Outcomes Committee Meeting Minutes

Zoom Meeting | 21 April 2020 | 2:35 to 3:50 PM

Attendance: Alyson Cartagena (chair), Daniel Osman, Aimee Ortiz, Caroline Durdella, Scott Jaeggi, Julie Huang, Sarah Cote, Lisette Acevedo, Yunior Hernandez, Kevin Barman, Mike Javanmard, Vann Priest, Mark Littrell, William Korf, Bonnilee Kaufman, Mike Hinze, and Marie Eckstrom (guest).

Unable to attend: Laura Ramirez, Robin Babou, Shelley Spencer, Rachel Garcia, Shaina Phillips, Mike Salazar.

NB: Motions and action items italicized in RED. Agenda items discussion did not necessarily proceed in the order below.

I. Welcome	A. *Zoom* etiquette: One important aspect of *Zoom* etiquette is to mute yourself when you are not speaking, and to "raise your hand" via the Participants list (or chat) when you have something so say. This makes the work of the committee more efficient. B. Cartagena noted she went to a National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment. NILOA webinar and pulled from presentations there the notion that outcomes should not be regarded as an extra thing, but rather a kind of "North Star" to guide faculty members. In particular she said, she was thinking about this metaphor as everyone applies and makes adjustments to coursework, projects, and exams. She suggested outcomes work is an important way to answer the question of what we are trying to accomplish, and that these notions—in addition to the idea that less is more—is something Outcomes Committee division reps might bring back to their division meetings. Another thing to think about, Cartagena noted, is that outcomes can be used to encourage students, possibly even in classes, by pointing to outcomes to chart progress. Outcomes could perhaps be another way to support students to let them know where a given class has been and where they are going. C. Unfortunately, the College could be in a better place when we consider outcomes work. Cartagena said she doesn't want to be "doom and gloom" but instead look at where the problems lie to figure out what we can do to catch up, and to this end then make recommendations to the academic senate.
II. Minutes Approval	A. *It was moved, seconded, and approved that the minutes from February be approved with a minor revision regarding a member's not being recorded in the attendance list.*
III. English Department Success: Marie Eckstrom	A. Marie Eckstrom visited the committee *Zoom* meeting to talk about English Department outcomes successes. i. Eckstrom reminded the committee that she came to the Outcomes Committee meeting in fall because faculty members were "upset" about the Closing the Loop (CTL) document and procedure: they did not know what they were doing, she said, and were concerned about undertaking outcomes work properly and efficiently. Following that meeting, Eckstrom spoke with IRP Dean Caroline Durdella, who proposed several options for the ways ENGL 101 could do outcomes. Eckstrom brought these ideas back to the department.

	ii. Eckstrom said English used a random sampling of ENGL 101 courses provided by IRP in order to use the final research paper and do an assessment of the four SLOs for the course. Research papers from ten CRNs were collected and sent to ten instructor-evaluators for a blind review of these papers. Eckstrom noted that this process did not take long: the most time it took any evaluator, she noted, was an hour. The department tabulated the results and sent them to IRP, who "performed their magic." iii. Eckstrom said the evaluators had some interesting conversations (i.e. *dialogue*) based upon what was done. She asked the chair to share the final page of the report in order to highlight the ways the ten instructors evaluated the 157 essays, noting outlier evaluators 10 and 3. She said the disparity between 10 and 3 resulted in questions about how instructors evaluate. Unfortunately, she said, these pilot study conversations occurred just before the COVID quarantine, so the department hasn't been able to follow up in order to figure out how to address findings. But they also had a conversation about outcomes criteria, the way outcomes are phrased, and whether proficiency levels the department uses are appropriate. iv. Durdella suggested the group look at the proficiency percentages for each outcomes, which she argued tells the English department a whole lot: in particular, she said, if for the purposes of the Closing the Loop document the department is looking for action items, the percentage of proficiency for outcome 3 could fuel one. This would make the action item more meaningful and actionable. She added that IRP has ideas for different departments and disciplines, and can work with departments to come up with outcomes and processes that will work for them. v. Eckstrom concluded by sharing that the process "was painless, and people actually liked it." Cartagena said it was good to have good news, and great faculty members found efficient new ways to do outcomes. Eckstrom thanked Durdella and Sarah Cote for "showing [them] the light," and that outcomes work can be meaningful. Durdella said this is what IRP likes to do, and reiterated IRP can help departments formulate outcomes if they are struggling.
IV. Update: Training Sessions	A. Training sessions led by Cartagena have been going on weekly and have been well-attended; a special session recently focused on training new faculty. B. The last few weeks have been focused on the Close-the-Loop (CTL) and Timeline deadline (April 17). Now, Cartagena is focusing on data, and in particular measures and findings.
V. Update: Closing the Loop	A. There was a great response insofar as CTL and timelines submissions went. Cote is working on inventorying submitted documents so the committee will have a better idea of where the College stands at the end of the month. B. When division representatives share Outcome Committee work when they go back to your division, one thing to think about regarding required "dialogue" about outcomes is that dialogue could look a lot of different ways, e.g., using the phone, arranging *Zoom* meetings, or an email chain. It is also important that faculty members know they can bring in folks from

