Outcomes Committee Meeting Minutes

Rio Hondo College Learning Resource Center 117 | 16 August 2019 | 10 to 11 AM

Attendance: Alyson Cartagena (chair), Cynthia Lewis, Julie Huang, Lisette Acevdeo, Daniel Osman, Yunior Hernandez, John Frala, Jose Arroto, Michael Hinze, Lupe Alvarado, Mark Littrell, Aimee Ortiz, Scott Jaeggi, Laura Ramirez, Caroline Durdella, Mike Garabedian, Vann Priest, Sean Hughes. Lydia Gonazlez.

Unable to attend: Robin Babou, Shaina Phillips, Rachel Garcia, Shelly Spencer, Adam Wetsman, Scott Dixon.

NB: Motions and action items italicized in RED.

I. Welcome and introduction	a. The meeting was called to order at 10:15 AM. Committee members introduced themselves and shared how long they've been at RHC.
II. Lydia Okelberry Gonzalez, Guided Pathways (GP) Coordinator	a. Mathematics faculty member Lydia Okelberry Gonzalez is the new GP Coordinator. Okelberry Gonzalez noted that she has been on sabbatical for a year, but that she has spent the past several months getting up to speed with GP, and working with VP Ramirez in this capacity. She said that after improving transparency and clarity, her thinking is that at RHC, we aren't doing anything new (i.e., the processes are in place), but we want to think about how to connect GP to related processes and make all of the processes meaningful. Okelberry Gonazlez told the committee she will be sending an all-campus email soon by way of introduction, and that although her teaching schedule prevents her from attending Outcomes meetings in the Fall, she will liaise with Cartagena (who is on the GP Steering Committee) to make sure GP items are included in Outcomes agendas when appropriate.
III. Approval of April minutes	a. Cartagena reminded committee members that the last Outcomes meeting was in April because of an Outcomes celebration that was held in the Campus Inn in May. The April minutes were approved unanimously, though the secretary noted and corrected several punctuation and spelling errors after the meeting, including changing all instances of "Adam Westman" to "Adam Wetsman."
IV. Governance Manual	a. The Governance Manual final draft is due Friday, September 13. b. Cartagena said that before we send outcomes information for the manual, the committee should note any changes to be made to this language. Durdella observed that outcomes is an Academic Senate committee, but there are other non-academic areas (e.g., service areas) that are required to do assessment. She said this issue needs to be resolved. Frala suggested cross referencing outcomes with Accreditation. *Cartagena said she and Durdella would get this language to the committee for review soon.*

V. Catalog	a. Catalog (Chapter 10) Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), summer cleaning
	i. Cartagena asked the committee to look at Chapter 10 of the catalog: This summer committee members revised, updated, and corrected the chapter, making changes to punctuation, grammar, syntax, and typography.
	b. Missing PLOs: Help needed
	i. Cartagena asked committee members to please look at their respective divisions to identify missing degrees and certificates, and/or missing PLOs, in order to update the catalog addendum. She also noted that we need to make certain that the outcomes in chapter 10 are truly outcomes, and not objectives; if they are, these things need to be changed, as well.
	ii. In order to make the printing deadline for the catalog addendum, changes need to be submitted to Alyson Cartagena by November 1.
VI. Website overhaul	a. Cartagena worked over the summer on streamlining the Outcomes website. She asked committee members to review the website, and share any recommendations, recommendations, and changes with her at the September Outcomes meeting.
VII. Outcome Committee recommendation(s) to Senate for discussion in September	a. We need clear processes and cycles in place to ensure readiness for the accreditation team. Durdella said RHC needs to have things written down in large part as evidence that the College is in a continual process of quality improvement.
	b. Cartagena distributed a draft document prepared by Durdella and IRP entitled *Rio Hondo College Standards of Assessment Practice for Instructional Programs* (see addendum 1, below). Durdella noted that currently we do not have a timeline for the review process/cycle, and that to this end IRP has prepared a fill-in-the-blank, six-year timeline sheet (see addendum 2, below) to help faculty members record this information. Cartagena said that many of these processes are in place already, but are not written down, and this is the purpose of the timeline worksheet. Frala asked and Durdella answered that the sheet is in TaskStream, but it will also be in Access Rio. Okelberry Gonzalez asked and Durdella clarified that the five-year cycle described in section 4.a.i. Of the *Standards of Assessment* document refers to the curriculum revision timeline/cycle. *Committee members will get feedback about the document from members of their respective divisions in order to inform discussion at the committee's September 17 meeting; Cartagena will email the document and post it online.*
VIII. Closing the Loop	a. Importance. Cartagena discussed the importance of the outcomes work later today, and described what will happen in terms of logistics.
	b. Opportunity. Specifically, she said, today's exercise will be an opportunity for faculty members in given departments to look at data associated with particular courses, dialogue about the data and what it indicates, answer five questions on the report form.
	c. Linking. In addition to serving as evidence that RHC provides time and resources for faculty

