



Outcomes Committee Meeting Minutes

Zoom Meeting | March 16, 2021 | 2:30–3:30 p.m.

Attendance: Alyson Cartagena (chair), John Frala, Vann Priest, Lissette Acevedo, Sean Hughes, Bonnilee Kaufman, John Frala, Mike Javanmard, Daniel Osman, Stephen Smith, Robin Babou, Melanie Fierro, Ryan Bronkar, Aimee Ortiz, Scott Jaeggi, Julio Flores, Kevin Barman, Eric Caesar, Alice Mecom, Sarah Cote, Cynthia Lewis, Jay Ribaya

Unable to attend: Mike Garabedian, Caroline Durdella

NB: Motions and action items italicized in RED.

I. Welcome	<p>A. The meeting commenced at 2:31 p.m.</p> <p>B. Cartagena welcomed Jay Ribaya, who will replace Melanie Fierro as one of the two Math, Science, and Engineering representatives on the committee.</p> <p>C. Cartagena reminded the group that at 3:30 p.m. Dana and Heather Arazi would present a workshop called The Tao of SLOs: SLOs, Equity, & Accessibility Registration—a workshop designed to encourage faculty to think beyond the kinds of outcomes basics that have performed been the focus of many outcomes workshops to date.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Because an equity-focused outcomes workshop was attended by just two folks last week, Cartagena asked committee members to encourage their division colleagues to participate in these opportunities—and even to plan on attending the workshops themselves—in order to learn how to learn how to design good outcomes and deploy authentic assessments related to the College’s mission and values.
II. Minutes Approval	<p><i>A. It was moved and seconded that the minutes from February be approved.</i></p>
III. Faculty Resource Center Updates	<p>A. The FRC is being continually updated with videos and resource documents; one criterion for a topic’s inclusion is if more than one person asks about an outcomes-related subject.</p> <p>B. Cartagena shared links to several new FRC videos she produced that take up topical outcomes-related issues and subjects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• “I Can’t Find Myself”: https://tinyurl.com/9pbs467t• Major Changes [to Outcomes Statements] (part A): https://tinyurl.com/fzw7h4e7• Major Changes [to Outcomes Statements](part B): https://tinyurl.com/36zy8su7• Minor Changes [to Outcomes Statements]: https://tinyurl.com/2v9xksvw• “Active” and “Obsolete”: https://tinyurl.com/wb7rknxa• Outcomes Created But “Missing” in Workspace: https://tinyurl.com/bhed5ymk

<p>IV. Spring Goal: Outcomes Statements</p>	<p>A. Outcomes Statements Will Be Published. Per ACCJC requirements, RHC outcomes statements will be published on the RHC website and therefore viewable to anyone via the course schedule. Cartagena asked the group to consider whether their division/area is ready (i.e., have all updates been made in <i>Taskstream</i>?) Acevedo thanked Cartagena for the videos she has been sending, noting many of Cartagena’s videos have helped answer faculty questions about outcomes. She asked and Cartagena answered that any departments with courses for which faculty are revising outcomes significantly should not be deleted, but made “Obsolete” via the radio button in <i>Taskstream</i>. Frala asked and Cartagena confirmed that if a faculty member wants to get rid of an outcome entirely, it too should be made “Obsolete”—particularly if there is data linked to the statement. Other representatives provided brief updates, and among other things noted that keeping things simple and providing “dummy-proof” instructions with examples—as Cartagena has— is imperative.</p>
<p>V. Institutional Level Outcomes (ILOs)</p>	<p>A. ILO Data. Because ILOs have never been systematically evaluated, there is no template about how to undertake this work. Reminding the committee that it is a work in progress, Cartagena shared a document she drafted that describes the proposed RHC process (see supplement 1, below), noting that although course learning and program-level outcomes were taken up at Academic Senate last year, ILOs were not. She focused on language in the document that has the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) “design activities to support development in areas that need improvement as well as areas demonstrating success,” noting that she does not think this piece should come from the Outcomes Committee, in large part because IEC has a better understanding of initiatives happening on campus (e.g., equity, Guided Pathways) that relate to ILOs.</p> <p>B. To Share at April Retreat. Once the committee reviews the document, and weighs in on emendations, <i>Cartagena will send the document to Garabedian for copy editing, and then share the document at IRP’s strategic planning retreat in April.</i></p> <p>C. Recommendations. Cartagena argued for the validity of the data despite some of its being collected post-pandemic, and described the recommendations in the document. Several committee members had questions and observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Javanmard asked and Cartagena answered that Sarah Cote in Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) collected ILO data over winter break (and shared in an <i>Excel</i> spreadsheet report), while the document Cartagena shared is her first attempt at trying to look at the data from the report in order to come up with recommendations. Javanmard noted and Cartagena agreed that in recommendations the committee should consider not only this upcoming assessment/accreditation cycle, but the next one, too; and in response to Javanmard’s caveat/observation that in the past RHC has not been able to assess ILOs, she suggested the committee can’t be sure whether in the past the issue was folks “hadn’t been able” to evaluate ILOS—or simply that they didn’t know this evaluation is ACCJC-required. She also pointed out that outcomes mapping in <i>Taskstream</i> did not exist prior. Cote described the process she undertook to derive this data from <i>Taskstream</i>, noting in future it could be aggregated by semester instead of year, and suggesting that although the data is not perfect, it does give a good general idea about ILO trends that would be beneficial for the committee to discuss. 2. Javanmard noted many courses’ outcomes are not mapped to ILOs—something Frala and others observed was at one time a directive from administrators, i.e., not to map outcomes to ILOs—and Cartagena pointed out that making certain this incomplete mapping is undertaken across divisions and areas is one of the recommendations in the

