for courses to be included in this semester's assessment.

All GELOs/ILOs are already available in Canvas Outcomes in the "Norco" folder, which can be accessed by selecting "Find" in Outcomes.

ILO/GELO to be assessed this year:

- Critical Thinking

3.4 Area of Emphasis (AOE) Assessment Plan

Traditionally, and in alignment with the ILOs/GELOs, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has coordinated the collection of data and discussion of results, with assistance from department chairs and discipline leads in identifying the courses and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) to include in the assessment.

The assessment plan for the Area of Emphasis (AOE) programs was presented. The AOEs will be assessed over four years, with two AOEs assessed each year for the first three years and the final AOE assessed in the fourth year, followed by a cumulative analysis in the fifth year. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will need assistance from the committee and department chairs in identifying which courses and PLOs should be included in the assessment.

Suggestion that there is a need to use the assessment of the AOEs to have a broader discussion about the continuation of these programs, with consideration of alternatives for degrees for areas that will no longer have a program if the AOE is discontinued.

The AOE program plans will be provided when requesting course alignment and identify the required and elective courses included in each program. Ideally, the assessment process would also identify the level (beginning, intermediate, and advanced) at which these courses

align with the PLOs. The IE Office will send out the AOE course lists and selection spreadsheet soon for department chairs and committee members to complete.

The PLOs for the AOEs are already available in Canvas Outcomes.

AOEs to be assessed this academic year:

- Administration and Information Systems;
- Communication, Media, and Languages

3.5 Program Learning Outcome Results and Action Reporting

In the Spring, the Legacy team started a draft worksheet and help text to utilize the existing Observation section of Nuventive for PLO assessment. The help text and worksheet were shared.

- Using the Observation section and existing prompts would maintain any assessments that have already been completed using this section.
- Using the Observation section would also provide more flexibility in choosing between using direct assessment or SLO mapping, with the ability to rotate methods across different PLOs as needed.
- Updated help text will be added to Nuventive.

4. Information Items

4.1 Canvas Outcomes / Nuventive Updates

New Quizzes Data will soon be incorporated into the Canvas Outcomes Dashboards.
If there are any issues with the dashboards or questions about how the data is displayed, please reach out to Charise to troubleshoot.

4.2 Area Updates

4.2.a Accreditation- No Report

4.2.b Schools, Counseling-

- SBS-General agreement to get on the cycle with the program review cycle.

4.2.c IE/Administrative- No Report

4.2.d Library- No Report

4.2.e LRC- No Report

4.2.f Student Services- No Report

5. Good of the Order

- Grateful to Eric for assuming the new leadership role.
- Question about training and workshops to be developed by project teams.
    - Please reach out to the co-chairs and/or Charise if you have any training or workshops in mind that you would like to provide or work on developing.
- Coordination with program review is essential for training. Moving forward, we need to focus on implementing Student Services area and administrative assessment. Need to think about how to incorporate support and training for these areas in addition to instruction.

6. Future Agenda Topics

- Training-Workshops
- Administration and Student Services Assessment

7. Adjournment

- 10:24 am

Next Meeting

Date: October 21, 2026

Area of Emphasis (AOE) Outcomes Assessment Plan

Purpose

Establish a sustainable, faculty-engaged process for directly assessing the College's seven Area of Emphasis (AOE) associate degree programs, using Canvas and Nuventive data to support institutional dialogue, curriculum improvement, resource decisions, and accreditation requirements.

The proposed cycle assesses all seven Area of Emphasis associate degree programs over four years, with two AOEs assessed annually during the first three years and the final AOE assessed in the fourth year. The fifth year is devoted to cumulative analysis, evaluation of the assessment process, follow-up on improvement actions, and possible revision of program learning outcomes. The five-year cycle also aligns with the College's strategic planning cycle, allowing broader-level assessment findings to inform the evaluation and development of institutional priorities.

Guiding Principles

- Build on the College's existing assessment practices and Canvas–Nuventive infrastructure.
- Coordinate the sequencing, course selection, and faculty participation for AOE and ILO assessment so that closely aligned assessment responsibilities are distributed across different years, disciplines, and faculty.
- Ensure broad representation across disciplines, instructional modalities, and student populations so that assessment findings reflect the interdisciplinary nature of the AOE degree programs.
- Select courses intentionally based on their AOE alignment, in consultation with discipline faculty, department chairs, and Assessment Committee members rather than relying solely on voluntary participation.
- Engage faculty program leads in defining the degree of alignment (e.g., introduce, develop, master) of courses to AOE outcomes.
- Prioritize direct evidence from students' actual work, performances, or demonstrated skills, supplemented when useful by student reflections, perceptions, or other indirect evidence that provides context for the results.
- Document findings and dialogue around patterns, strengths, equity gaps, and areas for improvement.
- Use resulting actions from AOE assessment to inform program review.

