



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING**

March 28, 2011

3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. , A141 Conference Room

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. March 14, 2011
5. **PRESENTATION - None**
6. **REPORTS**
 - a. Updates from Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)
7. **ACTION ITEMS – THA 120C; THA 205**
8. **DISCUSSION –**
 - a. SLOs for HD Umbrella Courses - (Melanie Parker)
 - b. Continuing Discussion of GE PLOs – (Melanie Parker)
 - c. Accreditation Concerns – (Melanie Parker)
9. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS - none**
10. **OTHER**
 - a. SLO Committee Faculty Professional Development Events for Spring 2011
 - Learning Outcomes Analysis and Evaluation - Friday, April 29, 1-4 p.m., SSV151
 - Learning Outcomes Update - Thursday, May 12, 4-6 p.m., SSV151
 - Learning Outcomes Update – Friday, May 27, 7-9 p.m., SSV151
 - b. Spring 2011 SLO Committee meeting dates:
 - April 11 and 25
 - May 9 and 23
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
March 28, 2011
Room A141, 3:00 – 4:30 PM

Members Present	Members Absent	Guests in Attendance
Melanie Parker	Michelle Hernandez	Santi Tafarella
Dr. Irit Gat	Rick Motawakel	
Dr. Bassam Salameh	Dr. Rosa Hall	
Maggie Drake		
Dr. Fredy Aviles		
Stacey Adams		
Aaron Voelcker		
Walter Briggs(proxy for Patricia Marquez)		
Kim Covell		
Ted Younglove		

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Ms. Melanie Parker, co-chair of the SLO Committee, called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m.

2. OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SLO COMMITTEE CHAIR (MELANIE PARKER)

–Ms. Parker stated that our guest, Mr. Santi Tafarella, will be speaking to the committee members later in the meeting. She also asked Walter Briggs to give his impression of the Learning Outcomes Analysis and Evaluation flex presentation held on March 24. He stated that he was confused at first but after the exercises and explanation, the process became clearer. He found the process of analyzing data and developing an action plan in WEAVE not as mystifying as he imagined. He felt the Q&A session was great and looks forward to the next presentation. Ms. Parker mentioned PLOs are beginning to come through on the new Excel form and she will provide the committee members a set of PLOs to look through and critique at the next meeting.

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – None

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Ms. Parker asked the members for any corrections to the minutes of the 3/14/10 meeting. With none forthcoming, Ms. Parker requested a motion to approve the minutes. A motion was made and seconded and with no further discussion, the motion was approved.

5. PRESENTATION – No presentations.

6. REPORTS

Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker) –Mr.

Voelcker gave a short review of the SLO presentation given to the Academic Senate Committee. He showed examples of the PLO forms to members and felt that it went very well. He still needs to consolidate the programs in WEAVE but what he presented was well received. Ms. Parker will get copies sent out to the Deans with examples, as well as having them posted to the website and put into the document repository. She asked if members of the SLO committee would volunteer to be contact persons in any areas where there are no facilitators. She would like them to become additional points of reference since she is unable to be everywhere.

7. ACTION ITEMS –

a. Approval of SLOs – THA 120C; THA 205 - Ms. Parker stated that she has received these corrected SLOs and deemed them sufficient to proceed to approval. She requested a motion to approve these SLOs. A motion and second was made and with no further discussion, these SLOs were unanimously approved by the SLO Committee.

8. DISCUSSION

a. SLOs for HD Umbrella Courses - (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker stated that due to time limits, this subject will be postponed to a future meeting date.

b. Continuing Discussion of GE PLOs (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker stated that due to time limits, this subject will be postponed to a future meeting date.

c. Accreditation Concerns - (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker introduced Mr. Santi Tafarella, the AVC Accreditation Coordinator. All members introduced themselves. Mr. Tafarella stated that he recently attended an accreditation conference conducted by the State Academic Senate in Napa, CA. There were representatives from several schools present and some even had teams of 3-4 persons. The President of the State Academic Senate headed the meeting and he presented four things that were being emphasized for accreditation. They are: program review, data-driven planning, documented communication and SLOs. The SLOs were the most prominent of the presentations and discussions. Mr. Tafarella was introduced to a number of colleges using a variety of methods to document SLOs and he felt this information would be of benefit to us. The first example cited was Santa Monica College. They have a database that contains all of their SLOs in a live Internet format. All of their ILOs, PLOs, and planning is linked in one site. They are capable of pulling data from this system and have areas where instructors can document their communications. It was very impressive. Mr. Tafarella suggested we contact Santa Monica for information regarding how BANNER is used in this process. He explained that after an instructor enters a student's grade in the grade book, there is a drop down box listing the three SLOs. Ms. Covell mentioned that this is a custom modification that is not delivered with basic BANNER. Members of the committee commented that WEAVE is already being used for SLO documentation. Mr. Tafarella suggested that perhaps we could get BANNER and WEAVE to "talk" to each other. Ms. Covell indicated that these two programs do not or cannot communicate back and forth so there would be two locations for our data. Some members liked the idea that since the instructors are already logged into MyAVC, it would be a much more convenient way to enter SLO data. Ms. Parker reminded the committee we have focused on SLOs as measurement of group data rather than individual, and entering SLO data in BANNER along with grades would instead put the focus on individual results.

