SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
Committee on Outcomes and Assessment | Minutes
04.21.26 | 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); ***Vacant (A&L)***
Classified Professionals	Ayana Woods (CS); Celine Ahearn (SS); ***Vacant (Inst.); Vacant (Admin.)***
Student Rep	Ramiah Wilson and Cornor Alexander
Advisory	Ashanti Hands (Pres.); Jacqueline Collins (VPA); Alex Berry (CTE); Rachel Russel (CTE)
Admin Support	Brenna Bonikowske (IE)

Attendees:

Hai Hoang, Liza Rabinovich, Ayana Woods, Celine Ahearn. Cynthia Rico, Dina Miyoshi, Jacqueline Collins, Jose Parral, Julie Schafer, Katie Palacios, Larry Maxey, Mary Gwin, Todd Curan, Isabel O'Connor, Michael Temple

1. **Call to Order**
    a. The meeting was called to order by Hai Hoang at 4:05pm

2. **Approval of Minutes from April 7th, 2026**
    a. Motioned: Todd Curan - Seconded: Cynthia Rico
    b. Approval: Minutes are approved

3. **Communication Loop**
    a. Updates from members: N/A

    b. Updates from Co-Chairs

i. Outcomes Status

    1. CLO status: 89%; PLO status: 9.2%; SSO status: 91%

        a. Liza: PLOs are 9.2% due to this semester's assessment timeline. Updates and support will continue. A student survey will gather feedback and assess interest in the PATH program and creative writing certificate to promote certificate completion.

ii. ACCJC – Roadmap 2.0

    1. Hai: PCAB first reading held 4/21/26. Roadmap to 2030 is a 2026–2030 five-year plan with five goals (Completion, Pathways & Partnership, Scholarship, Community, Stewardship), each with long-term goals, outcomes and measures. The framework aligns the mission to the 10-year goals to the 5-year outcomes. The divisions adapt the plan to their areas, and departments align to divisional plans through program review.

        a. Celine: Does a 10-year goal remain valid; it may become outdated.

            i. Hai: We can revisit the plan timeframe and ensure goals are broad and flexible to adapt to future changes.

        b. Celine: Completion and Pathways & Partnerships were seen as overlapping or closely related goals.

            i. Hai: We clarify goal overlap by refining outcomes, while acknowledging some shared end measures. I emphasize integrating assessment across all levels to link goals, implementation, and improvement, and aligning resources with priorities from the institution to departments.

iii. ACCJC Convening 4/13/26

Hai: Federal regulators are considering new accreditation requirements, with a decision expected November 1. The proposal would require colleges to demonstrate standardized student outcomes, potentially tied to return on investment, in addition to existing process-based standards. Details are still under discussion.

Liza: Registration is open for their fall conference. ACCJC Conference Link.

4. **Continuing Business**

   a. [ACCJC Rubric and Mesa's Self-Assessment]

      i. [Summary and Next Steps]

Hai: Reviewed ACCJC rubric self-assessment results. Liza compiled notes into a summary with current ratings, gaps, and suggested next steps. The committee is invited to review, comment, and help prioritize actions.

Liza: We are looking for input on who should be lead of the standard, noting some items may fall outside COA and could be led by other groups/committees.

   b. Discussion on Summary and Next Steps Document
      i. Celine: It is clear and easy to follow.
      ii. Todd: Should leads for each standard be assigned based on breakout group participation or another approach?
         1. Liza: I was just wanting to identify the appropriate group (e.g., curriculum, Academic Senate) to lead each area based on responsibility, since some items fall outside COA's purview.
         2. Hai: How can we move the work forward, including confirming the accuracy of the assessment, refining next steps, and identifying the appropriate groups to lead each area.
      iii. Mary: I think we need to define lead roles, responsibilities, and reporting expectations first to guide appropriate assignments and ensure access and accountability. We should not assign absent groups; maybe we can make it homework to allow time for input.
      iv. Dina: Does COA serve as the central hub for accreditation planning and lead assignments?
         1. Hai: This work extends beyond COA. Maybe COA just makes the initial lead recommendations, then collaborates with other groups.
      v. Mary: Is COA taking responsibility for coordinating accreditation?
         1. Hai: No, that would be a subgroup of the PIE Committee.
         2. Liza: We selected standards tied (directly or loosely) to outcomes assessment. Some could be led by COA, but others fall outside its scope. We're looking for suggestions on where these conversations should begin.
      vi. Mary: Our goal should be to align our work with the midterm report and beyond presenting what we're doing and following through on what we

say. I agree that some standards don't apply to COA. What are the next steps after we form recommendations?

1. Hai: I can raise this with the PIE Committee to discuss how to ensure forward movement, since it came from COA, and we can determine next steps from there.

vii. Mary: When viewing 2.7 Standard. Are you asking COA to define assessment outcomes for that standard? If so, it's unclear why this would fall under COA's role.

1. Liza: We reviewed the rubric because the standard language is vague, but the rubric clearly highlights learning outcomes as a key marker in Standard 2.7.
2. Hai: We can start by identifying who has more insight and beginning the conversation there. If we don't have clear guidance for a standard, we can recommend the standard to a lead.
    a. Mary: It may not be our role to direct how the standard is described and carried out; instead, it may be best to recommend leads and allow them to approach it as they see fit.

viii. Liza: I'm fine with making it homework since we only have one more meeting on May 19th.

1. Hai: We can add suggestions where they fit within COA's scope and leave unclear areas to the PIE Committee for broader input. Then, align any COA-related items with next year's goals to ensure follow-through.

ix. Dina: I think we should review the full rubric—not just top levels—to catch gaps early and avoid missing key areas.

1. Hai: That's a good point—we simplified the process, but that may have led to gaps. As a next step, we can share this as a preliminary COA analysis and recommend that each relevant area review the full rubric to ensure accuracy.

x. Todd: Too complex for one person; since we're not experts, it should be reviewed by subject matter experts.

1. Hai: Start with COA's initial work, then have experts refine it.

xi. Larry: That approach makes sense—Student Services is ready to support and contribute however needed, and it sounds workable.

Hai: We'll treat this as homework since time is short. Please add relevant input and suggest leads in the document. We'll revisit on May 19, and you're also invited to the PCAB Retreat on May 5th to help plan the next steps.

5. **New Business**
    a. Brainstorming for next timeline [Activity]

Hai: With the roadmap and program review changes, we are considering focusing next year on better integration and more meaningful processes, including workshops, a Canvas pilot, and committee work. Program review is also discussing taking next year to rethink changes, rolling them out gradually to ensure they're appropriate.

Liza: We're proposing to pause assessment data entry next year and instead focus on integrating changes to make the process more meaningful, not just for accreditation.

i. Isabel: There's a lot of effort going into this work, but low engagement and general fatigue are real concerns. We need to find ways to make it meaningful and more accessible, so people are more willing to participate.
    1. Liza: The proposal is to spend next year intentionally rethinking the process—starting in the fall—focusing on workload, effectiveness, and better ways to engage people, with input from the committee and others.

ii. Hai: We should keep reflecting on this, but the key issue is engagement—moving beyond compliance to meaningful work. This will require intentional culture change, time, and broad involvement beyond one person or committee.

6. **Announcements**

7. **Next Meeting/Adjournment**
    a. Next meeting: 05.19.2026 (Cancelled)
    b. Meeting was Adjourned by Hai Hoang at 5:02pm.

Minutes Submitted by: Brenna Bonikowske

Approval Date: September 1, 2026

1. Motioned: Pegah Motaleb - Seconded: Eliza Rabinovich
2. Abstained: Amanda Johnston
3. Approval: Minutes are approved by consensus