ILO document she drafted. She noted and committee members agreed that in recent years much outcomes-related work has required heavy lifting in Taskstream—particularly those folks who have hundreds of course-level outcomes (e.g., as in Frala’s case, 480 outcomes in 96 courses) to map.

3. Frala asked about how to utilize ILO data every year, specifically as it related to requests for resources. Cartagena made a distinction between program plans and reviews (the former is where requests are made). If a faculty member wants more resources, she said, it is worthwhile for them to document in their Close the Loop forms that they need these resources based on outcomes. (Though, she noted, the CBA does not ask faculty members to review outcomes annually, which could be problematic.) Ribaya asked whether it might be possible, if data is required every year for an outcome, for faculty members teaching the same course to alternate taking up a given outcome from year to year; Cartagena suggested it is possible, though it would mean working with less data. She noted that if one course has seven or eight outcomes, these outcomes should be reassessed in order to determine whether they couldn’t be whittled down to the recommended three to five outcomes per course.

4. Lewis recommended looking at how mapping is being undertaken since it can be subjective, noting that some faculty will map outcomes in different, inconsistent ways depending on a number of factors. It would behoove faculty within a department to have a conversation to make certain they are mapping similarly. She also troubled the idea of mapping one CLO to one ILO, as one CLO may be mapped to multiple ILOs. Mecom said the notion that “the more ILOs to which you map, the better” is erroneous, and has no bearing on a course’s “validity.” *Cartagena will change the language in the recommendation to “all that apply”*; Hughes suggested adding “at least one must apply.”

5. Cartagena noted there is an issue with mapping general education (GE) courses to ILOs. Cote said in the ILO document she compiled, there is a matrix that shows correlations between ILOs and GE outcomes, but intersections (and non-intersections) are not recorded, i.e., the mapping Cote did is a draft, only reviewed by IRP, and likely should be discussed elsewhere by appropriate folks. Cartagena suggested this become a rec.

6. Priest noted that deans cannot “ensure” faculty members to undertake work required by the CBA; about the only way deans could “enforce” the completion of outcomes work, he said, is by *for example* (i.e., hypothetically) withholding overload. Frala noted that in his area (i.e., Career and Technical Education), things are different; Priest agreed, suggesting that in CTE, faculty members think of Dean Mike Slavich not as a dean but as “a boss.” *Cartagena will change the language, possibly to Priest’s suggestion to use the term “facilitate.”* Frala asked and Priest said that overall faculty are doing their work, and sometimes as a dean he has to “encourage or remind.” Frala said he thought that once faculty are trained or they figure out how to do outcomes, it becomes far easier: the initial steps or just getting started, he suggested, could be a stumbling block.

