Outcomes Committee Meeting Minutes

Rio Hondo College KDA Conference Room | 18 February 2020 | 2:30 to 3:30 PM

Attendance: Alyson Cartagena (chair), Mike Javanmard, Yunior Hernandez, John Frala, Bonnilee Kaufman, Robin Babou, Shelly Spencer, Mark Littrell, Aimee Ortiz, Laura Ramirez, Caroline Durdella, Vann Priest, Mike Garabedian (serving as secretary), Sarah Cote.

Unable to attend: Cynthia Lewis, Kevin Barman, Julie Huang, Lisette Acevedo, Daniel Osman, Mike Hinze, Scott Jaeggi, Rachel Garcia, Shaina Phillips.

NB: Motions and action items italicized in RED.

I. Welcome	A. Cartagena thanked Littrell and Phillips for helping with program review in December. B. Lisette Acevedo will miss a few spring meetings due to her serving on a hiring committee.
II. Minutes Approval	A. *It was moved and seconded that the minutes from the November meeting be approved with minor revisions. The motion carried.*
III. Approval of November minutes	A. Cartagena and Cote attended the SLO Symposium in Monterey on February 7 and 8. 1. Cartagena said the symposium was valuable in several ways. She related that one college is linking program learning outcomes (PLOs) with Areas of Interest (AOIs) to better link these outcomes to Guided Pathways, though most colleges are "sticking with what they have"; and noted that according to one Delphi study, a funny/sad/interesting fact is that the top question faculty members ask outcomes coordinators like her is "How do I log in?" The good thing, she said, is that Rio Hondo College is further along than the rest of the state is (though we want to try to move past this benchmark). She noted that some of the data, as well as a book provided at the symposium (*Degrees that Matter* by Marshall and Jankowski) were thought-provoking, and as such *she will use some of these ideas for the Outcomes Guide*. Another big piece of good news (which links to our approval) is there are many colleges that have not clarified their outcomes processes. As such, Cartagena is feeling "really good and confident." 2. Cote shared there were several sessions at the symposium focused on student service outcomes at which it became clear that a few colleges didn't know how to formulate an outcome, while Rio Hondo College has moved beyond satisfaction outcomes to learning and other service-related outcomes. This, then, is another positive. 3. Cartagena summarized that she and Cote felt good at the conclusion of the symposium, as it underscored the areas where Rio Hondo College is moving in the right direction.
IV. Senate Approved Cycles and Processes	A. Academic Senate voted to approve the cycles and conferences the committee created last spring and presented in the fall.

and Outcomes Review Discussion	B. Outcomes Review Discussion. 1. Durdella noted when the committee met last time, there was a lengthy discussion about where outcomes would be stored, and asked whether there had been a resolution. She said it looked as if there was no resolution—that Curriculum Chair Dana Arazi said that the Curriculum Committee did not want to include outcomes in *Curriqūnet.* 2. Cartagena said that the Curriculum Committee is concerned because they don't want outcomes to be on the course outline of record (COR), and also a potentially increased workload for committee members. The only place the outcomes "live," she said, is in *Taskstream.* In response, Durdella asked, "How are we going to connect review of course outcomes to the curriculum process if they're stored in two different places?" Cartagena replied this is up to the faculty—to look at what their outcomes are when it comes to curriculum revision. Durdella asked who would let faculty know they need to do this; and suggested another issue is that if outcomes are stored in *Taskstream,* it creates a workload issue for the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. 3. The secretary noted he is a voting member of the Curriculum Committee, and that his understanding is the main concern of the Curriculum Committee is that members do not want to be responsible for reviewing or approving outcomes; he said he thought if outcomes were included as a part of the curriculum process (i.e., as a field in *Curriqūnet*), then that's fine—so long as the Curriculum Committee knows that the field is required for new courses or course revisions, but that they don't have to review it, just make certain it's there: it might be a workaround. Frala said in his area, CTE-accrediting bodies require the division secretary archive not only syllabi, but also outcomes. Ramirez said she recalled that one possibility that had been discussed is that when a course goes to the Curriculum Committee, it would trigger that learning outcomes should be updated, too; and that when a course comes to Curriculum, committee representatives could inform the Outcomes Coordinator in order that this person might check the suitability of the outcomes as part of a review process. What hasn't been clarified, she said, was whether this should be the job of just one person or a group/groups, and if the latter, which group or groups? One member suggested each division should be responsible for this review. 4. This is an important piece of the puzzle, Durdella said, because the way Rio Hondo College has structured outcomes success is that everything is tied to a course-level outcome; so if these aren't being seriously reviewed, it weakens the entire system. Without an automated process with a clear sense of who is responsible for what, where outcomes are being reviewed regularly, it will be problematic for the college, she said. 5. Javanmard brought up and the committee discussed exiting skills as an outcomes corollary; Littrell noted it was his understanding that ACCJC accreditation teams don't want to see "perfection," but rather appropriate progress and good faith efforts towards resolution. He said in his area the course identification numbering system (C-ID) plays a big role in shaping curriculum, and as course outlines are revised, his department has been migrating naturally to making exiting skills conform with C-ID. He asked and Durdella answered that accreditors might be satisfied by good faith efforts and striving toward

