



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING**

October 25, 2010

3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. A141

To conform to the open meeting act, the public may attend open sessions

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
2. **OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SLO COMMITTEE CHAIR**
3. **OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. October 11, 2010
5. **PRESENTATION - None**
6. **REPORTS**
 - a. Updates from Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)
 - b. Certificate and Degree PLO Updates (Melanie Parker)
7. **ACTION ITEMS – SLOs for approval:**
 - Graduation Evaluation
 - BUS 121
 - FTV 244, 242, 230
 - DM 145L, 127L, 143L, 110L, 112L, 106L, 101L, 206L, 298L
 - MKTG 112
 - PHTC 150L, 201L, 203L, 211L, 275L, 298L, 205L, 101L, 125L
8. **DISCUSSION –**
 - a. G.E. PLOs (Dr. Lee Grishman)
 - b. WEAVE mapping (Aaron Voelcker)
 - c. Proposed PLO Cycle of Assessment (Melanie Parker)
 - d. Planning for November 19th and December 2nd Learning Outcomes Updates
9. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS - none**
10. **OTHER**
 - a. Dates of remaining SLO meetings:
 - November 8
 - November 22
 - b. SLO Committee Faculty Professional Development Events for Fall 2010
 - Learning Outcomes Update – Friday, November 19, 4 to 6 PM, SSV151
 - Learning Outcomes Update – Thursday, December 2, 7 to 9PM, SSV151
11. **ADJOURNMENT**

NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY

Antelope Valley College prohibits discrimination and harassment based on sex, gender, race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, cancer-related medical condition, or genetic predisposition. Upon request, we will consider reasonable accommodation to permit individuals with protected disabilities to (1) complete the employment or admission process, (b) perform essential job functions, (c) enjoy benefits and privileges of similarly-situated individuals without disabilities, and (d) participate in instruction, programs, services, activities, or events.



ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME COMMITTEE MEETING
October 25, 2010
Room A141, 3:00 – 4:30 PM

Members Present	Members Absent	Guests in Attendance
Melanie Parker	Dr. Fredy Aviles	Tatiana Konovalov – ASO rep
Dr. Rosa Hall	Michelle Hernandez	
Dr. Irit Gat	Ted Younglove	
Aaron Voelcker		
Dr. Bassam Salameh		
Rick Motawakel		
Maggie Drake		
Patricia Marquez		
Stacey Adams		
Kim Covell		

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Ms. Melanie Parker, co-chair of the SLO Committee, called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

- **OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SLO COMMITTEE CHAIR (MELANIE PARKER)** – Ms. Melanie Parker welcomed the Associated Student Organization Representative, Tatiana Konovalov, to the Student Learning Outcomes Committee. Committee members introduced themselves and were pleased to finally have the opportunity to obtain the student’s perspective on SLOs.

The Department of Institutional Research and Planning were applauded for receiving a commendation from the Accreditation Team for providing a culture of evidence. The commendation was well deserved for the great work performed campus wide by members of the Department.

- **OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC** – No public comments.
- **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Ms. Parker asked the members for any corrections to the minutes of the 10/11/10 meeting. With none forthcoming, Ms. Parker asked for a motion to approve. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. With no further discussion, the motion passed.
- **PRESENTATION** – No presentations.
- **REPORTS**
 - a. **Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)** – Mr. Voelcker indicated there was nothing new to report. He is currently fine tuning the mapping functions in WEAVE.

b. Certificate and Degree PLO Updates (Melanie Parker) - Ms. Parker reported Deans have been notified of the work remaining to complete Certificate and Degree PLO development/assessments. She has finalized the scheduling of five PLO writing workshops through the Faculty Professional Development Program. Ms. Stacey Adams, Ms. Maggie Drake, and Ms. Melanie Parker will be providing brief divisional presentations in their particular divisions (Business, Computer Studies, and Economic Development; and Technical Education) on Certificate and Degree PLO information. Ms. Parker stated the committee will not formally approve submitted PLOs. The committee will provide guidance and input on PLO development, curriculum mapping, and acknowledge receipt of completed PLOs .