7. Cartagena asked about recommendations for the recommendations. Javanmard said that in his experience, an institution “promising but not delivering” is something the ACCJC frowns upon. Frala asked whether Cartagena had prioritized any of the existing recommendations, prompting Cartagena to note that in this meeting, several folks have suggested standardizing/institutionalizing the policies and processes for mapping CLOs to ILOs be prioritized. Priest said he felt the most “powerful” recommendations are her first three, whereas the others seem like “housekeeping”: because the fourth takes up

	<p>mapping, <i>Cartagena suggested and the committee agreed to forward the first four recommendations while “holding off” on the other recommendations for later. Cartagena will email the committee for final recommendations before the document goes to Senate.</i></p>
VI. Close the Loop (CTL) Form (Content)	A. <i>This agenda item was tabled.</i>
VII. Close the Loop (CTL) Form (Online Format)	A. <i>This agenda item was tabled.</i>
VIII. Program Review Form	A. <i>This agenda item was tabled.</i>
IX. Program Review Schedule	<p>A. Committee Assignments. Cartagena noted that she had spoken to the group regarding Fall 2021 program reviews, and heard back from everyone: in the main, folks were assigned to programs in their division or area. <i>Cartagena will send the program review template and information to committee members.</i></p> <p>B. Upcoming Important Dates and Deadlines Related to Program Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 13: Templates due to Cartagena • April 14–28: Coordinator reviews • May 3: Deadline by which to distribute to programs/areas
X. Curriculum Process	A. <i>This agenda item was tabled.</i>
XI. Moving the Needle: How Can We Get Past the Past?	A. <i>This agenda item was tabled.</i>
XII. Adjournment	A. The meeting adjourned at 3:29 p.m.
XIII. Next Meeting	A. The next meeting will be April 20 at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Mike Garabedian, 3/17/2021

Supplement 1. Institutional Learning Outcomes “Close The Loop”

Institutional Level Outcomes

At the midpoint in the Rio Hondo College Strategic Plan’s six-year cycle, institutional level outcomes (ILOs) are evaluated, and based on these evaluations, the Outcomes Committee makes recommendations that are then forwarded to the Senate as well as the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC). This ACCJC-required evaluation is an opportunity to make suggestions for college-wide improvements to teaching to improve learning. In addition to general recommendations for all courses, recommendations may be specific to a division, discipline, or program to which the ILOs are mapped.

ILO Six-Year Cycle

	AY 1 2018- 19*	AY 2 2019- 20	AY 3 2020- 21	AY 4 2021-22	AY 5 2022- 23	AY 6 2023- 24
Think Critically	Collect	Collect	Assess	Implement & collect	Collect	Assess
Communicate	Collect	Collect	Assess	Implement & collect	Collect	Assess
Demonstrate Global Awareness and Ethical Behavior	Collect	Collect	Assess	Implement & collect	Collect	Assess
Demonstrate Information Literacy	Collect	Collect	Assess	Implement & collect	Collect	Assess
Develop Personal and Career Goals	Collect	Collect	Assess	Implement & collect	Collect	Assess

* Taskstream introduced in fall 2018 and courses mapped to ILOs during AY 2018-2019 to collect qualitative and quantitative data (Measures and Findings).

Based on these recommendations, IEC designs activities to support development in areas that need improvement as well as areas demonstrating success. These planned activities are a collaboration between the Guided Pathways, Professional Development, and Distance Education Committees and other stakeholder groups to address areas of strength and weakness in existing outcomes

Analysis: Fall 2017 through Fall 2020

Proficiency rates by academic year increased within this three-year period for ILO area I. A. “Think Critically”. Currently (Summer and fall 2020), ILO I. E. (problem-solving

approaches) has the highest overall proficiency rate (88.6%) within this area. Whereas, ILO I.D. (ability to use mathematics) has the lowest overall proficiency rate (82.5%) within this area.

Overall (all years) proficiency rates have increased in ILO area I. (Think Critically).

I. Think Critically.	2017-2018	Summer & fall 2020	
ILO I.A.	80.9%	86.7%	+5.8
ILO I.B.	81.5%	84.5%	+2.9
ILO I.C.	85.0%	85.2%	+0.2
ILO I.D.	71.6%	82.5%	+10.9
ILO I.E.	80.6	88.6	+8.0

Overall (all years) proficiency rates have increased in ILO area II. (Communicate).