Five-Year Assessment Cycle

Year	AOEs	Actions
2026-27	Administration and Information Systems; Communication, Media, and Languages	Collect evidence in fall, analyze and discuss results in spring, and document improvement actions
2027-28	Kinesiology, Health, and Wellness; Social and Behavioral Studies	Collect evidence in fall, analyze and discuss results in spring, and document improvement actions
2028-29	Math and Science; Humanities, Philosophy, and Arts	Collect evidence in fall, analyze and discuss results in spring, and document improvement actions
2029-30	Fine and Applied Arts	Collect evidence in fall, analyze and discuss results in spring, and document improvement actions
2030-31	Cumulative Review	Analyze findings across all seven AOEs, evaluate the effectiveness of the process, review progress on improvement actions, and determine whether the AOEs or assessment cycle should be revised

Annual Planning and Implementation Timeline

The following activities will take place annually to assess the AOEs scheduled for the academic year.

Timeline	Action	Lead/Support	Deliverable
Early Fall	Assessment Committee Members confer with discipline faculty program leads on the degree of alignment of courses to the AOE outcomes to be assessed	Assessment Committee, Assessment Committee co-chairs, and OIE	Course to AOE Map
Early Fall	Identify courses to be assessed and work with department chairs, program leads, and Assessment Committee Members to notify faculty of AOE assignments	OIE and Assessment Committee co-chairs	List of courses and assignments, email to department chairs
Mid Fall	Training on assessing AOEs through Canvas (including assignment selection) and rubric norming	OIE and Assessment Committee co-chairs	Presentation and training materials
Late Fall	Faculty complete the assessment rubric in Canvas	Assigned Faculty	Assessment data in Canvas
Early Spring	Develop prompts to guide the discussion of the designated AOEs	Assessment Committee, Assessment Committee co-chairs, and OIE	Discussion guide
Mid Spring	Schedule, conduct, and document the discussion of AOE findings including identifying patterns, strengths, equity gaps, and areas for improvement	OIE and Assessment Committee co-chairs	Meeting minutes
Late Spring	Develop an AOE assessment report for the designated AOEs based on the findings and discussion	OIE and Assessment Committee co-chairs	AOE Assessment Report
Late Spring	Share the AOE Assessment Report with Academic Senate, IEGC, Academic Council, and other relevant governance bodies; present at subsequent Fall FLEX	OIE and Assessment Committee co-chairs	Presentation

Institution-Level Outcomes (ILO) Assessment Plan

Purpose

Establish a sustainable, faculty-engaged process for directly assessing the College's four institution-level outcomes (ILOs), aka General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs), using Canvas and Nuventive data to support institutional dialogue, curriculum improvement, resource decisions, and accreditation requirements.

The proposed cycle assesses one ILO each year for four years, followed by a fifth year devoted to cumulative analysis, evaluation of the assessment process, and possible revision of the ILOs. This approach recognizes the substantial assessment infrastructure already established at the course level and extends that work systematically to institution-level assessment. The five-year cycle also aligns with the College's strategic planning cycle, allowing institution-level assessment findings to inform the evaluation and development of institutional priorities.

Guiding Principles

- Build on the College's existing assessment practices and Canvas–Nuventive infrastructure.
- Coordinate the sequencing, course selection, and faculty participation for ILO and AOE assessment so that closely aligned assessment responsibilities are distributed across different years, disciplines, and faculty.
- Ensure broad representation across disciplines, instructional modalities, and student populations.
- Select courses intentionally based on their ILO alignment, in consultation with discipline faculty, department chairs, and Assessment Committee members, rather than relying on voluntary participation.
- Engage faculty in defining the degree of alignment (e.g., introduce, develop, master) of courses to ILOs.
- Prioritize direct evidence from students' actual work, performances, or demonstrated skills, supplemented when useful by student reflections, perceptions, or other indirect evidence that provides context for the results.
- Document findings and dialogue around patterns, strengths, equity gaps, and areas for improvement.
- Use resulting actions from ILO assessment to inform program review.

