



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING**

March 22, 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. March 8, 2010
5. **PRESENTATION - None**
6. **REPORTS**
 - a. Flex Event 3/12 (Melanie Parker)
 - b. SLO Coordinators Regional Meeting 3/18 (Melanie Parker)
 - c. Madera Assessment Workshop 3/19 (Melanie Parker)
 - d. Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)
7. **ACTION ITEMS**
 - a. Acknowledgement of revised and updated PLOs/SLOs from the following Student Service area: Admissions and Records, Cal Works, Counseling, EOP&S, Financial Aid, Information and Welcome Center, Job Placement Center (PLOs #2, 3, and 4), Star/SSS, Student Development and College Activities, Student Health Services, Veteran's Affairs (Please note that SLOs for SOAR are in process).
8. **DISCUSSION –**
 - a. Assessment Plan for 2010/2011 - Revisions
 - b. Spring 2010 Reporting Guidelines – Final Revisions
 - c. Assessment Form – Final Revisions
 - d. Planning for “WEAVE Week” – May 17 through 20
 - e. Planning for SLO Committee Socials
 - f. Continued Brainstorming – Planning for Staff and Faculty Involvement
9. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS - none**
10. **OTHER**
 - a. Remaining SLO Meetings (all in A41) – 4/12, 4/26, 5/10, 5/24
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 22, 2010
Room A141, 3:00 – 4:30 PM

Members Present	Members Absent	Guests in Attendance
Melanie Parker	Michelle Hernandez	
Kim Covell	Dr. Bassam Salameh	
Dr. Irit Gat	Yvette Cruzalegui	
Ted Younglove		
Aaron Voelcker		
Patricia Marquez		
Dr. Fredy Aviles		
Rick Motawakel		
Dr. Rosa Hall		
Maggie Drake		

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.

2. OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SLO COMMITTEE CHAIR (MELANIE PARKER) – Ms. Parker wished to thank each committee member for their dedication and commitment to the SLO process. Ms. Parker spent May 18 and 19 at different SLO/Assessment meetings and this was the one thing that stood out to her as she spoke with representatives from other campuses. She appreciates the support the SLO Committee is dedicating to the process.

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – No public comments.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – The minutes of the March 8, 2010 were presented for approval. No corrections were forthcoming from the committee members. Ms. Parker asked for a motion to approve. A motion and a second came from committee members to approve the minutes. With no further discussion, the minutes were approved.

5. PRESENTATION – No presentations.

6. REPORTS

a. Flex Event 3/12 (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker stated that the professional development event, “Learning Outcomes: PLO Write In”, had no attendees. Melanie, Christos Valiotis, and Maggie Drake were there to assist attendees but instead had a productive conversation concerning next steps we need to take in the SLO and assessment process. The afternoon event, “Learning Outcomes: Analysis and

Evaluation”, had a small turnout (both full time and adjunct faculty) and attendees came with questions about the entire SLO process. People who attended expressed that getting “a big picture” view was helpful and requested that Ms. Parker come to department meetings when more faculty are present to ask questions. She agreed to do that and is willing to schedule with others as needs arise. The next professional development events are scheduled for Friday May 7th. “SLOs Made Easy: Using WEAVE to Manage Assessment” will take place from 10 a.m. to noon. It will be followed in the afternoon by “Learning Outcomes: Spring Update”. Later in the meeting, the committee will discuss ideas for making the Spring Update a combined instructional/social event in order to attract more attendees.

b. SLO Coordinators Regional Meeting 3/19 (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker appreciated the opportunity to interact with people from other campuses. Many relayed that progress in SLOs and assessment really did not happen until they were put on warning by their accreditation teams. There was news that several campuses have withdrawn funding for SLO Coordinators due to budget issues. In Ms Parker’s discussion group, one woman was a former coordinator who came to the meeting on her own expense and time because she is concerned about progress on her campus. At the same table were two newly hired coordinators, in fulltime positions, so it seems some colleges have found the money to prioritize the process. Some attendees were very confident that their colleges would sail through accreditation and others were feeling rather hopeless.