	outside their area to help. (Cartagena noted she asked volleyball and swimming coaches in her division for feedback about Dance outcomes.) Again, as we think about a cultural shift in how outcomes are undertaken at Rio Hondo College, we want to get away from a situation where just one contributor fills out a form: dialogue needs to happen.
VI. Update: Mission Statement	A. Cartagena noted she attended the mission statement revision retreat, and that thanks to Durdella, a wonderful aspect of this time was that many different constintences got the chance to provide feedback, so there was a lot of buy-in about what the mission statement should look like. Cartagena said we should like to see the same thing with outcomes at the College.
VII. Update: Guided Pathways	A. There was an item in the scale of adoption for Guided Pathways that included mapping program level outcomes (PLOs). However, because CLOs are already mapped to PLOs, and mapped to the institution, so we do not need to take this extra step. B. The Guided Pathways website is looking fantastic: if you have not looked at it yet (see pathways.riohondo.edu), take a look. PLOs are included there so that students can see them when they are choosing a career path.
VIII. Update: IT Processes Workflow	A. We are trying to streamline IT processes, and take away from IRP's workload because they are so overextended.. When faculty members cannot get into *TaskStream* they need to do an IT Help Desk request. *TaskStream* in the subject line. Please spread the word.
IX. Discussion: Course Level Outcomes (Part 1—Rubric)	A. One of the big things the College and committee needs to do is really deepen our processes in anticipation of preparing for accreditation. Faculty members cannot keep doing things as we have been doing them, and for which last time's accrediting team dinged the College. If there is no collaboration or thoughtfulness about how outcomes line up with curriculum, resource needs, and student success—if outcomes work is not high quality—then the College is likely to get dinged again, with more significant consequences this time around. B. Cartagena shared a course level outcome rubric whose point is to ensure *quality.* Faculty members need, she said, to be proud of what they present. The rubric would be used for faculty creating new courses or revising existing courses, and also for members of the committee to have a guide and standards by which to give feedback *systematically.* This has never been done at the College. The Curriculum Committee does something like this every single week at their 75-minute meetings, where the committee gives feedback according to several criteria before a course is approved; we need to have a similar process for outcomes (though not one that requires as great a time commitment). C. In designing the rubric Cartagena and others tried to make things streamlined to telegraph criteria that need to be included in formulating an outcomes statement, e.g., action verbs as in Bloom's Taxonomy, one outcome per unit, etc. The categories in the draft rubric are outcomes versus objectives, clarity of outcomes, alignment to PLOs, and conventions. D. Cartagena asked for feedback. Ortiz said the rubric is similar to what Nursing uses, where outcomes have to be akin to so-called SMART goals: specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-based. Cote wondered if the first category could be more specific; perhaps it could

be another level. Cartagena noted the difference between outcomes and objectives is something about which she is asked frequently. Durdella agreed with Cote, suggesting the category label is something over which she has stumbled, but agreed that for faculty members it is particularly important that the evaluative criteria in the box needs to address an outcome versus an objective. But the dimension (the far left box) she thought needs to be worked upon. Cote and Durdella suggested they do not have a solution, but that the dimension in the far left box needs to be worked on. Jaeggi agreed, and wondered if in the practice column we could flesh out whether a given outcome looked too much like an objective. Garabedian suggested the fleshing out could happen in examples.