completion goals but only if there is a systematic process faculty members are aware of and following.

6. Spencer noted when the Math Department updates course-level outcomes, it is only faculty members who review these outcomes. She said she is not qualified to review outcomes in any area/discipline beyond her own, and vice-versa. As such, she asked: If it is not faculty members putting the documents through the Curriculum Committee, who might be qualified to do this work? Ramirez asked and committee members answered that when courses are revised, the faculty member does not go into *Taskstream* to update outcomes. Ortiz said that in Nursing, typically she and an assistant clinical director review outcomes every five years, taking input from lead content experts for each course. Durdella noted Math is exceptional in reviewing outcomes, and agreed that faculty in a given area are best to review the appropriateness of outcomes. However, she said, a feedback loop is needed because not all faculty members function as well as the small group in Math—there are more moving parts in larger departments. How, she asked, do we ensure faculty have done this work as part of their five-year process? She noted that courses must be updated every six years, while outcomes are updated every five—making it difficult to simply update the template to accommodate outcomes reviews (to say nothing of the fact that it lives outside of *Taskstream*)*.*

7. Cartagena asked Durdella what she would like to see happen. Durdella said we need one repository—not necessarily *Taskstream*—tied to a curriculum review process. (*Taskstream* is just a vehicle by which assessments and closing the loop are recorded.) Cartagena asked and Durdella said we really couldn't switch to a new system, a *Taskstream* alternative, until after this round of the accreditation process concludes in 2022.

8. Cartagena said she had communicated with Dana Arazi, Curriculum Committee chair, to remind him that when curriculum is due, faculty members should also be looking at outcomes. Ramirez said a start to this is for Cartagena and Arazi to get together to figure out a workflow/process by which this outcomes outcome might be achieved; she reminded the committee that it won't be automated because *Taskstream* and *Curriqūnet* do not talk to each other. Right now, there is no mechanism; *following this potential meeting, Ramirez suggested, a proposal could be generated that Cartagena brings to the Outcomes Committee, and Arazi to Curriculum.*

9. Javanmard noted that "in the old days" folks had to take a form to the Library for approval for Library resources. He asked whether the Outcomes Coordinator could be one of the "approvers" going forward. Cartagena reiterated that *until there is a formal process, she can work with Arazi to make certain outcomes are being looked at when necessary.*

10. Ortiz asked whether other divisions (like hers) have a curriculum work group: she said that any curricular changes in her division go first to the Nursing curriculum work group, and only if this body approves are changes forwarded to the RHC Curriculum Committee. Ortiz reported that this process works really well, and that this might serve as a model for outcomes, as well. Cartagena guessed many folks are probably doing things informally. Ramirez asked and Cartagena answered that when a course goes to the Curriculum