Another college that impressed Mr. Tafarella was Monterey Peninsula College. They start with their planning cycle which is very similar to what we work with here. That flows into their centralized data base with places for instructor reflections on student learning, program reflections on student learning, and action plans. He displayed a flow chart which he felt would

be very beneficial to us. He asked members if this is something that would work for us. A question arose about what instructor reflections refer to and some expressed this was associated with program review. Monterey Peninsula sets aside flex time during semester when this process is worked on. Ms. Parker mentioned that there are many colleges with good ideas, but she feels that we already have a workable structure through WEAVE at AVC. While we are certainly open to new ideas and would be willing to adapt whatever is workable into our own process, we can't throw out what we are already using. Mr. Tafarella stated he would email a link to Ms. Parker with further information.

Mr. Tafarella noted that he is fairly new to the accreditation process and had thoughts that we were recently done with our six-year cycle and there was nothing more to worry about. But he realized at the conference that if we are not in compliance, we could be put on sanction in the fall of 2012. Ms. Parker assured him that the college is well aware of where we stand in the accreditation process and that we hope to be in compliance by that date. Mr. Younglove mentioned that we need to rev up the process between now and then to accomplish this. Mr. Tafarella feels that if community colleges go on sanction, it would give the legislature the grounds to close them down due to the budget issues here in the state. Mr. Younglove stated we have known for awhile now where we need to be and with a lot of help from Ms. Parker and Mr. Voelcker, it looks like we will make it. We need to get to 100% compliance but getting that last 10% is going to be hard. Ms. Drake mentioned that her division has been quite successful in their compliance but it has taken almost around-the-clock encouragement to get to that point. This is what needs to come from every division. She has found that a number of divisions and faculty do not foresee any urgency in this matter, as they see no deadline or consequences. She sees that the requirement of giving a student a grade should also be applied to doing the SLO process, but how do we go about that when right now we have no teeth to enforce what needs to be done? One member commented that perhaps instructors could be "locked out" of entering grades until SLO results were entered. It was pointed out that since two totally separate systems handle SLOs and grades, this could become quite complicated. It was also brought up that forcing the issue of completing SLOs is a union contract matter. Mr. Tafarella has already contacted the union president for clarification on this matter. Ms. Parker will follow this up.

Ms. Parker stated that some portions of the SLO process were getting accomplished but when it comes to assessments and action plans we are lacking. At this point, we are not demonstrating that we "close the loop" or "connect the dots" as an institution. We must have some process that clearly connects SLO and program review work to planning processes. We are beginning to connect the dots between student learning outcome assessment and program review, but we are not certain where to go from there. Based upon Accreditation recommendations we must address this. People need to see this is an integral part of the process.

Mr. Tafarella feels that we need to look at the bigger picture. He suggested that he contact Ms. Mitchell of the Faculty Professional Development Committee to possibly set aside 4-5 days of just strictly SLO flex. Everyone would come together, do the work and get it done. Once they turn in their assessment report, they would receive the flex credit. If a particular group came together, say English 101, they could collectively decide what the three main points that you would like each student to come away with from the class. Based upon SLO results, you could create a wish list of things you wanted if money was available. In order to achieve the goals discussed if we had money, some strategies that we feel would help would be developed. You would then write a half-page report on this, and then do the same with ILOs and then PLOs. With the ILOs, you would show how your discussion related to the broad institutional objectives of the campus. This information could be done for each ILO and be documented on

a form and it would then comprise the documentation that we need for 100% compliance. We would then go to the rubric and show how we plan to sustain it and then we are back on track. Dr. Gat felt that we need to instill fear faculty so they understand that this process is as serious as it gets and if we do not comply, they are putting themselves in a very good position of losing their jobs. The era of complacency is over. Ms. Drake also feels that this is a great way to get the business of the SLOs done and feels that we should pursue this avenue. Ms. Parker asked how we could accomplish something like this and where it would fit into the schedule. Mr. Tafarella said it would be a teaching day and hours would be set aside for this process. It would be mandatory and should follow the end of each semester. Ms. Parker suggested time be allotted at Welcome Back days in fall and spring as we could not suddenly heap new expectations for flex requirements at this point in the year.