E. Durdella asked and Cartagena confirmed she wanted a recommendation from the committee that, after making small adjustments, they might forward the rubric to the academic senate with the intention of utilizing the rubric in the Fall Semester (or Summer) Jaeggi said he liked the rubric and that it looks good. Osman wondered if there was flexibility in "moving" the language to align more with evidence-based practices (i.e., measurability). He agreed that the rubric is close to being where we want to be, but also looked for confirmation about the point of the rubric. Durdella stated and Cartagena confirmed this document is to review and provide feedback on outcomes statements, i.e., outcomes statements by themselves do not necessarily have proficiency standards embedded. Osman agreed, but suggested there should be a general connection: as long as they are measurable and specific, he said, and said that the rubric looked good to him then.

F. Jaeggi asked who will use these and where will they end up? Cartagena said this will be for the outcomes committee: she is recommending there be a work group that looks at these comprising someone an area representative from the committee, the chair, the dean of IRP, and the dean of the area the course is being taught, who would share with the originator writing or revising the course. It wouldn't be housed anywhere: we would take notes and say these are recommendations: but it would not be housed anywhere, not public. Kaufman said for writing new or revised curriculum, the rubric is a really nice document and a guideline, and as such should be in an appendix to help faculty members. Cartagena explained *feedback* would not be public, but the rubric would be. Kaufman reiterated she found the rubric helpful, and that once the "semantic" issues are tweaked, it should work well. Lupe said " This tool can help strengthen our current course outcomes giving feedback as a guideline."

G. Ortiz asked whether Cartagena is looking to have the committee review every single outcome for every single course—a prospect she suggested sounds very labor- and time-intensive. Cartagena answered that the committee would try to do an emergency start but also reminded the group that *not every member would have to do this work:* if members are called upon to assist in this endeavor, it will only be for the areas they represent. Additionally, she said, although we are still waiting for data about the average number of courses revised in a semester (and because everyone's cycle is slightly different) the workload is yet unknown, but the goal in any case is to"divide and conquer" to try and get through all of the courses. Finally, she said, this would be a starting point to try to improve quality, and the group would not begin by attempting to review outcomes for all extant courses—just the ones that needed to be revised in a given year.

	H. After the discussion, *it was moved and seconded to forward the rubric, with the minor changes suggested, to the Academic Senate.*
IX. Discussion: Course Level Outcomes (Part 2—Quality Control Process)	A. Cartagena shared some of the examples that accompany the rubric, and expressed appreciation to Kaurfman, who provided her own example to demonstrate the poor, better, and best versions of the same outcome.

B. Cartagena checked in with the committee to get feedback about the course level outcomes review team proposal, and in particular whether the suggested members of the work group to take up any given course—i.e., the Outcomes Committee chair, an area rep, area division dean, dean of IRP, and course originator—made sense to everyone. No committee member objected to this composition.

B. The committee discussed the importance of nomenclature, and in particular making certain that the name of the group and process is non-threatening; the Outcomes Committee Feedback Work Group was proposed. Javamand asked that any recommendation to the Academic Senate be clear in order to make sure folks knew the work of the review team would in no way be punitive. Cartagena agreed, suggesting that if the committee decided to move the group composition/process as a recommendation to Senate, it be clear that it is not evaluative but feedback to strive for quality; Jaeggi noted it's like "QI, QA" (quality improvement, quality assurance). Durdella noted "quality" is a word consistent with accreditation standards. She clarified that her understanding is that the rubric and process are intended to provide feedback on course outcomes statement on new or revised courses, not to be singling out any faculty member, or punitive. It is intended to ensure there is an appropriate number of outcomes, they are sustainable, and phrased in a way that makes them outcomes, not objectives. Given this clarification Jaeggi suggested the rubric be called a CLO "feedback" form, not a review form.

C. Following other members' similar observations, Javanmard noted some areas like economics have only one faculty, and wondered how this would affect the process: would one-person areas be creating *and* evaluating outcomes? Cartagena clarified that in these cases the course originator/reviser would be getting feedback, participating in the conversation to ensure quality. Javanmard also sought clarification on what constituted an "area"—division or discipline or? Cartagena used an example from Dance, noting that the new Outcomes Committee representative from KDA is Mike Salazar, so he is the one who would be part of that process. She noted some areas have two people, so that provides more flexibility.

D. *It was moved and seconded to take the Outcomes Feedback Work Group name and composition to Senate. The motion passed, with one abstention.* |
| IX. Discussion: Course Level Outcomes (Part 3—CTL/Assessment Cycle Process) | A. One question many faculty members ask the Outcomes Coordinator has to do with due dates for assessment cycle activities. To this end, Cartagena developed a document with this AY's expectations, as well as a template for future.