Five-Year Assessment Cycle

Year	ILO	Actions
2026-27	ILO 1: Critical Thinking	Collect evidence in fall, analyze and discuss results in spring, and document improvement actions
2027-28	ILO 2: Information Competency and Technology Literacy	Collect evidence in fall, analyze and discuss results in spring, and document improvement actions
2028-29	ILO 3: Communication	Collect evidence in fall, analyze and discuss results in spring, and document improvement actions
2029-30	ILO 4: Self Development and Global Awareness	Collect evidence in fall, analyze and discuss results in spring, and document improvement actions

Year	ILO	Actions
2030-31	Cumulative Review	Analyze findings across all four ILOs, evaluate the effectiveness of the process, review progress on improvement actions, and determine whether the ILOs or assessment cycle should be revised

Annual Planning and Implementation Timeline

The following activities will take place annually to assess the ILO scheduled for the academic year.

Timeline	Action	Lead/Support	Deliverable
Summer	Determine which courses are aligned to which ILOs	Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE)	Report from District Curriculum
Early Fall	Assessment Committee Members confer with discipline faculty on the degree of alignment of courses to the ILO to be assessed	Assessment Committee, Assessment Committee co-chairs, and OIE	Course to ILO Map
Early Fall	Identify courses to be assessed and work with department chairs and Assessment Committee Members to notify faculty of ILO assignments	OIE and Assessment Committee co-chairs	List of courses and assignments, email to department chairs
Mid Fall	Training on assessing ILOs through Canvas (including assignment selection) and rubric norming	OIE and Assessment Committee co-chairs	Presentation and training materials
Late Fall	Faculty complete the assessment rubric in Canvas	Assigned Faculty	Assessment data in Canvas
Early Spring	Develop prompts to guide the discussion of the designated ILO	Assessment Committee, Assessment Committee co-chairs, and OIE	Discussion guide
Mid Spring	Schedule, conduct, and document the discussion of ILO findings including identifying patterns, strengths, equity gaps, and areas for improvement	OIE and Assessment Committee co-chairs	Meeting minutes
Late Spring	Develop an ILO assessment report for the designated ILO based on the findings and discussion	OIE and Assessment Committee co-chairs	ILO Assessment Report
Late Spring	Share the ILO Assessment Report with Academic Senate, IEGC, Academic Council, and other relevant	OIE and Assessment Committee co-chairs	Presentation

Timeline	Action	Lead/Support	Deliverable
	governance bodies; present at subsequent Fall FLEX		

PLO Assessment Worksheet

A pre-thinking guide for completing a Program Learning Outcome observation in Nuventive Solutions.

Before You Begin

This worksheet is designed to help you organize your thinking and discussion before you complete a PLO Observation entry in Nuventive. You do not need to submit this worksheet; it is for your use. It is also a useful structure for discipline-level conversations about your PLO results.

Start by reviewing your data. Pull up the following dashboards in Nuventive and spend some time with them before working through this worksheet. You will return to them as you complete each section.

- Outcome Mastery — overall results for the PLO
- Outcome Mastery by Demographics — results disaggregated by gender, age, and race/ethnicity
- Outcome Mastery by Declared Major — results disaggregated by major

The Norco College mastery benchmark: Norco College aims for 70% of students to achieve "mastery" (≥ 2 on the 0–4 scale) on each outcome. Use 70% as your reference point, but remember to look for patterns, not perfection — the goal is to understand where student achievement can be improved and for whom.

A note on use: As described in the Norco College Assessment Handbook, assessment results are intended to support inquiry and improvements to teaching, learning, and services, with a focus on closing equity gaps. They are not used in faculty evaluation or employment decisions. Please engage openly and honestly.

Section 1 — Identifying Your PLO

- Program:
- PLO being assessed (number and text):
- Reporting term or academic year:
- Faculty completing this report:
- How was this PLO assessed?

    ☐ Direct PLO assessment (capstone, portfolio, or other culminating assignment)

    ☐ Aggregated SLO assessment (results rolled up from course-level SLOs)
- Course(s) involved:

- If using aggregated SLOs, list the contributing SLOs:

Section 2 — Pre-thinking for "What Did You Notice?"

The "What did you notice?" field in Nuventive asks for a one- or two-sentence statement of the overall pattern. Use the prompts below to identify the headline.

- Overall mastery rate on this PLO: ___ %

- Did the program meet the 70% benchmark?

  ☐ Yes

  ☐ No

  ☐ Met overall, but with notable variation across groups

What jumps out at first glance? Write one or two sentences.

Section 3 — Pre-thinking for "Discussion/Analysis"

Use the four areas below to organize your reflection. You will summarize this thinking in the Discussion/Analysis field in Nuventive. Examining disaggregated data is an expected part of every PLO observation.

- **Strengths.** Where are students doing well? What aspects of the program are working?

