

Program Review and Outcomes Assessment Committee

Summary of 2-Hour PROAC Work Day via Zoom

May 20, 2020



Members Present:

Vilma Reyes, Lisa Hacskaylo, Adam Walsh, Diana Hocog, Lorna Liban, Yunzi Zhang, Rose Ada-Hocog, Mike Nurmi, Resida Keller, Wil Maui.

Members Absent:

IVP Char Cepeda, Geri Rodgers, Ryan Calvo, Tayna Belyeu-Camacho, Sue Atalig, Victoria Bellas

Tasks Completed:

1. Lisa began at 8:07AM with some reminders about the schedule and the plan for the morning.
2. Each review team who had PAFs submitted presented the rubric scores:
 - a. **Lorna** presented the rubric for CREES: Agriculture
 - i. **Summary of Data: Score=1** (unanimously passed with **no comment**)
 - ii. **Use of Results: Score=1** (unanimously passed)
Comment: Recommendation: The PROAC Committee approved how we graded the rubrics with a note that the recommendations for Fire Ants Monitoring should be improved. Describe what the program has done or is doing as a result of its findings in this Measure: Fire Ants Monitoring.
 - b. **Dr. Yunzi** presented the rubric for Distance Education
 - i. **Summary of Data: Score=1** (unanimously passed)
Comment: 100% should be used as success criteria for “login and navigate NMC Online; the current 70% target is low.
 - ii. **Use of Results: *Score=0**
Comment: Please specify possible recommendations for future assessment. The effort should be using the results for improvement, e.g. increasing the success criteria, using a different means of measure.
***This vote must be ratified at the next PROAC meeting because at the time of the vote, quorum was shy by one person (there were only 9 persons present since a member had to leave for another meeting).**
 - c. **Adam (on behalf of Mike)** presented the rubric for Project PROA
 - i. **Summary of Data: *Score=1**
Comment: By “76% of students tutored in Fall 2020 by Project PROA passed their courses” do you mean 76% of students passed with a C or better, or is it that 76% of students received a “B” (80%~89%/83%~92%) or better? Please specify. ***This vote must be ratified at the next PROAC meeting because at the time of the vote, quorum was shy by one person**

(there were only 9 persons present since a member had to leave for another meeting).

ii. **Use of Results: *Score= 0**

Comment:--The "Student College Credits" Measure doesn't have any findings or use of results. Is this because the data is still being collected? Also, the PAF did not indicate when the recommendation is to be implemented or when to expect to see an impact from actions taken. You need 2 dates for the last two categories of this rubric. **This vote must be ratified at the next PROAC meeting because at the time of the vote, quorum was shy by one person (there were only 9 persons present since a member had to leave for another meeting).**

3. Lisa led the committee in a review of the the assessment process with GLOWS (highlights) and GROWS (areas of improvement) from members as follows:
- a. Adam:
 - i. The 8-hour sessions were not as useful as they could have been. There needs to be a lot more work done prior to the meeting. The work of the review teams should be done prior to any work session so that the committee can focus on work that involves the entire committee.
 - ii. Difficult to nail down a schedule of due dates/deadlines, e.g.: due date for columns 1-3 and then columns 4-5. Be strategic in these deadlines for presentation of PAFs and voting by aligning with the academic calendar.
 - iii. Assessment is improving, but closing the loop is still difficult. It's hard to reinvigorate faculty since past recommendations have not been taken seriously or ignored (recommendations using the 5 column model).
 - b. Mike: Echoed the sentiments of Adam. Recommendations were only taken into consideration if it was just to keep doing what we are doing.
 - c. Wil: There needs to be someone or an office who can weed out the PAFs that do not meet the criteria (e.g. issues with misalignment) on the specific rubrics with a checklist before it reaches PROAC. There is an excessive amount of detailed work that should not be passed on to PROAC. Preliminary work needs to be done before it reaches PROAC. Perhaps the membership of PROAC should be extended to department chairs who can review the PAF initially with a checklist (to see if it actually passes all rubric requirements) before it goes to PROAC.
 - d. Adam- Streamline the process for PAF scoring/polling. There is a need for a norming session and then an expert who can make recommendations to the entire committee. It is unnecessary for each member of PROAC to vote on each rubric for nearly 40 programs when (for the most part) members agree with the initial scores and recommendations made by the assigned team.
 - e. Lorna: Streamline the process, need better methods to reduce the time for PAF evaluation.
 - f. Wil: Appreciate that PROAC counts as 2 committees. Look into compensating a faculty member to work with programs in the wordsmithing of PAFs with OIE.

- g. Resida- Decrease the back-and-forth process, need a checklist with the department chair to check the PAF before it goes forward to PROAC. Align PROAC events with the academic calendar so there is a master calendar.
 - h. OIE Recommendations and action items:
 - i. OIE to develop an assessment handbook
 - ii. OIE to train program assessment authors - i.e. webinars, one -on-one outreach
4. The work session ended at ~10AM.

Summary submitted by Geri Rodgers