B. One recurring complaint/problem has to do with there being little "quality time" for outcomes-related dialogue among faculty members—an accreditation requirement and a |

	potential red flag. Division meetings are not ideal times for outcomes work because of other business that must occur at these meetings, as well as time limits. FLEX Days, too, are not great times to have conversations/dialogue about outcomes, again because there is little time and other subjects that compete for folks' attention. C. Speaking to the red flag this shortcoming represents, Durdella said accreditors will look at a sample of CTL documents or summary of findings in *TaskStream,* and if they don't see evidence of substantive dialogue and data-based recommendations, the College will be dinged. For example, a lot of CTL documents turned in last time did not have actionable outcomes, were written poorly, etc. D. The committee discussed several different ways to address this issue. Garabedian noted that in his experience, the post-division meeting CTL activity at Fall FLEX Day seemed perfunctory—something to "check off"—and therefore the fact that many of the CTL documents did not contain evidence of substantive dialogue did not surprise him. He suggested further that remote technology might be a way to encourage dialogue among faculty members who don't see one another very often. Javanmard and others floated the idea of designated time, perhaps at FLEX Day, and perhaps in lieu of morning activities and breakout sessions. The idea of extra time at division meetings was also discussed. Osman suggested a required SLO meeting, outside of FLEX, in order to work on and finish this part of the process. Jaeggi noted the parameters would have to be specific, and suggested that providing the rubric and a cheat sheet would be helpful. E. After the discussion, *it was moved and seconded to forward to Academic Senate the suggestion that the two, 50-minute breakout sessions for the Fall 2020 FLEX Day be replaced with meetings intended specifically to undertake dialogue and complete CTL forms. The motion passed, with one abstention.*
X. Curriculum and Outcomes	A. Likely the Outcomes Feedback Work Group work will need to start in the summer in order to ensure the group does not back up any items looked at by the Curriculum Committee, and so that the group can provide support and friendly feedback. There may be as much as a total of 12 meetings, but it could be that each Outcomes representative would only need to attend one: it would all depend on how many courses will be up for revision. B. The Outcomes Committee wants to make sure the Outcomes Feedback Work Group process becomes part of the Curriculum Committee's process so that it is not is a "red flag" to the accrediting team that comes to visit. That is, according to AACJC, the College is supposed to show how the development of outcomes is part of the curriculum review process, and this is impossible currently (because it's not part of the curriculum review process). There is no connection, and this is a problem that needs fixing before the accreditation team visits. C. Durdella noted a tentative workflow to connect what would be Outcomes Feedback Work Group business with the Curriculum Committee's process had been developed. However, she said, VPAA Ramirez shared recently that although Curriculum Committee representatives liked the workflow, they did not want outcomes recorded on course outlines of record (COR) in *CurrIQūnet.* This creates an extra step, Durdella said: the key for accreditation is that if the