Mr. Younglove stated that while the deadline for compliance is Fall 2012, accreditation is looking for 100% assessment within a cycle which would mean we need to be in compliance by June of 2012. He stated that we could do some mop-up during summer and fall, but if we are not even close to 100% in June, then we could not show to the accreditation team that we have accomplished this goal. It was agreed that we need to hit people hard with this work during, June 2011, January 2012 and June 2012. This would give plenty of time to have conversations, document them and create action plans. Dr. Salameh asked if several instructors of one subject met and put together their cumulative work but only one entered data into WEAVE, who or how many would get flex credit. Those entering data can get flex credit according to guidelines that are already established. Since flex guidelines have already been established for this year we can not change requirements midstream.

Mr. Tafarella believes all groups should meet every 2-3 months and that the top administration talk about the need for SLO work and the consequences for not completing it. Each faculty member needs to be persuaded to understand that this means their jobs and/or their pocketbooks. Ms. Drake feels that this whole process should still come from within the faculty structure, with help from the flex committee and Senate to buy into the process. Ms. Adams feels that getting all the specific groups together during Welcome Back Day is a good idea, which would allow them the opportunity to create and document dialogue, although there would not be time to input data. Dr. Aviles stated that perhaps a form reminding faculty of the need to input this data could be put into everyone's mailbox and come with the signature of Dr. Fisher and/or VPs attached. It would require faculty to fill it out and return it. We have given them too much of a rosy picture of our situation and have not given them accurate information on deadlines and where we stand in the whole scheme of things.

Since Mr. Tafarella is on the FPD Committee he will go to Ms. Mitchell about trying to put something together for SLO flex work. Mr. Younglove stated that we really need to get this going in divisions. He had done some calculations and in order for us to get to 100% compliance by June 2012, it would take 80% of his working time and 90% of Aaron's time. They would virtually have no time for anything else. Unfortunately, it is the opinion of the committee members that this process needs to become mandatory and contain sufficient "teeth" behind it to enforce it. Right now, not enough people are taking it seriously and feel the consequences do not apply to them. Dr. Aviles also felt that the SLO process through assessment should be included in the AP&P process before any course can be taught. That is a topic Ms. Parker has already broached with the chair of AP&P, but at present implementing that process is not under consideration.

Ms. Covell was asked about the SLO technology being connected to the BANNER system. She feels that making things better technologically is not the answer. We have had a number of

flexes, division presentations and one-on-one training but it is only getting through to just a few. What we have to do the process is sufficient and faculty just needs to put their minds to it and do the work. Even the facilitators have to hunt down the faculty involved to get assessment data. It's going to end up being time-consuming and difficult unless something is done to "put the fear" into them to do it. As far as connecting to BANNER, the two systems are separate and cannot be joined.

A member asked if compliance in submitting SLO data could be linked to pay. This would obviously be a union issue. But Ms. Drake felt that flex is the way to go and make it geared toward SLOs and their assessment. Another recommendation was that some of the flex obligation be specifically geared to SLO work.

Ms. Drake also suggested to Mr. Tafarella that he make a very impassioned presentation to the Academic Senate with enough scare tactics to get people to start listening. Mr. Tafarella wanted to know if a date had been set for SLO assessment entry into WEAVE. Ms. Drake feels that June 17 is the date to have data entered into WEAVE but Ms. Parker relayed that we have already posted June 10. Ms. Parker also asked the members about the amount of time we need to ask for at the fall welcome back day. Most feel that 3 hours is what is needed in order for all division groups to meet and get their work done and prepared for input. It was also suggested that a joint meeting be arranged between the SLO and flex committees. Ms. Parker will also send e-mails out to the committee members to see what their thoughts are in regard to the discussions that occurred today.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS – none at this time

10. OTHER –

a. SLO Meeting Dates for Spring – April 25, May 9 and 23 – all meetings to be held in A141 unless otherwise notified.

b. FPD events for Spring 2011:

- Learning Outcomes Analysis and Evaluation - Friday, April 29, 1-4 p.m., SSV151
- Learning Outcomes Update - Thursday, May 12, 4-6 p.m., SSV151
- Learning Outcomes Update – Friday, May 27, 7-9 p.m., SSV151

11. ADJOURNMENT – the meeting was adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

pg