

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
Committee on Outcomes and Assessment
Minutes

October 1, 2024
4:00 – 5:00 PM

Attendees

Liza Rabinovich, Hai Hoang, Andrew Hoffman, Saloua Saidane, Ashanti Hands, Larry Maxey, Amanda Johnston, Ayana Woods, Monica Romero, Katie Palacios, Courtney Meissner, Miguel Murillo Ayala, Michael Temple

A. Call to Order

1. Approval of the agenda 10-01-2024
 - o The meeting was called to order by Liza Rabinovich at 4:05 pm, and the agenda for 10-01-2024 was presented for approval. Agenda approved without objections.
 - o Welcome new members: Courtney Meissner from COMS and Miguel Murillo Ayala from LRAS.

B. Approval of September 17th, 2024 Minutes

1. Motioned - Monica Romero
2. Seconded - Ayana Woods
3. Correction - N/A
4. Abstained - N/A
5. Approval - The minutes were approved on October 1, 2024

C. Communication loop

1. **Update from members and co-chairs**
 - o Update from Members:
 - o **President Hands:** Shared the year's goals, emphasizing the importance of reaffirming full accreditation and the consequences of not meeting this objective. She aimed to create a hopeful and forward-looking space for progress. While there were few questions during the presentation, she noted that more discussions might emerge after Andrew's report, particularly around identifying potential barriers.
 - a. Andrew noted limited discussion after his report, emphasizing that Senate members are engaged, but the challenge lies in reaching less-engaged faculty. He stressed the need for outreach to ensure everyone understands the accreditation process and expectations. He questioned

whether presenting a plan is sufficient or if implemented changes are needed, given the short timeline, and emphasized the importance of continuous improvement, even when benchmarks are met.

- b. President Hands emphasized that for full accreditation, the committee must show that their strategies are in place and working, not just present a plan. The timeline should ensure alignment, measurable progress, and evidence of effectiveness.
 - c. Liza emphasized the need for alignment in demonstrating progress to the ACCJC, focusing on both planning and documenting completed work. She noted that departments are reviewing fall assessment data in spring and holding discussions that need to be documented. She suggested that the committee should further discuss benchmarks and accountability, especially when some faculty are more engaged than others. She highlighted the importance of defining roles and addressing the biggest hurdle of ensuring consistent participation and accountability.
- o **Andrew Hoffman:** Andrew Hoffman shared a draft of the outcomes glossary.
 - a. Discussions included the addition of terms like program learning outcomes, institutional learning outcomes, and more. The committee will brainstorm regarding what terminology needs to be included in the glossary.
 - b. Agreement on making the document a living one for continuous updates.
 - o **Monica Romero:** Update on Outcomes Processes
 - a. Noted the need for clearer timelines and specific dates for completing tasks. She mentioned ongoing discussions about whether to continue using Nuventive or switch platforms and how this decision might affect the current curriculum cycle and process adjustments. Monica also questioned whether outcome updates should be allowed every semester, noting that the established cycle doesn't require such frequent changes.
 - b. Liza discussed the need to differentiate between short-term and long-term plans regarding Nuventive and Meta updates. City, Miramar, and Mesa are updating Nuventive, with potential future transitions to Meta, but training and access setup are still required. In the meantime, the committee suggested locking and unlocking forms in

Nuventive to control edits, especially after checks by deans and department chairs. Committee input needed on when to implement these changes, such as locking forms at the start of the semester or two weeks before.

- c. Andrew recommended locking edits when the semester begins, as changes to syllabi or outcomes mid-semester would be chaotic. He emphasized that edits should only happen at the start of a new semester, based on his experience with curriculum processes, which require consistency and control over documentation.

o **Motion to lock Nuventive for CLO edits- To be decided at next meeting**

- a. Motioned – Andrew Hoffman. However, it was not seconded or voted on yet due to an ongoing discussion.
- b. Michael suggested that outcome edits should be a personal choice and asked if it's possible to lock the system while still allowing access for those who need to make updates.
- c. Liza clarified that while outcome edits would be locked once the semester starts to maintain consistency, other updates like benchmarks and assessment results could still be made. She proposed unlocking the system before the next semester for any necessary changes, allowing faculty to request edits through her in the interim.
- d. Katie and Monica both stressed the need of having a clear schedule for when edits can be made would help faculty plan accordingly. She also suggested we run the idea by the DOCs for their input before next meeting.
- e. Miguel asked if there are sample syllabi for specific areas that include updated outcomes, which could be shared with faculty to ensure uniformity. He emphasized that these samples wouldn't dictate teaching methods but would provide a reference for how updated outcomes should be presented. He inquired if such a resource exists.
- f. Liza explained that they started this process this semester. Department chairs and outcomes coordinators received a spreadsheet with all outcomes to share with faculty. Additionally, Andrew and Academic Affairs are helping create a syllabus checklist to ensure all required elements are included.
- g. President Hands emphasized that a deadline should be set to finalize decisions, allowing time for feedback collection and ensuring progress to the next phase. A decision target

could happen at the next meeting, giving time to collect feedback and have discussions with department coordinators.

