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| **Outcomes Committee Meeting Minutes**  Rio Hondo College Fitness Center KDA107 | 19 November 2019 | 2:30 to 3:30 PM | |
| Attendance: Alyson Cartagena (chair), Kevin Barman, Mike Javanmard, Daniel Osman, Yunior Henrandez, John Frala, Bonnilee Kaufman, Robin Babou, Shelly Spencer, Aimee Ortiz, Laura Ramirez, Vann Priest, Mike Garabedian (serving as secretary), Shaina Phillips, Sarah Cote, Caroline Durdella, Lupe Alvarado, Kevin Smith.  Unable to attend: Cynthia Lewis, Julie Huang, Lisette Acevedo, Sean Hughes, Mike Jinze.  *NB: Motions and action items italicized in RED.* | |
| I. Welcome | A. Cartagena recognized new Outcomes Committee member Scott Jaeggi, Public Safety representative. |
| II. Minutes Approval | A. *It was moved and seconded that the minutes from the September meeting be approved. The motion carried.* |
| III. Update: Senate Progress Regarding Cycles and Processes | (NB: The discussion around this agenda item occurred later in the meeting after Academic Senate President Kevin Smith arrived. —MG)  A. Academic Senate President Smith said the outcomes process cycle documents (see supplements 1 and 3 from the September minutes) were delivered to the Senate Executive Board approximately six weeks ago, at which time representatives from the Outcomes Committee asked Smith asked to shepherd the documents through/to Senate, because the Executive Board sets the agenda for the Senate meetings.  B. Smith said that several members of the Senate Executive Board who also serve on the Curriculum Committee were a little concerned about how (or whether) *Curriqūnet* was going to be used as a method by which the Curriculum Committee would approve or vet outcomes. As a result, Smith said, he has not brought the outcomes process cycle documents to the full Senate because, especially because the committees are coequal and neither can tell the other what to do, he wants representatives from the Curriculum and Outcomes Committees to meet to figure out some of these things.   C. Cartagena suggested that *Curriqūnet* is not mentioned in the process documents, which are in the main visualizations of how and when outcomes-related activities should occur, in part so that when new faculty members arrive at Rio Hondo College they will have a guide to help them. The *Curriqūnet* idea, she said, was a part of discussions that obtained earlier this year as it would be convenient to integrate outcomes with the curriculum process; in other words, if there were an outcomes component in *Curriqūnet,* faculty members could ensure to articulate outcomes and align the with exit skills every time they revised existing courses or created new ones. Cartagena insisted that the Outcomes Committee is not asking the Curriculum Committee to review or approve outcomes; the idea was simply to allow a space in Curriqūnet for some kind of outcomes reminder. She said that she had met with Curriculum Co-Chair Dana Arazi earlier in order to clarify the idea, and suggested that this idea is no longer an issue, as the “worst case scenario” would result in a kind of checkbox in *Curriqūnet* that might, for example, remind faculty members writing curriculum whether they have communicated with Outcomes Committee representatives, etc.  D. Smith noted that the most pressing concern of Senate Executive Board members had to do with the notion of recording outcomes in course outlines of record (CORs): one worry was that the upcoming accreditation team might come, pull CORs, and if outcomes listed in these documents were different than those recorded in *Curriqūnet,* it would be problematic. Cartagena noted that she asked and Arazi answered that he does not know whether this has been a problem at other schools; she also said that in part because they are produced by competitor companies, *Curriqūnet* and *Taskstream* do not communicate with one another.  E. Smith said that from his perspective there needs to be a discussion between representatives from the Outcomes and Curriculum Committees before bringing the outcomes documents to the Senate. Durdella said she didn’t think anyone on Outcomes or elsewhere is suggesting outcomes have to be in *Curriqūnet;* but she said that at some point the committee needs to establish processes where outcomes can be archived and accessed, and determine not only how outcomes articulation and reexamination will be looped into the 5-year review cycle, but also how the Outcomes Coordinator will be looped into the processes. Related, she said, the other thing the Outcomes Committee has struggled with is how outcomes will get in the catalog (i.e., outcomes need to be in the catalog and how they get in needs to be systematic).  F. Javanmard observed that “in the old days” someone (Javanmard) suggested exiting skills should be SLOs, and wondered whether this procedure wouldn’t simplify things? Cartagena said that it seems like this idea would be an easy way to go. Ramirez suggested the idea would require a bigger conversation, but that any future direction/process needs to be documented for several important reasons (including for the benefit/information of future coordinators).  