II. Communicate.	2017-2018	Summer & fall 2020	
ILO II.A.	81.7%	83.1%	+1.4
ILO II.B.	81.8%	90.8%	+9.0
ILO II.C.	85.5%	94.5%	+9.0
ILO II.D.	85.7%	85.7%	0

Overall (all years) proficiency rates have increased in ILO area III. (Demonstrate Global Awareness and Ethical Behavior.).

III. Demonstrate Global Awareness and Ethical Behavior.	2017-2018	Summer & fall 2020	
ILO II.A.	83.0%	83.4%	+0.4
ILO II.B.	87.8%	88.3%	+0.5

Overall (all years) proficiency rates have increased in ILO area IV. (Demonstrate Information Literacy).

IV. Demonstrate Information Literacy.	2017-2018	Summer & fall 2020	
ILO IV.A.	82.4%	85.8%	+3.4
ILO IV.B.	85.8%	93.6%	+7.8

Overall (all years) proficiency rates have increased in ILO area V. (Develop Personal and Career Goals).

V. Develop Personal and Career Goals.	2017-2018	Summer & fall 2020	
ILO IV.A.	85.7%	93.0%	+7.3
ILO IV.B.	90.1%	94.2%	+4.1
ILO IV.C.	88.5%	99.4%	+10.9
ILO IV.D.	88.8%	95.1%	+6.3

Overall Proficiency Rates

ILO area I

The overall (all years) proficiency rate for this area is 81.1%.

ILO area II

The overall (all years) proficiency rate for this area is 85.28%.

ILO area III

The overall (all years) proficiency rate for this area is 86.35%.

ILO area IV

The overall (all years) proficiency rate for this area is 85.7%.

ILO area V

The overall (all years) proficiency rate for this area is 89.6%.

Highest and Lowest Overall Proficiency Rates

Highest (All Years) Proficiency Rate:

ILO area V (Develop Personal and Career Goals) has the highest proficiency rates (89.6%) across the ILO assessment. Within area V, ILO V. D.: (Maintain and improve their personal health, wellness, and performance.) and ILO V. B (Utilize college resources to support their educational goals) have the highest overall rates at 90.2% and 90.1% respectively.

Lowest (All Years) Proficiency Rate:

ILO area I (Think Critically) has the lowest proficiency rates (81.1%) across the ILO assessment. Within area I, ILO I. D. (Demonstrate the ability to use mathematics) has the lowest overall rate at 73.9%.

It should be noted, that although this is the lowest proficiency rate within the area and across the ILOs, the proficiency rates have made continuous gains during the assessment cycle. Compared to academic year 2017-2018, the Summer & Fall 2020 rates improved from 76.8% to 82.5%. This marks a +5.7 gain in the I.D (Demonstrate the ability to use mathematics).

Analysis: 2018-2019 and Summer-Fall 2020

To examine the affect the pandemic had on ILO rates, comparisons were made assessing outcomes data from academic year 2018-2019 and outcomes data from summer and fall terms in 2020. The 2018-2019 AY data was the most recent academic year that was not influenced by the COVID-19 pandemic. It also was the first full academic year in which course-level outcomes (CLOs), also known as student learning outcomes (SLOs) were mapped to the ILOs. The summer and fall 2020 data reflect fully remote instruction during the pandemic.

Gains: Significant

Of the 17 ILOs, 13 ILOs improved by _____. The greatest increase was the outcome "Feel a sense of connection to the college". There was a + 10.1 gain with growth demonstrated by change from 89.3% to 99.4%.

The

Losses: Minor

Of the 17 ILOs, four ILOs decreased by _____. The greatest decrease was the outcome "Demonstrate an understanding of diversity in culture, ethnicity, religion, sexuality, political background, and other areas." There was a – 0.7 loss with growth demonstrated by a decline from change from 84.1% to 83.4%.

ILO Gains and Losses

In comparing 2018-2019 with Summer-Fall 2020, 13 of the 17 ILOs increased in the proficiency rate and four ILOs decreased in the proficiency rate.