2. Update from co-chairs:

- o Update from ACCJC
 - o **Hai:** shared a recent [communication](#) with ACCJC to clarify some questions that arose from the college community. The main points are:
 - a. We will be evaluated using the [2014 standards](#), not the 2024 ones.
 - b. ACCJC will review a random 5% sample of syllabi from the current semester as evidence for the 2025 report.
 - c. The focus will be on changes due to the recommendation and evidence of outcomes in Fall 2024 and Spring 2025.
 - d. For Recommendation 2, evidence should align with guidance from pages 48 and 28 of [the standards](#).
 - o Hai also highlighted that ACCJC emphasized the need to demonstrate systematic program assessment and show evidence of improvements made due to this process.
 - o Saloua shared that ACCJC's mention of providing evidence of improvements from the assessment process is challenging because programs don't always have changes to show—sometimes the assessments confirm things are already working well. What should happen in those cases?
 - o President Hands added it's important to clearly articulate when no changes are made because a benchmark has been met. This shows that we've reviewed the data and made an informed decision about maintaining current practices, which is a key part of the assessment process.
 - o Hai suggested that courses perceived as needing no further improvements should review data on potential equity gaps, as disparities in performance among certain groups could indicate areas for improvement.
 - o Andrew emphasized the need for continuous improvement, even after meeting benchmarks. He suggested aiming for higher targets, like moving from 70% to 75%, and focusing on closing equity gaps. Simply meeting benchmarks without striving for further progress, especially repeatedly, may not be sufficient.
 - o Saloua highlighted the need to explore new strategies for improvement, even when benchmarks are met. She questioned whether addressing equity gaps requires additional tools or broader

discussions beyond just course adjustments, suggesting a need for more comprehensive conversations at the departmental or school level to understand and address disparities.

- o Andrew agreed, emphasizing that simply having these discussions and asking thoughtful questions is valuable. He suggested that examining challenges with specific groups and considering whether solutions involve instructional changes, support services, or new strategies could serve as strong evidence of progress.
- o Hai agreed, underscoring that discussions at the department or school level are key to improvement. While the 2024 standard values continuous progress, the focus is on showing efforts to address challenges, not necessarily solving long-standing issues, but working to close equity gaps.

D. Continuing Business

1. Adding closing the loop questions to Nuventive
 - o *How did you discuss your assessment findings with faculty/classified professionals?*
 - o *Based on data collected last year, what changes/actions are being planned?*
 - o *If none, please explain why.*
 - o *Describe the process for implementing these changes.*
2. Liza recalled that the committee previously voted on adding discussion summaries to program review but did not receive enough votes from PRSC for approval. As an alternative, we can consider placing the summaries under the course units or analytics section, with a form for three key questions to be completed once each semester.
 - o Hai stressed that there is urgency in the timeline, and we need to implement changes at the right time. We sent the proposal for an email vote but only received 2-3 votes, so the motion failed. It seems most prefer to discuss it at this meeting. Hai also had offline conversations where some suggested alternative placements for better compliance with recommendation #2. The goal is shared, but there are differing views on the best approach between program review and this group. He will have more information after the next PRSC meeting.
 - o Monica elaborated that Dina highlighted when DOCs handle the work, they have the necessary information, not the lead writer. It makes more sense for DOCs to input this data directly into Nuventive, where they work, as it's their expertise. Lead writers can access it but typically aren't the ones answering these questions. This way, the information is gathered within the assessment process and then pulled into the program review, rather than embedding the questions directly in program review.

- o The committee suggested adding a workspace in Nuventive and calling it “Reflection and Action Plan”.
 - o **Motion to add Closing the Loop workspace: “Reflection and Action Plan”:**
 - a. Motioned – Monica Romero
 - b. Seconded- Andrew Hoffman
 - c. Correction - N/A
 - d. Abstained - N/A
 - e. Approval- Motion approved on October 1, 2024

E. Announcements & Resources

- o Next Meeting: 10/15/2024
- o [ACCJC Accreditation Standards-2024](#)
- o [Outcomes Assessment Handbook](#)
- o [Meeting Schedule 2024-25](#)

A. Action Item/Next steps: Summary of Action Items

1. **Liza**
 - o Collect feedback from DOCs about the timing for locking and unlocking outcome editing
 - o Committee to vote at next meeting
2. **Andrew and Liza:**
 - o Create a draft of outcomes glossary to share with committee to add their ideas before next meeting.
3. **Andrew:**
 - o Continue working with Academic Affairs on the syllabus checklist.
4. **Monica and Liza:**
 - o Meet to discuss outcomes process flowchart and bring processes to next meeting for review.

Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM. The next meeting will take place on October 15, 2024. Members are encouraged to send any feedback or additional agenda items to Liza Rabinovich and Hai Hoang.

Minutes

1. Submitted by: Liza Rabinovich

Approved on: