

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Committee on Outcomes and Assessment | Minutes

03.03.26 | 4:00 – 5:00 PM | Zoom ID: 876 9601 0293

Membership:

Co-Chairs	Liza Rabinovich; Hai Hoang
Leadership Reps	Isabel O'Connor (VPI); Larry Maxey (VPSS); Cynthia Rico (SD); Michael Temple (Counseling); Nancy Cortes (IE/IR); Mary Gwin (AS); Ayana Woods (CS)
Inst. School Reps (not to exceed 3 Deans)	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); <i>Vacant (A&L)</i>
Classified Professionals	Ellen Engles (Admin.); Ayana Woods (CS); Celine Ahearn (SS); <i>Vacant (Inst.)</i>
Student Rep	Ramiah Wilson and Cornor Alexander
Advisory	Ashanti Hands (Pres.); Lorenze Legaspi (VPA); Alex Berry (CTE); Rachel Russel (CTE)
Admin Support	Brenna Bonikowske (IE)

Attendees:

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

1. Call to Order

- a. The meeting was called to order by Hai Hoang at 4:04 pm
- b. Agenda was approved by consensus.

2. Approval of Minutes February 17th, 2026

- a. Pegah: Am I representing the English Department or all of Humanities?
 - i. Liza: You're not necessarily the DOC for the entire school—just providing updates at department meetings with journalism and humanities faculty. Membership is designated by the school.
- b. Motioned: Monica Romero - Seconded: Ayana Woods - Abstained: Katie Palacios
- c. Outcome: Minutes for February 1, 2026, were approved.

3. Communication Loop

- a. Updates from members:
 - i. Hai: Susan from the district asked if the outcomes are still locked due to concerns about faculty changing them. Liza, do you know anything about that?
 1. Liza: The outcomes are still locked.
 2. Hai: Is it locked until next semester or until we decide?
 3. Liza: Programs submitted outcome changes by the end of Flex Week. I compiled them and sent them to Desiree at the District to update Meta. Outcome changes are still sent to me to update in Nuventive.
 4. Hai: That was the decision we decided on last semester, correct?
 - a. Liza: Yes.
 5. Hai: Isabel, would you like us to email Susan to clarify that process with her?
 - a. Isabel: Yes, please reach out to Susan and Shelly.
 6. Liza: I sent Desiree a spreadsheet highlighting the changes.
 - a. Isabel: They thought no changes were happening, which is why they emailed me.
 - b. Liza: Outcome revisions submitted by Spring Flex Week would be sent to the district and take effect in Fall 2026 to allow time to update Meta.
 - ii. Hai: Liza, can you send an email to Susan and Shelly and CC me and Isabel?
 1. Liza: Yes.
 - iii. Pegah: Where can we find the most updated course outlines?
 1. Liza: Isabel are they still on meta?
 - a. Isabel: Yes, that is where they are. If you do not have access to meta, you can request it through Shelly.
 2. Pegah: Can anyone request access to Meta?
 - a. Isabel: I believe anyone can, just have them contact Shelly.
 - b. Liza: The course outline is public. The course report requires access.
 - c. Pegah: Where can I find the course outline.
 - i. Katie: [Course Outline Link](#)
- b. Updates from Co-Chairs
 - i. COA Website Update: ACCJC 2024 Accreditation Standards.

Liza: I will complete this after today's meeting.

ii. [Midterm Report Template](#)

Hai: Interest was expressed in learning more about the new ACCJC requirements and the midterm template. Timeline: Start review Fall 2026, complete review Spring 2027, governance review Fall 2027, submit March 2028. Key sections include Section A (Continuous Improvement Since the Last Comprehensive Review) and Section C (Assessment of Student Learning).

1. Liza: This was shared at Academic Senate and Chairs. Section C requires not only describing what we're doing, but also using collected data to identify patterns, trends, and action plans.
2. [Full Midterm Report](#)

iii. [Senate Round Table](#)

Liza: Faculty discussed connecting Canvas and Nuventive to obtain disaggregated data for ACCJC. The conversation will continue at a future meeting pending Senate approval. Nuventive addressed privacy concerns using language from the previous resolution and contract.

1. Mary: Exec met yesterday. Senate meets on the 9th with another presentation; you can return on the 23rd. Is that ok?
 - a. Liza: Yes, should we invite other faculty?
 - b. Mary: Yes. Be ready to address privacy, Canvas not being required by contract, and the handout. More discussions can be scheduled later.
 - i. Liza: I can't address privacy—should we invite IT for technical questions?
 1. Mary: Yes, include faculty representation and possibly someone from the district to allow open discussion.
 2. Liza: If District IT is available, can they join?
 - a. Mary: I'll check and follow up.
 - c. Hai: Include faculty who expressed the need; Liza is coordinating, not deciding, so space for discussion is important.

4. Continuing Business

a. [ACCJC Rubric and Mesa's Self-Assessment](#) [Activity]

Hai: The activity assessed where programs stand, identified strengths and gaps, and considered needed support before the midterm report. The next step is to review and add the previous feedback.

Liza: Some suggestions fall outside this committee's purview, so we should consider how to handle that information while focusing on how COA can support the work within its charge.

Hai: Focus on what we can control and pass other ideas to the appropriate group.

i. Standard 1.3 Discussion: Group Stated Developed

1. Celine: The roadmap discussion emphasized aligning outcomes with the college's five-year goals and strengthening cross-department collaboration. Greater awareness of outcomes across areas could support shared data and reduce multiple student surveys.

a. Hai: Would you say that it is more specific to student services than in some other areas?

i. Celine: Understanding outcomes across a school could help create more consistent and aligned outcomes across departments.

b. Hai: Some analytics data was shared in November, but there hasn't been time to fully discuss it due to the focus on maintaining ACCJC compliance over the past two years.

c. Liza: The past two years were mostly a scramble to get everything in place, but we did have some meaningful discussions.

d. Celine: Because students move across pathways and departments, outcomes should have a consistent structure, so data can be meaningful and comparable across areas, rather than collected inconsistent ways.

e. Hai: A key challenge is data paralysis—the inability to take action due to the overwhelming amount of data and analysis.

2. Hai: Do we agree that Standard 1.3 is at the developed level?

a. Consensus agrees

ii. Standard 2.1 Discussion: Group Stated Highly Developed

Liza: Curriculum alignment and streamlining processes are outside this committee's purview, so it's unclear how we should address that feedback.

1. Isabel: Curriculum and outcomes are already reviewed in a six-year cycle, so it's unclear what is meant by alignment, though a faster curriculum process would be helpful.
 - a. Monica: Instructional programs already follow systematic review processes, such as the six-year cycle and CTE's biannual reviews with regular curriculum updates so that is highly developed.
 - b. Isabel: I agree.
2. Dina: The slide referred to challenges with aligning curriculum across district campuses, which can add complexity to the process.
 - a. Isabel: We have aligned curriculum, not aligned programs, which can slow the process. With Common Course Numbering, some elements will be aligned statewide, and the committee is discussing how often they should be reviewed.
3. Liza: Programs systematically review outcomes every 4–6 years and submit revisions as needed, with updates allowed between when necessary to maintain current standards.
4. Amanda: CTE programs are highly developed with two-year reviews, but writing outcomes more generally could allow greater flexibility to adapt to changing professional practices while still maintaining regular reviews.
 - a. Liza: Do you mean making outcomes less specific in the curriculum?
 - i. Amanda: Yes—so outcomes can remain relevant without constant updates.
 - b. Isabel: Using broader or shared outcomes could be possible if they still align with course objectives and content. This approach can be discussed with the Curriculum Committee.
5. Pegah: An experience updating curriculum outcomes across colleges showed the process was unclear and chaotic, with little

coordination or participation. In the end, a small group completed the updates, highlighting confusion about the districtwide process.

- a. Isabel: Outcomes are not required to be aligned across colleges—only objectives are. Faculty can update their own course outcomes. However, coordination across the district is still a challenge, and the district office could provide better support for connecting colleges during curriculum updates.
 - b. Pegah: We met to update Student Learning Objectives and Course Outline and Scope.
6. Mary: Programs control their own outcomes, typically keeping 2–3, but any changes still go through the curriculum process, where other campuses can review and approve or reject them.
 7. Hai: Like curriculum, our research initiates many processes for the district.

iii. Standard 2.2: Group stated Highly Developed

Liza: It's unclear if this is happening campus-wide, since some faculty don't use rubrics, and no decision was made about accountability measures. Input from the group that worked on this would be helpful.

1. Amanda: The group felt some areas were highly developed but had gaps, so overall they leaned toward rating it as developed.
2. Cynthia: Some programs with specialized accreditation lead in assessment practices, while others may have gaps. A key challenge is inconsistent documentation and communication of assessment work across programs.
3. Liza: It's unclear whether "rubrics" refers to classroom grading rubrics or institutional rubrics for departments to self-assess.
4. Isabel: Rubrics should remain program-level, but the campus could do more collective analysis—identifying trends across assessments and connecting them to resources and professional development.
5. Hai: Next COA steps
 - a. Isabel: Identify trends across assessments to better support departments.

- b. Cynthia: Faculty Inquiry Groups (FIGs) and communities of practice allow faculty, such as those in PERG, to meet and discuss their work.
- 6. Hai: Are we okay with not using a traditional rubric?
 - a. Isabel: The concern is avoiding mandates—departments can create their own rubrics, but using a required external rubric would be too prescriptive.
- 7. Hai: ACCJC has not provided one, it is up to us to develop.
 - a. Liza: Outcome rubrics in Canvas could potentially address this, and piloting Canvas outcomes tools would help faculty see how it works.
- 8. Hai: Departments should develop their own processes and share best practices, without a prescribed approach.

5. New Business

- a. Milestone for New 6-Year Timeline [did not get to]

6. Announcements

7. Next Meeting/Adjournment

- a. Meeting was adjourned by Hai Hoang at 4:59 p.m.
- b. Next meeting: 03.17.26

Minutes Submitted by: Brenna Bonikowske

Approval Date: 3/17/2026

- 1. Motioned: Monica Romero – Seconded: Ayana Woods
- 2. Outcomes: Minutes were approved