- I. Think Critically.
 - a. Apply theory to data. (82.5, 86.7) + **4.2**
 - b. Demonstrate an understanding of course material. (85.0, 84.5) - 0.5
 - c. Demonstrate the ability to employ the scientific process. (82.3, 85.2) + **2.9**
 - d. Demonstrate the ability to use mathematics. (72.7, 82.5) + **9.8**
 - e. Apply various problem-solving approaches. (82.3, 88.6) + **6.3**
- II. Communicate.
 - a. Communicate effectively in written or spoken forms. (83.4, 83.1) - 0.3

- b. Comprehend and interpret various types of written information. (84.7, 90.8) + **6.1**
- c. Utilize various media formats. (85.7, 94.5) + **8.8**
- d. Recognize, interpret, and actualize creative expression. (86.1, 85.7) – 0.4
- III. Demonstrate Global Awareness and Ethical Behavior.
 - a. Demonstrate an understanding of diversity in culture, ethnicity, religion, sexuality, political background, and other areas. (84.1, 83.4) – 0.7
 - b. Evaluate civic, social, and environmental policies. (84.9, 88.3) + **3.4**
- IV. Demonstrate Information Literacy.
 - a. Research, analyze, evaluate, and utilize relevant information. (84.2, 85.8) + **1.6**
 - b. Effectively use appropriate research or technology tools or sources. (85.5, 93.6) + **8.1**
- V. Develop Personal and Career Goals.
 - a. Identify the steps necessary to accomplish their educational goals. (87.7, 93.0) + **5.3**
 - b. Utilize college resources to support their educational goals. (90.0, 94.2) + **4.2**
 - c. Feel a sense of connection to the college. (89.3, 99.4) + **10.1**
 - d. Maintain and improve their personal health, wellness, and performance. (91.5, 95.1) + **3.6**

Recommendations for ILO Improvement

Ten recommendations are being presented for consideration. These include specific ILO areas and outcomes. Also included are general recommendations regarding ILO practices.

These recommendations are a starting point for further brainstorming.

Recommendation:

Establish aspirational proficiency standards for each of the five ILO areas. Current rate averages range from 81.1% (Area I.) to 89.6% (Area V).

Recommendation:

Investigate through the summary of findings and interviews what activities can be implemented and resources needed to continue to make gains in the area of I. D. (Demonstrate the ability to use mathematics). To be considered are the kinds of instructional styles, methods, and/or activities that are working for faculty making gains. Although continuous gains have been made during this assessment cycle, I.D. remains the lowest proficiency rate for the college and efforts should be made to continue to focus on this area.

Recommendation:

Continue to invest in programs and resources that have influenced the high proficiency rates (89.6%) in ILO area V. (Develop Personal and Career Goals). The obstacles students continue to face at the college which affect their success should also be taken

into consideration. Support in this area would continue the success in areas utilizing college resources to support educational goals (ILO V. B.) which is directly linked to Guided Pathways efforts as well as maintaining and improving personal health, wellness, and performance (ILO V. D.). It should be noted that this recommendation links both the instructional and non-instructional experiences to improve student learning.

Recommendation:

During spring 2021, division deans in collaboration with faculty should ensure all courses not mapped, as well as new courses, be mapped to the ILOs.

Recommendation:

All CLOs/SLOs be mapped to ILOs. Current practices of mapping recommend that at least one outcome from a course be mapped to an ILO.

Recommendation:

Course-level outcomes that are mapped to an ILO should have data collected every year. As CLOs data is collected based on a timeline established within the area, not all mapped courses collect data every year.

Recommendation:

Establish how many ILO recommendation activities is feasible to implement within an academic year.

Recommendation:

In Taskstream, there is not a specific place for faculty to comment on the link of the ILO data in their CLO/SLO reporting. Two possible corrections could be implemented. The "Summary of Findings" box in the "Findings" section of the assessment report could include a prompt regarding ILOs. Another possibility is that an additional area be created in Taskstream.

Recommendation:

GE rates to ILOs- need to report on this area
IGETC Certificates linked to GE
GE Outcomes linked to GE Certificate?
GE Certificate

Needs to be revisited.

Recommendation:

Do we need to compare the overall success rates and ILOs?

- *Tableau reports*
- *What might help students be more engaged, directed, and valued?*

Needs to be revisited.



Outcomes Committee Meeting Minutes

Zoom Meeting | April 20, 2021 | 2:30–3:30 p.m.