G. Returning to the main thrust of the discussion, Durdella said and Frala recalled that when the automotive technology bachelor’s degree was being developed, accreditors recommended that assessment, outcomes, and curriculum processes need to be connected, and that the committees that take up these areas need to communicate with one another. Ramirez said that a mechanism has yet to be worked out, but that usually these processes are connected at the COR. Durdella noted that with the accreditation process coming up, it is a good time for faculty members to review CLOs to make certain that public-facing outcomes are of sufficient quality. She also said that this is not something to do manually every year.  H. Smith concluded by saying that if the folks on Senate Executive who had previously had concerns are now “okay with it,” then the outcomes documents and discussion can be moved forward for an upcoming agenda. Cartagena said that if she needs to clarify anything, she is happy to do so, but Smith said if the *Curriqūnet* piece is not an issue, then everything should be fine. Cartagena agreed, and reiterated that the committee’s intention had been to link the curriculum and outcomes processes somehow. |
| IV. Strengthening Student Success Conference | A. Cartagena attended the Strengthening Student Success Conference in San Francisco in October, noting that the conference was informative but that the networking and discussions that happened outside of official conference meetings and events were helpful too. She said that several Rio Hondo College coordinators attended, including Guided Pathways Coordinator Lydia Okelberry Gonazlez.  B. Cartagena observed that many schools and colleges at the conference had already “moved onto the next thing,” and because outcomes is one of the four pillars of Guided Pathways, it will be important not to “get lost in the mix” as the College moves forward. Hopefully, she said, in future the committee will have a clearer idea about the direction in which the College should move, outcomes-wise.  C. A workshop in February (the 7th Annual SLO Symposium) is scheduled for February 7 and 8, 2020. Ramirez suggested it would be good to have a team from Rio Hondo College attend, and to this end solicited interested committee members. Frala, Hernandez, Javanmard, Cote, and Kaufman expressed an interest in going; *Cartagena will follow up with them.* |
| V. Update: Guided Pathways | A. In an all-day Guided Pathways Student Success Team Summit on October 24, Melinda Karp of Phase Two Advisory addressed participants from various departments and programs, and then facilitated exercises designed to “identify, develop, and monitor strategies and interventions to support students and ensure each student has an equitable opportunity for success” and to “explore the development of a Guided Pathways Student Success Team framework” (according to a flier emailed by Acdemic Affairs to potential participants on September 11, 2019). The October 24 event was followed by an event the next day with Al Solano to develop logic models for the student success teams.  B. Cartagena noted one upshot of the Guided Pathways event is that 14 work groups have been reduced to three, including a website work group designed to envision what an effective website will comprise, as well as what back end (i.e., which information system) would be most appropriate (though of course one concern was cost). *Outcomes committee members should send any website recommendations or desiderata to Cartagena.*  C. The next part of Guided Pathways work will take up SOAA—the Scale of Adoption Self-Assessment, i.e. a tool intended to “ help your college assess how far along you are toward adopting essential guided pathways practices at scale.” t, a tool designed to “help your college assess how far along you are toward adopting essential guided pathways practices at scale.” (See <https://tinyurl.com/rhcsoaa> to access the document..)  i. The group looked at Guided Pathways Essential Practice 4: Ensuring that Students are Learning. Ramirez said when we the College was part of the California Guided Pathways Project, completing the SOAA was something that was done every quarter.  ii. Cartagena and Okelberry Gonzalez are requesting feedback about the SOAA; in other words, any questions, elements to add, language changes, etc., for especially 4a through 4G. *Committee members should review the SOAA for next time but in the meanwhile also email any feedback to Cartagena and Okelberry Gonzalez.*  iii. Cartagena went through and described/explained the columns in the SOAA (description, self-evaluation, progress, and next steps). Durdella asked and Cartagena answered that she didn’t know what the language in 4a means, but that it comes from the Chancellor’s Office. Durdella observed the language seems to indicate that there has been discussion and consensus about targeting further outcomes and employment that extend beyond an associate’s degree or certificate. Ramirez concurred, and suggested that to her, a perfect example would be nursing programs. The committee discussed various aspects of this observation, and several members talked about ways in which their courses/students fulfill the requirements outlined in Essential Practice 4 (e.g., Frala’s and Hernandez’s students use *LinkedIn* profiles). Durdella suggested the “Next Steps' column didn’t seem to apply here; Ramirez said a first step if for programs to identify the four-year and workforce models and then identify/develop outcomes, and that another next step may be sharing with other faculty members. To this end she suggested scheduling FLEX Day workshops.  