Another talking point emphasized at the coordinators meeting is the issue of how we communicate appropriately to the different audiences that are involved in SLOs and assessment. This includes the students, faculty, staff, and the community. Many have resisted including SLOs on course syllabi due to contractual issues but attendees were reminded that students need to be given information regarding SLOs. On our own campus, a variety of communication methods have been used: SLOs as part of the syllabus or as an attachment to the syllabus, links to AVC SLOs online, notations on course assignment formats linked to SLO assessment, and verbal communication in class. The committee’s impression is that many students are not receiving information regarding SLOs and that others on campus may not be getting the correct information or all of the information that they should have. Another point emphasized at the meeting is that we be certain we are assessing through multiple measures and that we are including authentic assessment. Janet Fulks commented that “We are sending students into an ‘open-book world’ and we need to be certain we are using ‘open-book’ (authentic) measures.” Ms. Parker liked the analogy suggested by the SLO Coordinator from Diablo College: “Working with SLOs and assessment is like watching my grandchildren learn how to walk. There are developmental stages that build one upon another.” His point was that we understand working with SLOs as a developmental process. We are learning as we go, sometimes learning best from our mistakes along the way. He emphasized his belief that we avoid too much “hand-holding” and be willing to let faculty and staff learn developmentally through the process. A third point emphasized was the need to communicate success stories that will encourage others to participate more fully in the process. Attendees were encouraged to develop a common language, create venues for wide-spread dialogue across campus, focus on closing the loop, and know that now we are entering a developmental stage. In this stage our focus should shift to quality learning assessment work, making sure that we have strong SLOs and appropriate assessments in place.

c. Madera Basic Skills Meeting 3/19 (Melanie Parker) – There was much review of assessment practices during the morning session, and discussion again focused on speaking a common language and being sure that our students know what we are doing and why. Presenters emphasized the need to go beyond cognitive skills so that our students can apply what they are learning in class to make real-life decisions. The second half of the day was geared towards Faculty Inquiry Groups (FIGs). Diane Flores-Kagan, Agnes Jose-Eguaras, and other AVC faculty working with the Basic Skills Initiative are very interested in this approach and have submitted a proposal to establish FIGs as part of the 2010-2011 professional development program. This could provide an important avenue for the dialogue and analysis of our SLO assessment processes. Dr. Hall stated that the juncture between basic skills and SLOs is becoming much more apparent, and Ms. Parker stated she is beginning to realize we are all teaching basic skills students even though we may not be teaching basic skills courses. Ted Younglove commented that the percentage of incoming students who tested into at least one basic skills course as of Fall 2008 was 95.5%.

d. Office of Institutional Research (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker) – Mr. Younglove will be introducing the topic of WEAVE Week at the Dean's Meeting Tuesday. He will let the deans know that we need names of faculty who will be facilitating the WEAVEonline process for each specific subject area. Dr. Hall requested that Ted communicate this information at her Student Services Dean's meeting as well. Weave Week will include morning (8:30 -10:30 am) sessions and afternoon (1:30-3:30 pm) sessions each day of the week, May 17th through 21st. All sessions will be held in BE 310. We are currently working on arranging evening sessions, tentatively scheduled for Monday and Tuesday evenings. Any committee members able to attend and lend their support would be appreciated. Ms. Parker asked Aaron Voelcker to grant each SLO committee member READ permission in WEAVEonline, in order for committee members to track campus progress. Aaron agreed to do this. Dr. Hall mentioned that we must consider how we are tying budget requests and information into WEAVE as this will be important for "closing the loop" and for planning supply and personnel budgets. This is an area we need to move into. Mr. Voelcker will be giving a WEAVEonline Board presentation on April 12. He has created a "dummy" course for the presentation. Ms. Parker mentioned that anyone on the committee still needing WEAVE training should schedule a time with Aaron. Ms. Parker asked Aaron to bring a computer to one of our next meetings so that the committee can see the progress made in WEAVE.

7. ACTION ITEMS – the SLO Committee acknowledges the revised and updated PLOs/SLOs from the following Student Service Area: Admissions and Records, Cal Works, Counseling, EOP&S, Financial Aid, Information and Welcome Center, Job Placement (PLOs #2, 3 and 4), Star/SSS, Student Development and College Activities, Student Health Services, Veteran's Affairs.

8. DISCUSSION

a. Assessment Plan for 2010/2011 (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker wants to make sure we will all be on the same page and that we are communicating standardized information regarding next year's plan. The process we have discussed includes: 1- asking that every SLO for each course be assessed at least once during next year's academic cycle, 2- that uniform due dates be listed (on or before the grade reporting deadline for academic SLOs and on or before June 30th for Student Service and operational areas), and 3- the process for reporting and to whom we are reporting. (Pat Gordon is working on an Excel spread