Attendance: Alyson Cartagena, Mike Garabedian, Julio Flores, Stephen Smith, Sarah Cote, Daniel Osman, Cynthia Lewis, Julio Flores, Jeronimo Ribaya, Connia Gutterrez, Ryan Bronkar, Bonnilee Kaufman, Scott Jaeggi, Robin Babou, Vann Priest, Lisette Acevdeo, Kevin Barman, Eric Caesar

Unable to attend: Sean Hughes, Alice Mecom, Aimee Ortiz, Rachel Garcia, Caroline Durdella, Mike Javanmard

NB: Motions and action items italicized in RED.

I. Welcome	A. The meeting commenced at 2:31 p.m. B. Cartagena welcomed DSPS Director Connie Gutierrez, who will replace Shaina Phillips on the committee. Gutterrez noted she is especially excited to support DSPS faculty, as DSPS does offer academic courses that support RHC students with disabilities.
II. Minutes Approval	<i>A. It was moved and seconded that the minutes from March be approved.</i>
III. Institutional Level Outcomes (ILOs)	A. Senate Approval. The recommendations in the ILO report were accepted by the Senate and forwarded to PFC; Cartagena presented the ILO report to PFC at last Tuesday’s meeting. We will start implementing these recommendations next fall for the 2021–22 academic year; however before then the committee needs to start looking at mapping course level outcomes to the ILOs (per one of the recommendations). <i>Cartagena will work with Cote to generate another report to determine the status of this mapping.</i> B. April Retreat. <i>Cartagena will share the ILO report at the strategic planning retreat</i> that will take place on Friday, April 30. C. Next Steps: Finalize Mapping. <i>Cartagena will email the ILO report she and Cote generate to committee members in their capacity as division representatives, and then work with these reps and deans to ensure this work is done and the mapping finalized.</i>
IV. Program-Level Outcomes (PLOs)	A. Program Review: “Feedforward” checklist/rubric. The committee’s main focus for Spring 2021 has been to use the PLO “feedforward” checklist/rubric to provide information for those programs going through the program review process in Fall 2021. Different committee members were designated to look at this information; Cartagena has received Kaufman’s, and Smith and Cartagena will work together to finalize theirs later this month. 1. Ribaya—who is paired with Priest to assist with the Physics checklist/rubric—asked and Cartagena answered that those who need access to <i>Taskstream</i> should submit an IT Help Desk ticket request: this will allow them to access a given program’s program plan (and reviews) and related, germane documents. 2. Bronkar asked what the group should be looking for; Cartagena answered that the checklist/rubric was created last year and implemented in Fall 2020, when she, Phillips, and Lewis used it to structure their recommendations for programs going through review

	<p>at that time. <i>Cartagena will send the checklist/rubric to the committee again.</i> She said the document has members looking at everything from the number of outcomes in a given program to the quality of how outcomes are written, as well as other recommendations to support colleagues as they undertake program reviews. Cartagena emphasized that members should not be looking for fault, and that the checklist/rubric can also be utilized to let people know what they are doing right.</p> <p>3. Cartagena shared the checklist/rubric on <i>Zoom</i>, and emphasized that committee members should not take too much time on completing their work so that faculty in the programs can implement recommendations during spring (and if they want, over the summer) and thereby avoid being inundated in Fall 2021. <i>Once members have completed the checklist/rubric to the programs to which they have been assigned, they will email them to Cartagena.</i> Then, Cartagena will get the documents to the right folks in a given department, and this will also give her a sense of what the committee needs to do to continue to support colleagues.</p> <p>4. Cartagena checked in with a few committee members to check their progress, and indicated anyone who needs help should let her know. Acevedo asked where close-the-loop (CLO) forms are located; Cartagena said CLO forms should be in section 3 of program plans. Smith noted he is waiting to hear from IT regarding access to <i>Taskstream</i>; Cartagena noted Rosalva Garcia in IT usually grants access within 24 hours. Jaeggi added IT won't notify folks that their help desk ticket has been closed and access granted, and recommended checking back after submitting tickets. He wondered whether, in future, there might be a person in these programs to contact for clarification and information; Cartagena noted the main point of the committee's program review intervention is to look in <i>Taskstream</i> to inform checklist/rubrics, i.e., the information in <i>Taskstream</i> is the only thing group members should be basing recommendations on. Noting Jaeggi and others are looking at non-instructional programs, <i>Cartagena said she will look into developing a checklist/rubric for non-instructional programs, as the current document is geared toward instructional programs.</i></p>
<p>V. Course Level Outcomes (CLOs)</p>	<p>A. Data (Measures and Findings). Measures and findings for AY 2020–21 are due June 30; faculty do not need to wait until June 30, however—they can input things before then, and area representatives should convey this information.</p> <p>B. Outcomes Statements Ready for Public Viewing: June 30. Any revisions or edits to outcomes statements should be completed by June 30; on July 1, courses in the Fall schedule will include these outcomes. Because this is an initial attempt, no doubt there will be hiccups for IT to solve. Again, when in their capacity as representatives committee members go to their divisions, please tell colleagues outcomes statements should be <i>finalized</i> by June 30. This is an opportunity to make outcomes statements more efficient and ensure they are written well; it also gives us an opportunity to think about the efficacy of assessment tools, and whether practices are equitable.</p> <p>C. Online Form. The online, close-the-loop (CTL) form the committee developed was approved by Senate, so we will begin full implementation in Fall 2021. Cartagena will share the form with faculty soon because so many areas have a lot of courses that require a completed CTL form. <i>Cartagena will ensure it is clear these CTL forms aren't from the last academic year but the current one (i.e., 2020–21) by including this information in a campus-wide email to be sent Thursday.</i> Smith asked and Cartagena said when the “submit” button is clicked, the completed</p>