	members to dialogue about outcomes, another important piece of the work today is to demonstrate how outcomes link to to program reviews.
	
	d. Resources.
	
	    i. Deans. The deans have selected the courses whose data will be examined today. They also have the forms, which are hard copies. Cartagena noted that *dialogue* is the important thing: the accreditation team needs to see that RHC is indeed talking about outcomes. VP Ramirez emphasized this point, and asked committee members to lead discussion today. Cartagena noted additionally that we are undertaking this work now because we are in between having collected the data and the program review/planning time of the year.
	
	    ii. FRC. Cartagena reminded the committee that the Faculty Resource Center (FRC) is an excellent place to find answers to questions, as well as all documents related to our outcomes work.
	
	e. Further discussion. VP Ramirez expanded upon Cartagena's observations about today's work. She said that FLEX Day is a great opportunity to have a critical mass of faculty members work together to see what the process looks like. Today, just one report needs to be completed per department. But later, faculty members can come together to complete work for other courses: for program review, all courses with data will be assessed. Cartagena noted that we won't do this again at the Spring Flex Day, and that if there are hiccups today that is okay. One part of today's work is also identifying any areas of the process that need improvement. She concluded by encouraging committee members to explain the importance of what we are doing: that we need evidence for accreditation, and to link to program reviews.

IX. Additional committee recommendations: dialogue and discussion	a. Submitting data. Ortiz asked and Cartagena answered that we have not yet figured out who will input the data from today. But we will. b. Canvas. The committee discussed the feasibility of using Canvas shells as discussion boards for outcomes work. Cartagena noted that one academic dean (possibly Grant Linsell) had suggested he would look into setting a template up. Osman noted similarities between the *Outcomes Component* report forms and former Assessment Reports; Cartagena agreed, but suggested the piece missing in the old days was the requisite dialogue and conversation. Frala noted that he uses and likes Canvas, and that if faculty members use Canvas for outcomes work going forward, this might be a way to get them to use it more frequently. Littrell observed that within Canvas there is an outcomes module, and wondered whether we might use this module to increase efficiency. Cartagena said that she is piloting linking this feature with her hybrid and online courses, and that if all goes well, she will introduce this work at the next FLEX Day. She suggested that she was driven to experiment with the outcomes module in Canvas after witnessing faculty members struggling to compile and assess data from disparate sources. Frala noted that Zulma Calderon might have expertise she could share; Cartagena agreed, but wondered whether contracts limit Calderon's ability to teach faculty members.

X. Meeting dates for AY 2019-20200	a. Fall 2019: August 16 (FLEX Day TBA), September 17, October 15, November 19.
	b. Spring 2020: January 24 (FLEX Day TBA), February 18, March 17, April 21, May 19.
XI. Adjournment	a. The meeting adjourned at 11 AM.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Garabedian, 08/16/2019

Rio Hondo College
Standards of Assessment Practice
for Instructional Programs

In an effort to clarify processes for outcomes assessment, the following standards of assessment practice have been created by the College.

