

# SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

## Committee on Outcomes and Assessment | Minutes

03.17.26 | 4:00 – 5:00 PM | Zoom ID: 876 9601 0293

### Membership:

<b>Co-Chairs</b>	Liza Rabinovich; Hai Hoang
<b>Leadership Reps</b>	Isabel O'Connor (VPI); Larry Maxey (VPSS); Cynthia Rico (SD); Michael Temple (Counseling); Nancy Cortes (IE/IR); Mary Gwin (AS); Ayana Woods (CS)
<b>Inst. School Reps (not to exceed 3 Deans)</b>	Monica Romero (B&T); Todd Curran (EXSC); Amanda Johnston (HSPS); Pegah Motaleb (HUMA); Katie Palacios / Miguel Murillo Ayala (LRAS); Jose Parral/Dina Miyoshi (SBS); Julie Schafer (M&S); <b><i>Vacant (A&amp;L)</i></b>
<b>Classified Professionals</b>	Ellen Engles (Admin.); Ayana Woods (CS); Celine Ahearn (SS); <b><i>Vacant (Inst.)</i></b>
<b>Student Rep</b>	Ramiah Wilson and Cornor Alexander
<b>Advisory</b>	Ashanti Hands (Pres.); Jacqueline Collins (VPA); Alex Berry (CTE); Rachel Russel (CTE)
<b>Admin Support</b>	Brenna Bonikowske (IE)

### Attendees:

Hai Hoang, Liza Rabinovich, Monica Romero, Isabel O'Connor, Amanda Johnston, Ayana Woods, Celine Ahearn, Cornor Alexander, Mary Gwin, Jacqueline Collins, Jose Parral, Katie Palacios, Larry Maxey, Michael Temple, Miguel Murillo Ayala, Ashanti Hands, Cynthia Rico, Dina Miyoshi, Todd Curran

#### **1. Call to Order**

- a. The meeting was called to order by Liza at 4:03pm
- b. Agenda was reviewed and approved
- c. New Member: Jacqueline Collins

#### **2. Approval of Minutes March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2026**

- a. Motioned: Monica Romero - Seconded: Ayana Woods
- b. Abstained: None
- c. Outcome: Minutes are approved by consensus

#### **3. Communication Loop**

- a. Updates from members:
  - i. Mary: On March 23<sup>rd</sup>, the Academic Senate will hear a presentation by Brian, Karen Waite, and Liza with Allied Health staff present. Public

comments are allowed at the beginning, with up to 15 minutes per topic (3 minutes per individual). Brian will then present on privacy. Afterward, the meeting will continue through the agenda and conclude with a senators-only roundtable discussion; non-senators are able to attend just not give input during the round table discussion. I am sure there will be questions during/after the presentation.

b. Updates from Co-Chairs:

- i. Liza: I contacted Shelly and she responded, but I'm still unclear on the district's specific concern. The outcomes are already locked, and there were no changes to the program's learning outcomes in the updates I sent to Desiree. My guess is Shelly may be worried about timing with catalog updates, but that hasn't been confirmed.
  1. Hai: Lisa, to clarify: our current process was designed to support the district's process and was already built in from prior ACCJC workgroup discussions. I'm also surprised by the concern raised in the email, and it seems Shelly hasn't responded to you yet.
  2. Liza: They had asked us to submit changes by Spring Flex Week so they could update Meta by Fall 2026. I'm not sure what the concern is—my guess is it relates to the catalog, though course learning outcomes aren't included there. I'm still waiting for clarification.
  3. Hai: I can follow up and ask if she'd like to meet briefly.
    - a. Liza: That'd be great; I can be there too if you would like.
- ii. Liza: There was discussion about making outcomes less specific to reduce frequent updates. Isabel suggested using broader or shared outcomes if they align with course objectives and content, to be reviewed with the curriculum committee. I'm unclear on the next steps moving forward.
  1. Isabel: Reach out to Justin to add this as a CRC agenda item—that would be the next step, and you or someone else can present it.
- iii. Liza: I reached out to coordinator listservs about handling disaggregated learning outcomes. Responses have been limited, but those who replied are facing similar challenges—many faculty don't use Canvas, so the process is often manual and time-consuming. Some campuses only use Canvas for final grades and assessments. There's also discussion about advocating funding to support this work. I'll continue following up and researching, and others are encouraged to reach out to contacts at different colleges for additional insight.

1. Hai: I'm also on that listserv and was surprised by how quickly many people responded. This is clearly a hot topic, as institutions are scrambling to find systems to meet the new ACCJC requirement.
2. Liza: I plan to meet with Nuventive to explore possible workarounds. Some programs are also using tools like eLumen or other software to integrate with Canvas and automate the process.
3. Hai: At City College's request, we're organizing a meeting next week with IE deans and the Faculty Outcomes Coordinator to collaborate across the district on how to meet the new requirements.
4. Liza: Will give update at next COA Meeting
- iv. Liza: Training schedules are being shared (and will be posted on the website), including weekly Friday support hours, upcoming trainings on Nuventive reporting/analytics and program learning outcomes assessment, and recorded sessions from the recent DOC orientation.
- c. Isabel: We're currently at 75% compliance on outcomes and closing the cycle—are we expected to reach 100% by June?
  - i. Liza: The goal is 100% by June, and we should be close, but some infrequently offered courses may not be assessed this cycle.
    1. Isabel: Are we going to review or take action based on that number? What's the plan?
      - a. Liza: That number is mainly for tracking, but we could include it in the midterm report to show progress.
      - b. Hai: We should be close to 100% by the end of June, right Lisa?
        - i. Liza: We are at 82% for courses and for Student Services we are at 91%.
      - c. Hai: I'm curious from the committee's perspective whether reaching close to 100% is still a priority, given that some programs may not be assessed in time. Now that we're back on track with compliance, should we keep pushing for 100% or shift focus to other priorities?
    2. Isabel: How are we ensuring we maintain momentum, stay on cycle, and continue this work?
      - a. Liza: I've been sending general email updates and providing detailed reports to departments upon request. I

can resume regularly sharing these with chairs, as done during accreditation. Departments can also track their progress directly in Nuventive.

3. Isabel: Moving forward, departments should create their own assessment cycles to reduce reliance on centralized reminders. While the urgency has eased, maintaining momentum is important to avoid falling behind again.
  - a. Liza: Some departments do create assessment timelines in Nuventive, but they aren't always followed—often due to courses not being offered. This leads to gaps in data, as seen with courses like Shakespeare, creating unique challenges.
  - b. Hai: We can maintain momentum by sharing progress updates less frequently, like a few times per semester.
4. Liza: Some areas are still below 50%, so I'll reach out individually this week to offer support.
  - a. Isabel: Can you share that information with me?
    - i. Liza: Yes.
    - ii. Liza: When developing the new 6-year timeline, we should clearly define annual targets and be more intentional than in the previous cycle.

#### 4. Continuing Business

- a. [ACCJC Rubric and Mesa's Self-Assessment](#) [Activity]
  - a. **Standard 2.3 Group Stated - Developed**
    - i. Isabel: That curriculum is for general education, not major preparation. Correct?
      1. Cynthia: Yes, that's correct—this focuses on general education (GE), not major prep. There are several established GE patterns (e.g., CalGETC, CSU GE, IGETC, bachelor's GE), but the challenge is ensuring the right GE is applied to the right student and catalog year, as there are still gaps in that process.
    - ii. Isabel: This isn't really about assessment itself, but about ownership. With GE or interdisciplinary degrees drawing from multiple disciplines, the key question is who is responsible for assessment and how course-level assessments feed into evaluating the overall GE pattern.

1. Liza: Right now, we only track whether students meet benchmarks, but once we determine how to disaggregate the data, we'll be able to analyze it for GE and other identifiers.
2. Isabel: That data should be collected by GE pattern to assess GE components.
  - a. Liza: Right.

*Liza: How can this committee better support the assessment work? What concrete actions can we take, and were there ideas discussed (or not yet covered) on what this could look like?*

- iii. Isabel: That's a common, ongoing challenge—no one has fully solved it yet. It's challenging because there's no single department overseeing it—courses are spread across disciplines, and students take them for different purposes (GE vs. major prep), complicating how assessment feeds upward.
- iv. Liza: We don't know yet, but this is something we could explore, since dashboards already disaggregate data for course success and retention.
  1. Hai: We have general outcome metrics, but they don't show whether students are demonstrating key competencies like critical thinking or quantitative reasoning—we don't have that data readily available.
- v. Liza: The biggest change in the new standards is the requirement to disaggregate data.
  1. Isabel: I think that the biggest challenge is how to document that effectively.
- vi. Amanda: Would this be something we collect through graduate surveys?
  1. Hai: We've collected this data before and could continue, since a system already exists. However, graduate surveys only capture successful students, so it may be valuable to also assess outcomes across the broader student population.
  2. Amanda: We could track students by their starting cohort and GE pattern, then follow up after about two years with

a survey to assess outcomes—capturing both those who graduated and those who took a different path.

- a. Isabel: We're assessing specific outcomes—what kind of student feedback would we collect?
  - b. Liza: How would it look, and how do we connect it back to the curriculum? That would be a valuable dataset, especially for revisiting institutional learning outcomes and understanding how it drives curriculum improvement.
  - c. Isabel: I think it is capturing a different data point.
3. Liza: Once learning outcomes are disaggregated, Nuventive should allow filtering (e.g., GE and other categories). It's still hypothetical, but we expect a clearer understanding once the system is in place.
    - a. Isabel: The key is putting it all together—while you can disaggregate by course; the more critical piece is combining those courses across GE patterns.
  4. Isabel: Who would do all of the work?
    - a. Liza: I would create the space, train faculty, and guide them on how to interpret the data.
  5. Hai: This likely only captures Canvas users, leaving out those who don't use it.
    - a. Isabel: This is if we connect Canvas to Nuventive, correct?
      - i. Liza: Yes
  6. Hai: Previously, the ILO survey was included in graduate surveys; in 2023, COA separated it into a short standalone survey administered during commencement. Suggested also sending it to a random subset of students to collect learning outcomes data.
    - a. Liza: We would need their student ID's to disaggregate the data.
    - b. Hai: We could include demographic and student progress questions in a short survey as one approach, though it wouldn't be systematic and would still require implementation.
  - vii. Mary: We should be cautious about relying on the Canvas–Nuventive connection, as many faculty may not adopt it due to

privacy concerns. Since it's not guaranteed or required, we need a backup plan for collecting and disaggregating data.

1. Liza: We can pilot the Canvas–Nuventive connection with faculty who opt in, while continuing to explore alternative methods for those who don't use Canvas.
  - a. Mary: If we don't find a solution, someone will—we'll figure it out.

**b. Standard 2.4 Discussion Group Stated - Developed**

- i. Isabel: These are optional examples for making information public—we don't have to do everything, correct?
  1. Liza: To be considered highly developed, information should be publicly available in clear, accessible language—though that standard is subjective.
    - a. Isabel: A syllabus could count as publicly available.
    - b. Amanda: It's publicly available since it's in Meta and accessible without logging in.
    - c. Liza: Outcomes are visible in Meta without logging in and are mostly available, but the classification may be “developed” due to potentially unclear or jargon-heavy language.
- ii. Mary: The group likely rated this as highly developed, since program outcomes are on the website, and courses include clear, plain-language descriptions aligned with those outcomes.
- iii. Todd: One concern was that some CLOs and PLOs use jargon, which raised the question of whether this is fully “highly developed” or still just “developed.”
- iv. Liza: Are we satisfied with current access (syllabi and PLOs online), or should we also add CLOs to the website?
  1. Committee members stated that they would not like to add CLOs to the website.

**c. Standard 2.7 Discussion Group Stated - Developed**

- i. Mary: All three of us were sincere, and I still stand by the information.
- ii. Todd: We agreed we are developed but questioned whether institutional learning outcomes are identified for learning support programs, which affects being “highly developed.”
- iii. Haii: Do we consistently have learning outcomes identified for our learning support programs?

- iv. Liza: The library offers many services (tutoring, training, courses), but lacks overall learning outcomes for learning support programs.
- v. Isabel: We're referring to learning resources/academic support as a whole—while individual areas (tutoring, honors, library) have outcomes; there aren't overarching outcomes for the entire group.
- vi. Hai: If learning support includes library services, do student services also count—and do their programs have defined learning outcomes?
  - 1. Cynthia: Learning support is seen as tutoring and LRC services with direct classroom impact, though others' perspectives are invited.
    - a. Isabel: I agree.
  - 2. Miguel: We offer reference help, workshops, and collaborate with faculty on information literacy—these may also fall under learning support, though it's unclear where they fit.
    - a. Isabel: I believe that would fall in Direct Student Support.
    - b. Liza: Miguel I can connect offline with you on this one.
    - c. Isabel: How do you assess one-on-one meetings—do students fill out a form afterward?
      - i. Miguel: I log student and session details in Gimlet and use a new post-session survey to capture how students were supported (e.g., research, databases, research questions).
    - d. Isabel: Students often think they don't need help but do when writing papers. The challenge is tracking who received support and linking it to course success, similar to tutoring data.
      - i. Miguel: I created a new survey for this semester, previously tracking students via ID in Gimlet, and are considering adding a question to measure long-term impact of research support.

**5. New Business**

- a. Milestone for New 6-Year Timeline: annual benchmark, reassessment expectations, programs with 2 courses, gen ed courses, programs with 1 section [Did not get to]

**6. Announcements**

**7. Next Meeting/Adjournment**

- a. Next meeting: 04.07.26
- b. Liza Adjourned the meeting at 5:01 PM

**Minutes Submitted by: Brenna Bonikowske**

**Approval Date: 04.07.2026**

- 1. Motioned: Monica Romero – Seconded: Amanda Johnston
- 2. Outcomes: Minutes were Approved