iv. The idea of systematization and demonstration came up at several points during the discussion. For example, Durdella looked to 4b and suggested that professional development is a good first step, but systematically ensuring/demonstrating that this is part of what is done at the College is necessary (i.e., just because someone takes advantage of a professional development opportunity, this doesn’t mean the person will implement learned skills in the classroom, and it doesn’t mean it will be systematic across all courses that are delivered). She noted that at universities there is instructional peer review. When committee members noted there is a peer review process at Rio Hondo College, too, Durdella agreed, but noted that currently aspects of the SOAA are not included systematically in evaluations? To what degree, she asked, are these principles part of existing peer and instruction review? It was suggested the committee look at Distance Education peer review. Kaufman said she was most interested in 4c because it takes up students having broader critical thinking skills; Babou noted that the Library active learning in instructions and orientations, and wondered where such things might be recorded.  v. Cartagena and Ramirez noted the SOAA is a living, working, multi-year document that the committee will continue to revisit and shape, and that again, members should take time to review and address aspects. *Cartagena will take the recommendations that obtained during the discussion to Okelberry Gonzalez.* |
| VI. Update: English Area | A. Marie Ekstrom from English came to the September meeting to talk about shortcomings in the English Department’s outcomes process, and possible ways to make things work. Osman reported on behalf of the department that “It’s on.” He reminded committee members that English finds itself in a difficult situation with over 100 sections of ENGL 101 and no clear criterion for assessing student performance. Ekstrom’s idea was to have IRP select roughly 15-16 sections of 101 at random and have the final papers of students in those sections evaluated by a small group of English faculty in order to generate more accurate, comparable data (and to relieve faculty members of filing data for their sections). After some negotiating with the department Ekstrom’s idea was adopted, and the pilot will begin in a few weeks.  B. Cartagena noted there was an English faculty member who reached out and was not comfortable with the process; but, she told this instructor, as long as they are collecting data and reflecting then they can still be part of the next steps in the outcomes process. Osman said that initially there was some resistance, but that he was under the impression that everything was “smoothed over”—a notion evinced seemingly by the fact that Cartagena never heard back from the faculty member in question. |
| VII. Status: PLOs | A. Program level outcomes (PLOs) were due November 1. Cartagena noted most of the missing PLOs were for new degrees. More than several came through after the due date, and after being proofread by Garabedian, submitted to Lydia Corrales to be included in the catalog. Cartagena noted she presented remaining PLOs to Academic Senate earlier in the day. |
|
| VIII. Update: *Taskstream* Training Sessions | A. Cartagena told the committee she had not realized how much support was still needed, and that there had been additional work this year introducing faculty members to timelines, closing the loop processes and documents, and *Taskstream* functions (e.g., how to get into *Taskstream*). To address some of these issues, at the last minute Cartagena produced a question-and-answer sheet, but admitted she did not think it was a “great” document, and *requested that members let her know if they have any changes they want to see implemented*. Cartagena said she still wants to use some version of her question-and-answer sheet in the guide she is developing for especially new faculty because confusion remains, and though training session have gone well, in future we will need to have more. Durdella told committee members to *spread the word that any technical support issues related to* Taskstream *should be sent not to Cartagena, but to IRP.* Spencer said that the trainings helped out a lot in getting the SLOs into *Taskstream;* and another committee member complimented *Taskstream* “goddess” Cote for her expertise and thanked her for her help. Cartagena noted that this document as well as training videos are all in the online Faculty Resource Center.  B. Cartagena noted that there will be *Taskstream* training sessions on December 2, 3, and 4, from 9 to 11 AM in KDA PE 107; 3 to 4 PM in the IRP Conference Room; and 10 AM to 12 PM in LR230, respectively. Folks who attend the December 2 training session will have to bring their own laptops. Cartagena said challenges have to do with the fact that time will be limited because the sessions will be held during finals week, program reviews will be in full swing, and she will be involved with the *Nutcracker* production. Cartagena told the committee that if they can support faculty members working on outcomes and are able to assist at one or all of the sessions, it would be very helpful. She reminded administrators especially that upcoming division meetings may be a good opportunity to tell professors to start doing outcomes now, and that conceivably they could be done with contractual obligations in December (depending on course loads, of course), but in any event the idea is to make sure this happens before May. |
| IX. Update: Non-credit and Community Education Outcomes | A. Durdella provided an update about how assessment will work for non-credit and community education courses. In short, after meeting with faculty members in these areas, it was decided that non-credit courses will be treated as instructional areas, where community education courses will be treated as non-instructional areas.   B. There are five non-credit course disciplines, and these five will work on developing outcomes for those courses and programs now that IRP hasset them up in *Taskstream* and given them a timeline. As noted in today’s meeting agenda: “Non-credit will now follow the same process as all of the instructional programs—assessing courses annually and reporting on course outcomes through the annual program plan.”  C. Community education courses will be removed from the outcomes workspace in *Taskstream,* and then program outcomes will be created and reported upon through the annual planning process, and when community education is up for program review. |
| X. Program Review | A. Mark Littrell will help with program review on Tuesday, December 3.  B. Shaina Phillips will help with program review on Wednesday, December 4.  C. Alyson Cartagena will help with program review on Thursday, December 5.  D. A volunteer is needed to help with program review on December 2. Cartagena asked and Durdella confirmed these hours could be divided (and conquered). After splitting the day into two, *Babou volunteered to do the 12 to 3 PM portion of the day; Priest will do 8:30 AM to noon.* |
| XI. FLEX Day: Canvas/Outcomes | A. Durdella said for FLEX Day Outcomes should share exemplary Closing the Loop documents.  B. Cartagena noted that one of the things she and Frala have been working on is utilizing *Canvas* to collect data, because users can input outcomes into the program and then link these outcomes to quizzes, projects, discussion boards, etc. Moreover, the gradebook in *Canvas* allows for the efficient and immediate tabulation of data, which can then inform fancy data charts and visualizations. Cartagena noted that if it is possible to convince other faculty members to use *Canvas* it would save much time. Frala confirmed that once *Canvas* is set up in this way, it really is simple to collect, aggregate, and visualize outcomes data. Alyson asked and *Frala agreed he would co-present with her on FLEX Day,* which will complement the other outcomes-related presentation (e.g., the “aspirational,” exemplary Closing the Loop forms). One committee member noted that sometimes FLEX Day is not an ideal time to present data, because breakout sessions are not required, so many folks skip. He wondered about the feasibility of creating short, instructional videos; to which Cartagena noted she has created such resources, and they live in the online Faculty Resource Center.  C. Spencer noted that she recalled at the last SLO Symposium, it seemed most campuses were using *Canvas* for outcomes; Cartagena clarified that *Canvas* is merely for data *collection,* while *Taskstream* is for reporting. Durdella expanded: *Canvas* is a platform by which where you are collecting outcomes at the student level, where in *Taskstream* the data is aggregating. She noted further that *Canvas* makes really nice charts, and guessed that *Canvas* data can be extracted and connected with demographic data for the purposes of analyses. Cartagena said she believes there is yet another, add-on program that can be purchased in order to facilitate this kind of thing. A committee member asked whether student-level outcomes are the direction in which the College is moving; Durdella answered that currently the commission isn’t requiring it, but a few years ago they did want schools to move in this direction. She said that in her last conversation with the liaison, she learned the commission would not hold institutions accountable for producing de-aggregated outcomes data—but it is within the realm of possibilities that the College will be required to move in that direction. |
| XII. Adjournment | A. The meeting adjourned around 3:30 PM. |
| XIII. Next Meeting | A. The next meeting will convene on Tuesday, February 18 at 2:30 PM. |

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Garabedian, 11/20/2019