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| **Outcome Committee Meeting Minutes**  Rio Hondo College Fitness Center KDA 107 | 19 March 2019 | 2:30 to 3:30 PM | |
| Attendance: Julie Huang, Vann Priest, Mark Littrell, Aimee Ortiz, Yunior Hernandez, Lupe Alvarado, Cynthia Lewis, Lisette Acevedo, Shelly Spencer, Alyson Cartagena (chair), Mike Garabedian, Sarah Coté (ex officio)  Unable to attend: Robin Babou, Jose Arroyo, Caroline Durdella, Scott Jaeggi, Adam Westman, Wendy Carrera, Scott Dixon, John Frala, Rachel Garcia, Mike Salazar, Shaina Philips Motions and action items in RED. | |
| I. Welcome | a. The meeting was called to order at 2:32 PM. |
| II. Approval of February minutes | a. The February minutes were approved unanimously without changes. |
| III. Approval of November minutes | a. The November minutes were approved unanimously without changes. |
| IV. Updates [and dialogue and discussion —MG] | a. Comparative reports.  i. Cartagena noted that on March 18, with Coté’s help, a “Course-level Outcomes Measure and Findings Report” for 2017-18 was generated and then sent to Markelle Stansell in Academic Affairs; VPAA Ramirez is hopeful Stansell can run this data against Tableau to see which faculty members have inputted all their data. In response to a committee member’s inquiry, Cartagena said shen these reports are sent out, they will be sent only to deans, not the entire community.   ii. Cartagena reminded the group that at this time faculty members will not be penalized if they have not entered data or entered data incorrectly, and that the imperative just now is to support faculty members as they learn these processes.  b. Confusion and the vagaries of the outcomes recording process.  i. Priest said he is discomfited by the number of faculty members asking how many outcomes are required; committee members agreed some things are confusing, and a discussion ensued.  *Discussion.* A committee member noted that the goal is to have every section have one outcome articulated, and another noted that “legally” the “one section, one outcome” goal is also a requirement. Priest suggested he would like this language clarified from the Association or District, while Spencer observed that requirement-wise, the faculty contract says one thing, vaguely, while our accrediting bodies seem to say something else. Littrell and other members noted that the committee should work toward *standardizing* definitions and requirements*.*  ii. Members shared ideas and noted how outcomes are articulated and recorded in their divisions. One member suggested her division seems to put more time into outcomes of courses that are taught more regularly. Ortiz suggested her division (Nursing) seems to feel they should keep doing as much as possible, outcomes-wise. Acevedo said Communications and Languages faculty members input all data for every class, and handle assessment reports once a year in spring. Huang said that in Business Division, because of the different foci (e.g., Accounting, Business Management, etc.), there are different outcomes articulated with different vocabulary, and as a result things look kind of “ugly.” Hernandez said that in Counseling, one staff member put things online so anyone teaching the course can do outcomes and assess; another member noted that in her division, a full-time faculty member asked all part-timers to provide them with the data so that the full-timer could enter it for them.  iii. Littrell expressed concerns about TaskStream, suggesting that in a worst-case scenario, at the end of the semester and after all data is in, it will be difficult to obtain meaningful data if there are different standards for every section. Garabedian noted that it sounds as if the committee should develop defined, controlled vocabulary for data entry. Littrell suggested that in some ways SLOlutions was a superior product to TaskStream; another committee member noted it would be in our interest to configure things in TaskStream to drop down menu. Cartagena said that from what she recalled from our previous meetings, TaskStream is “pretty set.” There was a measured dropdown by type, Coté replied, but it is mostly not customizable.  c. Standardization recommendations.  i. Cartagena asked: What are the processes by which an area/division might come up with proficiency standards, and/or recommendations? Should the development of standards happen on division meetings? Flex day? A special session? One committee member said Flex Day would be the best way to proceed, and a motion was introduced, seconded, and approved unanimously: The committee will request time on Flex Day to standardize proficiency standards within divisions, areas, etc.  ii. Cartagena solicited more best practices recommendations, e.g., perhaps giving more direction regarding what the contract says. Spencer asked and Cartagena replied that the accreditation team is primarily interested in having a robust outcomes process; they won’t specify what it is, she said, but the College must have to have a process everyone understands so that we are measuring something useful. Cartagena noted this may not be a perfect process in a program plan, but perhaps at the program review stage folks can make changes. This is a “catch up” year, she said, and perhaps next year the committee can pay attention to these other issues.  iii. Later in the meeting, a committee member observed that the whole purpose of this work is “to generate a mountain of data saying learning is taking place, [so] We need to have a common way of doing things …”  d. More on TaskStream’s shortcomings; other potential assessment management solutions.  i. Littrell and others noted that TaskStream is not user friendly, but clunky and non-intuitive. Littrell observed that if we can make data collection and entry easy, we will get better information, and shared an anecdote about a colleague at another institution who uses a Scantron machine to collect data. The machine automatically generates an Excel spreadsheet that is uploaded via a thumb drive into his assessment management software; the result is rich information that can be parsed. Manual processing, Littrell suggested, is tedious and demotivating, and if we can make it easy faculty members will be a lot more interested in complying. He wondered, as more people use Canvas, whether there might be a way to get an assessment quiz in there that could be automatically uploaded,because Canvas has a powerful assessment tool. Spencer agreed, suggesting Canas was “so much easier than Taskstream.” All the other schools were using Taskstream.  ii. Littrell and others suggested the committee reach out and find out what peer institutions are doing: i.e., Is there a wiser way to do this? Cartagena said she was fairly convinced the College is “stuck with” TaskStream, and doesn’t “see us making a U-turn.” But, she said, she could investigate how Canvas and TaskStream can work together, or get great data into Canvas faculty members can then quickly transfer into TaskStream*.* Littrell said If we have data to show we can make it more meaningful doing things one way or another, that would be helpful. Another committee member likened using TaskStream to buying shoes that are too small but instead of buying new shoes, wearing the too-small pair because they’re paid for, and being in constant pain. Cartagena said that perhaps Caroline Durdella can weigh in on this issue next time. |
| V. Guided Pathways updates | a. Cartagena said that the Guided Pathways committee is working on 14 different elements to which they are trying to pay attention. She said she wants to make certain the Outcomes Committee goals are all lined up with these elements, and suggested that the committee flesh them out.  b. The committee discussed whether there was anything to edit, delete, add to, or clarify regarding #13 on the Guided Pathways chart, and agreed that although some changes need to be made to page 1, none need to be made to page 2. One committee member asked about how the committee might “create buy-in,” and suggested this idea might be fleshed out. Cartagena asked whether there might be any ideas about how to serve faculty (page 3). Littrell said we need to see the data. Another staff member offered that more interactive workshops with the recommendation of increasing professional development funding related to Guided Pathways and Outcomes might be a desideratum. These recommendations will be synthesized and submitted to the GP Committee for their report. A Powerpoint of Outcomes Goals and Recommendations will also be created and presented at the Annual Planning Retreat on April 12. |
| VI. Governance results | a. The committee briefly considered the parts of the Governance Committee report, and made suggestions about what might be included in each section.  i. Accomplishments: Members noted that Cartagena, IRP, and the committee have made significant progress on assessment, offered lots of training for faculty (14 session in the first 8 weeks of Fall 2018 and 20 sessions in the first 8 weeks of Spring 2019), listed all 1,200 courses with into Taskstream and mapped those courses to both PLOs and ILOs, and launched the online Faculty Resource Center in Canvas creating an Outcomes Modules with how-to guides, videos, and hacks.  ii. Strengths: Committee strengths, members noted, leadership of Cartagena and terrific support in Sarah Coté, excellent weekly communication, and a willing enthusiasm to help faculty make things happen.  iii. Issues: Some problems included previous discussion items, e.g., TaskStream’s not being particularly user friendly or customizable; unclear language for faculty in the contract, a need to standardize, and the necessity of providing resources to support faculty in creating and supporting outcomes.  iv. Actions: Suggested actions were clarifying best practices through research and providing recs to the Senate and Association. Also, continue to develop faculty resources within FRC and workshops  v. Goals: Members said goals for next year might be to have a certain percentage of part time faculty members actively entering measures and findings instead of full timers doing this work. “More engagement” was another goal, i.e., the committee seeks more faculty members to be involved in more meaningful dialogue about outcomes. A staff members said the redesign of the website could support clear language. Cartagena suggested that the quality of what is in TaskStream could be a phase 2 goal for later, and that phase 1 might be simply to “get everything in there.” Spencer troubled the idea of goals for the committee necessarily lining up with the goals for the campus, and suggested this is a topic that requires further consideration. That these goals should align with GP and Accreditation mandates and standards.  These recommendations will be synthesized and submitted to the Governance Committee by April 12. |
| VII. Reporting back: linking #13 with Governance Results and Outcomes Goals/Timeline | This agenda items was discussed earlier within V. Guided Pathways updates. What followed was discussion about the contract language.  a. Cartagena said that Coté demonstrated that a lot of faculty members/sections are already in TaskStream. She noted that she will continue the work of onboarding/training, and work toward the final goal which is due when grades are, but reminded the committee that the administration will not penalize anyone at this time for non-participation.  b. Spencer said that although language is vague, faculty members still could be in charge of entering the data.  c. Your report is in program plans. In some ways we can make the case TaskStream is easier because you are just putting in measures and findings it’s not until program plans that you must evaluate program outcomes. |
| VIII. Additional committee recommendations | a. The committee had no further recommendations. |
| IX. Next meeting: April 16 | a. At the next meeting Caroline Durdella will provide a status report.  b. The remaining 2019 spring meeting date will take place on May 21. |
| X. Adjournment | a. Meeting adjourned at 3:42 PM. |

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Garabedian, 03/19/2019