- **Challenges.** Where are the gaps? What aspects of the program are not working as well as you would like?

- **Equity.** The Norco College Assessment Handbook defines an equity gap as a statistically meaningful difference in the average level of "mastery" achieved by student subgroups (e.g.,

gender, race/ethnicity, age). Examining disaggregated data is expected for every PLO observation. Consider these equity-minded reflection prompts from the handbook:

  - Are there differences in achievement of "mastery" within subgroups (for example, higher mastery among some demographic groups than others)?
  - Are course materials relevant to students' personal backgrounds?
  - Do students have equitable access to course materials and resources?

- **Opportunities for improvement.** In broad terms, what direction might the discipline take in response? You do not need a detailed action plan here, just the general direction. Detailed action planning will live in a separate tab in Nuventive once it is built.

Section 4 — Possible Explanations

What might explain the patterns you are seeing? Check any that apply and add notes.

☐ Curriculum sequencing across courses

☐ Assignment design or rubric alignment

☐ Alignment of contributing courses to the PLO

☐ Student preparation entering the program

☐ Modality differences (online, hybrid, on-campus)

☐ Resource or access issues

☐ Other:

Section 5 — Evidence to Attach in Nuventive

- Screenshots (paste into the screenshots field):

  ☐ Outcome Mastery dashboard

  ☐ Outcome Mastery by Demographics dashboard

☐ Outcome Mastery by Declared Major dashboard

☐ Program map (if relevant)

☐ Other:

- Documents (upload to the documents field) — Use this area to submit evidence of discipline-level dialogue. Collegial dialogue is a core part of the assessment process:

  ☐ Meeting minutes from discipline discussion

  ☐ AI generated notes/transcripts from Zoom discussions

  ☐ Email threads showing faculty dialogue

  ☐ Other:

Section 6 — Drafting Your Nuventive Entries

- Draft of "Observation Name" — Suggested format: "[Program] PLO #[number]: [short descriptor] – [Term Year]."

- Draft of "What did you notice?" — One or two sentences. Reference the 70% benchmark.

- Draft of "Discussion/Analysis" — A few paragraphs covering strengths, challenges, equity gaps, possible explanations, and the broad direction the discipline might take.

Appendix — Quick Reference

Key terms from the Norco College Assessment Handbook:

- **Mastery.** Achievement of ≥ 2 on the 0–4 scale used in the Canvas Learning Mastery Gradebook.
- **Equity gap.** Statistically meaningful difference in average "mastery" between student subgroups (for example, by gender, race/ethnicity, or age).

- **PLO.** Program-level Student Learning Outcome. What students should know and be able to do upon completion of a degree or certificate program.
- **SLO.** Course-level Student Learning Outcome. What students should know and be able to do after successfully completing a course.
- **Closing the loop.** Using assessment results to improve student learning through collegial dialogue and informed change.

Assessment cycle reminder: Each PLO must be assessed at least once during the assessment cycle. Submitting at least one Nuventive observation per PLO per program review cycle satisfies this expectation. Of course, disciplines are encouraged to report more frequently depending on their needs.

Date The date you are completing this report, not the date the assessment was administered.

Observation Name A clear, searchable title. Suggested format: "[Program] PLO #[number]: [Term Year of Observation]."

What did you notice? A one- or two-sentence statement of the overall pattern. Norco's benchmark is 70% of students achieving "mastery" (≥ 2 on the 0–4 scale). Note whether the program met it. See the PLO Assessment Worksheet for guiding prompts.

Course(s) List the courses connected to this PLO assessment — either the course(s) where direct PLO assessment occurred (capstone, portfolio, or other culminating assignment), or all courses whose SLO results were aggregated to evaluate the PLO.

SLO(s) Paste the full text of the Program Learning Outcome (PLO) this observation addresses, along with its number (e.g., "PLO #1: ..."). If you are using aggregated SLOs to evaluate the PLO, indicate the contributing SLOs here for context.

Discussion/Analysis Reflect on the strengths, challenges, equity gaps, and opportunities for improvement revealed in the data. Address overall patterns, disaggregated results (gender, age, race/ethnicity, declared major), possible explanations, and the broad direction the discipline might take in response. Examining disaggregated data is expected for every PLO observation. See the PLO Assessment Worksheet for equity-minded reflection prompts.

Please paste any relevant screenshots here Include the Nuventive dashboards or any other visualizations that support your observations.

Please add any relevant documents here Upload evidence of discipline-level dialogue: meeting minutes, Zoom notes, email threads, or other documentation showing faculty discussed the data collectively.