Ms. Kimberly Covell inquired how the PLOs for Student Services will be included in the WEAVE mapping process since they will not be using the curriculum mapping function created for PLO assessment. Mr. Voelcker indicated there are some alternate means in which Student Services can still use some of the features created for PLO statistical data and will look into the matter further to create modifications as needed.

Ms. Parker indicated that since Student Services has most of their PLOs created, the real push for PLO completion will be concentrated in academic areas. She will discuss the matter further with the Department of Institutional Research and Planning to determine modifications needed in order to meet the needs of data collection for Student Services PLOs.

• **ACTION ITEMS – approval of SLOs:**

- Graduation Evaluation
- BUS 121
- FTV 230, 242, 244
- DM 101L, 106L, 110L, 112L, 127L, 143L, 145L, 206L, 298L
- MKTG 112
- PHTC 101L, 125L, 150L, 201L, 203L, 205L, 211L, 275L, 298L

A motion was made and seconded to approve the above SLOs which passed the technical review process. Ms. Parker offered her gratitude to Dr. Irit Gat for performing the Technical Review Process with the above SLOs. All SLOs met established SLO rubric requirements instituted by the committee for formal approval. Motion carried.

• **DISCUSSION**

a. GE PLOs (Dr. Lee Grishman) – Ms. Parker stated Dr. Grishman was not available to attend the scheduled meeting. Since he is the primary G.E. PLO facilitator, this discussion item should be postponed to the next SLO meeting. Committee members were in consensus to postpone this discussion item to a future meeting.

b. SLO WEAVE Mapping (Aaron Voelcker) - Mr. Aaron Voelcker reported the primary feedback received regarding WEAVE mapping was cosmetic. There was a function error reported which has been corrected and is now working properly. All cosmetic feedback received has been addressed accordingly. Currently, the database is ready for campus use when the committee is ready to move forward. Ms. Drake cautioned moving forward with this process without a thorough testing being performed by committee members. She stated she was not able to move beyond the initial function error which occurred at the beginning of the data entry process. Ms. Parker requested Mr. Voelcker redistribute the corrected database to committee members for further testing. All revisions or problems encountered should be reported immediately in efforts to move forward with this process and have prepared for implementation prior to the scheduled PLO Write-In workshops.

c. Proposed PLO Cycle of Assessment (Melanie Parker) - Ms. Parker indicated after much consideration of the SLO and PLO processes, she believes the committee must consider the

need for creating a PLO cycle of assessment. There is a need to initiate the assessment process to get the campus progressing in the area PLO development and assessment. She conveyed it is her belief that implementing a three year cycle of assessment, requiring the assessment of at least one PLO annually or biannually, will move the campus towards making more data-driven decisions based on assessments. Ms. Drake remarked it is important to move towards a PLO assessment cycle but the committee must ensure faculty are aware of the necessity to include assessments when creating PLOs. Ms. Parker indicated if the committee is in agreement with moving forward in creating a PLO Cycle of Assessment, they would have to allow enough flexibility for individualization for different programs. Procedures within the process have to be flexible enough to allow program faculty to assess PLOs in a manner that best fits individual disciplines. A holistic approach must be presented to the campus so everyone is aware and understands the entire process of PLO development and assessment. Ms. Parker stated she will distribute a sample cycle to committee members electronically for consideration in determining whether to formalize a PLO Cycle of Evaluation. She stressed if the committee decides to move forward in implementing a cycle for PLO assessment it will need to be flexible. Faculty should not be restricted to assessing their PLOs according to one specific cycle that may not fit the boundaries of their discipline, degree, or certificate. At the same time, there must be overall consistency in our approach and a clear understanding of what is expected in the PLO development and assessment process. The Accreditation Commission has publicly announced campus SLOs and PLOs are to be created for all programs/certificates by fall 2012. Additionally, once established, faculty need to move immediately forward with preliminary data assessment. This is one of the primary reasons behind the proposal to implement a PLO Cycle of Assessment. The committee needs to ensure establishing a cycle of assessment will meet the Accrediting Commission's deadline date.