	<p>form gets emailed to the originator, as well as the division secretary. But with this, she noted, all committee members will have access to the CTL information because all the data from submitted forms will be in a .csv file. At this time the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) does not expect it to be uploaded into <i>Taskstream</i>—a helpful development because the extra uploading step will no longer be necessary. Cartagena also will send the current CTL inventory audit from Fall 2020: there remain about 800 courses still missing CTL forms, which could be explained by these courses not having been offered last semester, or it could be they were misplaced. Smith noted a couple courses missing CTL forms were taught by folks who have retired, or by part-timers now gone; therefore there is no data, making it difficult to complete CTL forms. Cartagena said one thing reps could do in such cases is to speak to faculty in the department currently teaching the course to help answer questions that don't require data—but still be honest that the data is missing. She shared with the group the document tracking those courses still missing CTL forms. Overall she noted a great improvement from last year, and said hopefully the online form will help with completion. It being a new process may have also engendered confusion, and as we start “round 3” things will likely make a little more sense, and folks can find time to have these discussions: again, accreditation needs to see evidence of discussion, not just one person filling out the form.</p> <p>D. Curriculum. Cartagena noted an ACCJC representative addressed administrators in a meeting earlier this semester; one concern we have had in the Outcomes and Curriculum Committees is that there is not a direct connection between revising and creating outcomes and revising and creating courses. The ACCJC rep said the RHC process is okay, though not ideal because of this lack of direct connection, but we do have in place safeguards we did not have before. (For example, Cartagena attends the Curriculum Committee's Tech Review every other week and then reaches out to faculty to see if they need assistance creating and revising outcomes; the program review process described earlier in the meeting, too, is a new development that provides checks and balances.) Cartagena suggested the ACCJC representative's approval is a good thing, allowing us to breathe a sigh of relief about a less-than-ideal process we thought might be far more problematic, accreditation-wise.</p>
<p>VI. Resources: Faculty Resource Center (FRC), most common questions</p>	<p>A. Cartagena reminded committee members that there are “tons” of resources in the FRC for area representatives and faculty—and especially new faculty. Cartagena has attempted to make things specific and granular so folks don't have to search for help on their topic: we want, she said, to make outcomes work painless.</p> <p>1. The calendar of upcoming outcomes training sessions is accessible at this link: https://www.riohondo.edu/staff-development/events/</p>
<p>VII. Adjournment</p>	<p>A. The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.</p>
<p>VIII. Next meeting</p>	<p>A. The next meeting will be May 18.</p> <p>1. Cartagena noted that for May and most of next year, the committee will “stay the course.” In other words, Outcomes members have done a lot of heavy lifting over the past several semesters; it is now time to implement changes, and “hopefully at this point we have smooth sailing ahead.”</p>

Respectfully Submitted,
Mike Garabedian, 4/21/2021