	Committee, not everyone from that discipline has to sign off. Several committee members noted that in their respective areas, three full-time faculty members need to sign off; Javanmard said that in Behavioral and Social Sciences, there is a curriculum person who grants this approval. Ramirez observed that there is no standard across divisions, which Spencer observed is a necessary complication: for example, there are a lot of majors in her division of Math, Science, and Engineering, and the content experts who could weigh in on the suitability of given outcomes generally reside in a particular discipline/department. 11. Durdella asked and Priest answered that deans "sort of" get a list of courses up for five-year-review, and that it lives on the curriculum website. Ramirez noted that Dean Mike Slavich sends this list out, as Instructional Operations tracks this five-year rotation. Ramirez suggested a checkoff list should be involved in this existing process. Durdella asked and Ramirez suggested that it would make sense for an updated list to "live" in Instructional Operations. *Durdella asked and Ramirez answered that yes, she (Durdella) should get in touch with Slavich to begin discussions about how to make this happen, perhaps at an upcoming dean's meeting.*
V. Update: Guided Pathways	A. Website Work Group. The Guided Pathways website work group met three times over the break, and is "coming along really nicely." The program-level outcomes are listed on the site. Cartagena asked the committee whether they have had a chance to see the website (pathways.riohondo.edu). A committee member noted that one concern at senate was that areas of interest change over time; Cartagena said that the optimized site would also change. She said that the work group also was trying to make certain there were not a lot of clicks to get to information, and that all the information is presented in a clear way. *Cartagena asked members to let her know if they have any suggestions or concerns that she can share with the work group, as the final iteration deadline is coming up.* B. Scale of Adoption Self-Assessment (SOAA). Cartagena shared not the entire document, but only information from one pillar/area (i.e., "4. Ensure that learning is happening with intentional outcomes"). She said she and Guided Pathways Steering Committee Chair Lydia Okelberry Gonzalez did their best to include Outcomes progress, but also to be honest about where we stand on process articulation. *She asked committee members to look at next steps to see if there might be anything to clarify.* 1. Cartagena said we have not mapped program-level outcomes to institutional-level outcomes, and that she felt this would be a fairly simple task for the committee to tackle, possibly even before the end of the semester. Durdella noted that in *Taskstream* and the way RHC has structured assessment, course-level outcomes are mapped to program-level outcomes, and to institutional-level outcomes. She said mapping program-level outcomes to institutional-level outcomes would be a kind of "double mapping." Cartagena said she has presumed that was what had been decided, but then this issue had come up, and she wasn't sure from whom. She asked and Durdella answered that when Cote and Durdella get data for program-level outcomes for programs in review, they pull all the course-level outcomes mapped to a program-level outcome and aggregate them, then return them to the program. She said process-wide she thinks the committee can create whatever we want to create but we should avoid duplicating work. Spencer noted she recalled course-level outcomes were already linked to institutional-level outcomes, and so

program-level outcomes are already going through the process: she agreed it seems like double the work.

2. Littrell noted Guided Pathways has a particular feel about them that make him wonder how long it will be around, i.e., How long before a Sacramento legislator comes up with something else in their place. He asked: Is it in our interest to rush to make everything conform to Guided Pathways if a legislator might change things?

3. Durdella returned to the current assessment structure: Everything, she said, is connected to course-level outcomes, which are mapped to program-level outcomes, and also institutional-level outcomes by extension. Spenser said this happened when Adam Wetsman was Outcomes chair, so he might shed some light. Durdella said when we IRP pulls data, they pull it at the course or program-level, but it is all based on that building block of the course-level, which is why Durdella was persistent about linking the outcomes review process at the course review level in Curriculum, because RHC has to have a review process that works and ensures quality. The way we have been evaluating program-level outcomes is to aggregate all mapped course-level outcomes to their respective program-level outcomes, and then provided this data to programs undergoing review for them to report on. So course outcomes are done on an annual basis through the planning process, and program-level is done on the six-year cycle

4. Ramirez asked and Durdella answered that institutional-level outcomes have not been reviewed. Rarmirez asked what that might look like; Durdella said institutional-level outcomes review could be linked to the accreditation cycle, and happen twice: once at the midterm and once at the end of the seven-year cycle. Cartagena asked and Durdella answered that she didn't know how institutional-level outcomes were developed, or whether they are linked to RHC's Mission/Values. This, Cartagena said, is something that could be looked at. The committee discussed their recollections about how ILOs were developed, again during the tenure of Adam Wetsman as Outcomes chair. Ramirez asked about assessment; Spencer said she recalled course-level data would feed into program-level data, which would in turn feed into institutional-level data. Ramirez asked what the process for data evaluation might be, and how to determine we should look at how we want to evaluate institutional learning outcomes.