d. Planning for November 19th and December 2nd Learning Outcomes Updates -

Because today's meeting will adjourn early due to the Accreditation Steering Committee debrief at 4 p.m., discussion on this topic was limited. Ms. Parker stated she will email committee members in the next week for assistance in the planning and presentation of the upcoming Learning Outcomes Updates. All committee members were encouraged to participate in scheduled SLO-related workshops in order to interact with faculty, participate in discussion, and ensure we move forward with a common purpose and understanding.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS – none at this time

10. OTHER –

a. SLO Meeting Dates for Fall – The remaining SLO Committee meeting dates are November 8 and November 22. Please remember that the November 8th meeting will be held in the President's Conference Room.

b. Remaining FPD events for fall:

- Learning Outcomes Update – Friday, November 19, 4 to 6 PM, SSV151
- Learning Outcomes Update – Thursday, December 2, 7 to 9PM, SSV151

c. Ms. Patricia Márquez, Faculty Accreditation Coordinator, provided a brief report on the SLO Accreditation Team Recommendation. One of the main issues the team focused on is how assessment data is being used to evaluate student success/retention. Currently, the SLO Committee Co-Chair and the Program Review Coordinator are working together to more completely tie SLOs into the Program Review Process. Efforts to clearly connect SLO/PLO data results to decisions made in regards to programs, must be documented in both Program Review reports and in WEAVEonline. The Accreditation recommendation was not a big surprise. The important issue addressed was maintaining the SLO process and procedure which has been holistically accepted campus wide. Ultimately, the Accrediting Commission has established a final deadline for districts to develop and assess PLOs, which is one of the

primary reasons for the recommendation. They want to ensure they have clearly communicated that all SLO/PLO development and assessment are established by the fall 2012. The committee is on the right path and have the steps in place but must move the campus swiftly in the direction of finalizing the process.

In addition, the visiting team specifically recommended improvements be made in the area of accurately documenting discussions which lead to a change in operational decisions. It is imperative to depict the entire cycle of dialogue through discussion, analysis, and changes made as a result of discussions. It was very evident the evaluation team was focused on how we “close the loop” in the cycle of evaluation. There are some gaps in evidence especially in various committee and department meeting minutes. There is a need to incorporate new methods of documenting dialogue of assessment discussion in meetings. Often times these conversations occur in the hallways, over coffee, and other places outside official documented meetings which makes it difficult to provide supportive evidence of changes made as a result of discussions occurring based on a campus wide process. It was proposed to include a standing SLO/PLO agenda item for division agendas to document dialogue. Beyond the documenting dialogue there needs to be a standardized process to ensure appropriate evidence is available prior to moving to an action plan. The WEAVE software has a document repository where documents (i.e. committee minutes, forms created, graphs, etc.) can be attached to provide a clear evidence documentation trail. Kim Covell recommended this function be utilized by staff and faculty for documentation of SLO-related discussion and decision-making.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the committee moving to complete electronic submission process for SLOs/PLOs. Some committee members expressed the need to maintain continuity and believe that offering a dual submission process would be more advantageous in acquiring necessary course/program assessment data. Ms. Parker stated offering a dual system still requires someone who will enter the data into WEAVE. The Department of Institutional Research and Planning (DIRP) staff cannot take the time to enter data when they have more important data projects they need to be concentrating on. Unless the data has been entered the DIRP is unable to perform data analysis for courses and/or programs. Currently, the PLO process will follow a common format very similar to that used with SLOs. Some of the forms will need some minor language revisions to provide clear definitive information on the process, but beyond these minor language changes the process will remain parallel to what was instituted for submitting SLOs.

A concern was raised on why all SLOs indicate success at 70%. Faculty may need the assistance of the DIRP office to develop alternate achievement targets. Target rates are created and agreed to through faculty dialogue and it may be trial and error that establishes appropriate levels for achievement targets. When faculty analyze assessments, the staff from DIRP should be included in dialogue regarding the creation of appropriate measurements to indicate success.

11. ADJOURNMENT – the meeting was adjourned at 3:59 p.m.

gmk