Assessment of instruction at Rio Hondo College meets each of the following criteria:

1.) Three to six course-level outcomes, also known as student learning outcomes (SLOs), are identified for each course, where:

    a. SLOs are listed in all course syllabi.

    b. SLOs are posted in Taskstream.

    c. SLOs are mapped in Taskstream to program level outcomes (PLOs).

    d. SLOs are mapped in Taskstream to institutional outcomes (ILOs).

2.) At least three program level outcomes for each program are established, where:

    a. PLOs are current and accessible in the College catalog.

    b. PLOs are current and accessible to the public through the College's website via the catalog and the outcomes PLO web page.

    c. PLOs are current and accessible to faculty via Canvas in the Faculty Resource Center.

    d. PLOs are posted in Task Stream.

    e. Course-level outcomes are mapped PLOs are in Task Stream.

3.) Outcomes are measured by use of direct assessment methods.

    a. It is strongly recommended that SLO assessment methods are uniform for different sections of the same course.

    b. Assessment of SLOs is rotated within a six-year timeline so that **all outcomes for a given course will be assessed at least once within a six-year time period and all course outcomes for courses within a discipline will be assessed within the same six-year time period.**

    All course outcomes must be assessed within the six-year cycle irrespective of the term in which they are offered.

4.) A regular, explicitly stated course assessment timeline for all outcomes is submitted during program planning within TaskStream.

    a. SLOs are analyzed annually as a component of annual program planning.

i. SLOs are revised on a five-year cycle which coincides with the five-year cycle for course revisions within curriculum.

b. A complete course-level assessment process includes:

1.) Collecting course-level data* in accordance with the outcomes rotation timeline and entering Measures and Findings into TaskStream.

2.) At least once annually and in accordance with the outcomes rotation timeline, analyzing course-level data, reflecting on measures and findings, and recording dialogue and discussion on the [NAME OF FORM].

3.) At least once annually, reporting results in the annual program plan via TaskStream.

c. PLOs are assessed every year and addressed in annual program planning in Task Stream.

i. PLOs are revised on a six-year cycle which coincides with the six-year cycle for Program Reviews.

The four criteria stated above represent a threshold for assessment practice for instruction. They enable the institution to describe the achievement of a common core of learning to external stakeholders. The College invites and encourages faculty to engage in outcomes assessment practices that go beyond this threshold.

Cycle of Assessment and Course Outcome Revision

Outcomes are regularly assessed using a cycle of assessment that is connected to the course revision schedule and the program review schedule. This schedule specifies that all programs (PLOs) are reviewed once every six years and in the case of CTE programs every two years. And SLOs are reviewed every five years.

The overall achievement of course and program level student learning outcomes should be evaluated holistically, using longitudinal data when possible, at least once within a six-year cycle. For example, during the program review process, programs and disciplines should discuss the degree to which all course and program outcomes were achieved rather than specific outcomes for a particular course, unless a pattern of improvement or success for a course or set of courses emerges that is relevant to a discussion of program quality.

The college recommends a standard calendar for course level outcomes assessment. This calendar specifies the assessment schedule as follows:

• course outcomes associated with courses offered in both fall and spring terms are assessed in either the fall or the spring with results reported in Task Stream during the spring term;

• and course outcomes associated with courses offered once or less than once annually should be assessed and reported during the term in which they are offered ~~with results reported in the subsequent term.~~

Revision

SLOs are revised on a six-year cycle which coincides with the six-year cycle in curriculum.

Outcome Area	Assessment Cycle	Revision Timeline
SLO	Annually	5 years
PLO	Annually	6 years

Addendum 2. Timeline Worksheet

Six-Year Program Outcomes Assessment Timeline

Area:

Unit/Division:

Program:

Last Program Review:

Next Program Review:

Date:

Program Outcomes	17-18 Y1	18-19 Y2	19-20 Y3	20-21 Y4	21-22 Y5	22-23 Y6

Program

Six-Year Course Outcomes Assessment Timeline

Area:

Unit/Division:

Program:

Last Program Review:

Next Program Review:

Date:

Course	Course Outcomes	17-18 Y1	18-19 Y2	19-20 Y3	20-21 Y4	21-22 Y5	22-23 Y6