5. Cartagena asked and Durdella said in her opinion we should tie institutional-level outcomes to the accreditation cycle, so they are being looked at once every three years. Going back to SOAA, Cartagena asked whether Durdella would you remove program-level outcomes—or address them in a different way? Durdella said we need to elaborate or restructure what is already in place. We are still evaluating program-level outcomes, she said, but they do not need to be mapped. *Cartagena will also check with Okelberry Gonzalez to see about the history of where this part of the cycle came from.* Babou asked Cartagena for clarity about program-level outcomes that don't have a course (i.e., service areas): how are these things to be assessed?

6. Ramirez noted one of the parts of the Chancellor's *Nova* system asks about whether a given "essential practice" would benefit from additional support. She said she guessed the Chancellor's Office would have some kind of mechanism to support colleges in

	implementing one or more of the essential practices of Guided Pathways. Is this an area, she asked, in which we need more guidance or support? She asked for which of the four pillars RHC requires resources, reminding the committee that Pillar 4 does not have to be only about outcomes: it could also be about professional development, classroom practices, etc. Spencer said it depends, i.e., if the request makes RHC look bad or incompetent then we should probably figure out, but if not, and RHC might get resources as a result, then "yes, why not?" Ramirez reminded the committee that based upon what Cote and Cartagena saw at the Guided Pathways Symposium last month, RHC is not number one, but the College is far from being the worst: she said the College has done a lot of work over the past several years across the board in all areas—e.g., Guided Pathways, instruction, equity, onboarding students—and have shown improvement and a willingness to improve further.
VI. Update: Outcomes Guide	A. Cartagena passed out an Outcomes Guide draft. She noted the draft still requires some components the committee has not yet talked about (e.g., how to map courses to degrees, including where an outcome might be introduced, developed, and mastered), as well as how-tos. *She asked the committee to look through the document and provide feedback.* B. Ramirez reiterated that curriculum updates and outcomes need to be linked explicitly. Cartagena said once finalized there needs to be a separate section to make this linkage stand out. *Durdella asked and Cartagena said she would send the draft out for feedback, and that committee's homework would be to look at the draft; she said she would like a final version of this document before the end of the semester.*

VII. Update: Training Sessions	A. Cartagena noted that during final exam week in December, she will be offering additional *Taskstream* training sessions.
	
	B. A call for help: Cartagena said that there is only one person (i.e., her) leading training sessions. As such, she proposes each committee member lead an open lab to help when faculty members get stuck. She handed out a sign-up sheet for volunteers to help out.
	
	    1. Spencer expressed the concern that she and other members of the committee might not be able to help others out with *Taskstream;* Cartagena said that she really needs help during the one week of finals, but that in the two weeks beforehand, she will be conducting workshops that committee members might come to to get help. She said if we all need to know Taskstream, it behooves the committee to know the basics. Ramirez said that Cartagena and Cote cannot be the only ones helping everyone on campus: there need to be more trainers. Cartagena said that a lot of the times, the questions folks have are very simple (e.g., "How do I log in?").
	
	    2. Priest noted often people (especially new folks) come to him for help, but he does not have faculty access. He asked for IRP to set up dummy accounts for deans to "play in" to get training and perhaps provide some assistance. He noted this goes for *Banner,* too.
	
	    3. Ramirez noted that IT has a trainer, and that we may have to draw upon this expertise. Cote noted that IRP is building collaborations currently.

VIII. Discussion: PLOs	TABLED
IX. New *Taskstream* User Credentials and Workflow	A. Going forward, IT, not IRP, will create new *Taskstream* accounts. B. There will also be a new, single sign-on to authenticate users. Cartagena asked and Durdella said that according to IT Director Gary Van Voorhis, these things will happen as soon as possible. Rosalva Garcia ("Rosie") in IT is going to be creating all the new credentials and logins for everyone. She said that the new single sign-on will use a unique identifier and not a name and email address. Spencer asked and Durdella said that the issue has to do with name changes: When someone changes their name, or registers for the Fitness Center, it invalidates *Taskstream* credentials.
XII. Adjournment	A. The meeting adjourned around 3:30 PM.
XIII. Next Meeting	A. The next meeting will convene on Tuesday, March 17 at 2:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Garabedian, 03/04/2020