	outcomes for a course are not recorded on the COR, which is the key communication tool for new faculty teaching a given course, then official outcomes for the course need to be stored elsewhere. Under the proposal, outcomes would still be recorded in *TaskStream*—extra work for a faculty member who would have to reenter outcomes for a new or revised course there, and for the division dean who would have to pull not only the COR from *CurrIQūnet,* but also the associated outcomes for the courses from *TaskStream,* when orienting new faculty. D. A discussion ensued regarding Curriculum Committee representatives rejecting the tentative workflow and their alternative proposal. Cartagena asked and Durdella answered that she was not certain why Curriculum Committee reps did not want the outcomes on the COR, as this would be the most streamlined process. She noted that insofar as accreditation goes, the problem could be fixed (i.e., connecting outcomes review with the work of the Curriculum Committee), but undeniably this would be a very inefficient way to proceed, resulting in extra work for colleagues as well as administrators: the Curriculum Committee reps' proposal would require double-entry of outcomes; a feedback loop whereby revised outcomes would have to be shared with the already-strained IRP staff (who would then have to record the outcomes in a second place); and the dean to go into two places to orient new faculty members (they would have to get the COR and also pull the most recent outcomes for the course from IRP/*TaskStream*). Durdella noted if we document this workflow and show that it is systematic, and a way by which quality is ensured, then the College will have no accreditation issues. E. Cartagena noted the hope was to have outcomes work integrated into *CurrIQūnet* so there weren't these extra steps and inefficiencies. Durdella said it is her understanding that outcomes will not be in *CurrIQūnet:* the process moves forward in the way discussed earlier, but the process goes through *TaskStream.* There would be a process in *CurrIQūnet* that would drive another process by notifying Outcomes representatives. Durdella said she did not understand the opposition to having outcomes in *CurrIQūnet* or stored on CORs, and that it seems to put a lot of work on other offices. Cartagena asked and Durdella said she did not know whether this was the final word on the subject. SHe said it could be made to work, but is neither easy to implement nor prereable: it will burden IRP and put a lot of extra work on deans. Cartagena asked and Durdella said it seems like Cartagena will have to revise the workflow. She reiterated she did not understand the opposition to having outcomes "live" on a COR, and Javanmard asked and Durdella said she did not know where the opposition was coming from. It did not, she said, seem logical to her to require more effort. F. Cartagena said her concern with recommending even an amended workflow is that this would suggest the Committee endorses not recording outcomes on the COR, and inefficiently using *TaskStream* in addition to *CurrIQūnet* for outcomes work. Committee members speculated about opposition to the proposed workflow. Cartagena asked and Durdella suggested speaking with VPAA Ramirez about next steps in this regard; *Cartagena will speak to VPAA Ramirez for feedback and guidance.*
XI. PLOs: New Degrees and Certificates	A. There is just one department in one division that has not submitted program level outcomes (PLOs): Carpentry. Likely there has not been a full-time person in the area for some time, and this is likely why the outcomes are incomplete. *Cartagena will work with this*

	program to get PLOs written.
	B. *Garabedian will proofread submitted PLOs before they are printed in the catalog.*
XII. ILOs	A. Cartagena praised IRP and Durdella for hosting a good planning retreat, especially given the fact that at the last minute Durdella and her team had to do a lot of work to condense the retreat and conduct the meeting on *Zoom.*
	B. Although folks who attended the retreat did not get to institutional level outcomes, plans to discuss ILOs are on the books to look at on the next cycle, in AY 2020-21.
XIII. Accreditation	[The outcomes-related "red flags" that the accrediting team noted in their last report and which were to be the subject of this part of the meeting were brought up during the discussion in sections IX and X. —MG]
XIV. IEC Recommendations	A. Cartagena shared seven outcomes-related Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) recommendations prioritized by Durdella (see addendum 1, below). These priorities speak to issues the Outcomes Committee needs to solve/figure out, so they represent a road map of sorts for future committee business.
XV. Discussion: PLOs	A. The committee will need to have a discussion about program level outcomes, and in particular how to evaluate PLOs. However, as time did not permit having this discussion at the April meeting, the committee will discuss PLOs at the May meeting.
XVI. Next Meeting and Adjournment	A. The next Outcomes Committee meeting will be on May 19 at 2:30 PM.
	B. The meeting adjourned around 3:50 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,
Mike Garabedian

Addendum 1. IEC Recommendations Prioritized

1. The Outcomes Committee should provide appropriate training and guidance to instructional programs on the Summary of Findings section of TaskStream so that the narratives describe the results of the outcomes assessment rather than repeating outcomes statements.

2. The Outcomes Committee should provide appropriate training on reporting results of outcomes assessment so that results go beyond whether standards are met and actually report data.

3. The Outcomes Committee should provide appropriate training on the Findings section of the TaskStream template so that the Findings section reflects specific actions and a rationale for those actions. Programs should be able to specify what actions will be implemented as a result of their assessment findings or provide a rationale for no actions taking place as a result of their assessment findings.

4. The Outcomes Committee needs to establish and communicate to all instructional programs the deadline for submitting the Course Outcomes Timeline. Timelines need to be submitted as part of the Annual Program Plan and need to be on file in Task Stream.

5. The Outcomes Committee needs to establish and communicate a protocol or recommendation for small or one person departments to dialogue about course outcomes assessment and record the dialogue and action plan as part of closing the loop.

6. The Outcomes Committee should take the lead in developing examples that demonstrate appropriate use of outcomes data and actionable instructional strategies that can be used to improve student outcomes or to provide a rationale for why an improvement plan is not necessary.

7. The Outcomes Committee should also review the Closing the Loop document and make revisions so that programs can report on whether the actions they took to improve student performance resulted in increased mastery of student learning outcomes in subsequent assessment cycles.