sheet that divisions will use to communicate the names and contact information for WEAVE Facilitators beginning this semester.) Dr. Irit Gat asked what should be done with courses that are not taught at all during the cycle and if there is a way to indicate that in WEAVE. She mentioned that if a class is entered in WEAVE but no assessment numbers are indicated, it brings down our stats. Mr. Voelcker suggested that when faculty reach the action plan portion of the course, they input that the course was not taught during that academic cycle and therefore no action plan has been entered. When the total report is run, all the numbers will be counted. Ms. Parker believes next year should be used as a baseline year and that is why we will ask for 100% SLO assessment. Mr. Younglove feels that after 2010-2011, we can go to a 50/50 assessment cycle where each division designates 50% of their courses to be assessed the first year and the remaining 50% the second year. Dr. Hall feels that since the assessment process is tied with budget and everyone needs budget each year, it should be tied with the program review reports done every four years and the mini-reviews done annually. Since we have the budget model in WEAVE, it should be utilized. Ms. Parker is sensitive to the issue that many campuses are only asking that courses be assessed on a three or four year cycle. Some committee members feel that it becomes confusing if SLO guidelines change from year to year. Ms. Parker agrees that is a valid concern and that we want to encourage as much assessment as possible but also do not want faculty to feel overloaded by the process. Hopefully, faculty will continue to see we do not have to “reinvent the wheel” and that most of them can use assignments and exams already in place as assessment of their SLOs.

b. Spring 2010 Reporting Guidelines – Final Revisions (Melanie Parker) – Dr. Hall recommends that paragraph 2 also be highlighted in yellow. All feel that the form is now ready for distribution. The term “WEAVE Facilitator” is acceptable to all. In regard to reporting dates for Student Services and operational areas, they believe that June 30th is acceptable. Ms. Parker will finalize this form, one for Student Services, and another for Operational Outcomes, and forward them to the committee for final review.

c. Assessment Form – Final Revisions (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker shuffled information on the form to better reflect how data is entered into WEAVE. She put the course name at the top, followed by the SLOs being studied. She included a dialogue box for Data Analysis and another one for the Action Plan. The boxes can be expanded as needed. It will be posted on the website as an optional, recommended tool for use when analyzing SLO data. It was recommended that we post examples from academic, operational, and Student Services area.

d. Planning for WEAVE Week (May 17-20) – Much of this information was discussed previously in the meeting. Dates are May 17-21 in Room BE 310. Times are 8:30 – 10:30 a.m. and 1:30 to 3:30 p.m. Evening sessions are also being arranged.

e. Planning for SLO Committee Socials – Ms. Parker recommended that we turn the flex event on May 7 (Spring SLO Update) into both an instructional and social gathering, incorporating Patricia Marquez’s suggestion from the March 8 committee meeting. She would like the committee to gather success stories that can be communicated both orally and in print. (These could also be posted online.) Ms. Parker asked that each member of the committee think about success stories they have heard and send any stories or contact information to her via email. There appear to be several stories in Admissions and Records. Ms. Parker would also like to accumulate success stories from students. We need to communicate basic information and campus progress in order to give participants a holistic view of SLOs and assessment processes. Another idea is to develop a game or activity to explore the progress we have made (or need to make) in “speaking the same

assessment language”. We want to provide goodies (maybe ice cream and/or sandwiches) so we will check on the Senate budget for that. If there is no budget, we will see what committee members are willing to contribute food-wise. Pat Gordon will check on budget.

f. Continued Brainstorming – Planning for Staff and Faculty Involvement – Ms. Parker has approached the Professional Development Committee (Kathryn Mitchell) with a proposal for Welcome Back Day. She has spoken with Christos Valiotis, Academic Senate President, regarding her ideas and he is very supportive. The proposal is to allow a block of time (1 1/2 hours was suggested) for people to work on departmental SLO-related tasks individualized to each area’s needs. For example, some areas may need to write PLOs, others may need to revise SLOs and assessments or write action plans, some may need to analyze assessment results from the 2009-2010 academic year, and others may need to enter information into WEAVE. We would ask SLO committee members and others who have been trained in the SLO process to facilitate the work groups and provide assistance as needed. Dr. Hall remarked that she believes this idea and process would be an outstanding example of our SLO efforts for the accreditation team’s fall visit. Since full time faculty are required to attend Welcome Back events and will receive Standard 1 flex credit, and many adjunct faculty seem to attend the day’s events as well, we believe this could be a good venue for involving people across campus in the SLO process. It would require much research and planning to pull off, but we would have the whole summer to prepare for this event. Faculty and staff could be notified by e-mail in order to be prepared for the work their group needs to accomplish. This would allow participants the opportunity to come prepared to work. Ms. Parker hopes to attend a future Faculty Professional Development Committee meeting to give further information to the committee and to solicit feedback.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS – none

10. OTHER –

a. Remaining SLO Meetings (all in A141) – 4/12, 4/26, 5/20, 5/24

b. It suggested that we have a person representing an operational area on the committee. Ms. Parker will check with Pam Ford on this as there is one spot open for classified staff which has not been filled. It was also suggested that we invite Ms. Wallace and Mr. Turner to future meetings.

c. Dr. Hall commented that there should be a much clearer link to the SLO website and the committee agrees. Ms. Parker will explore this with our webmaster.

d. Ms. Parker passed out the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III along with a checklist for committee members to use in assessing our progress. Most of the committee members felt that we have accomplished some goals in Development, Proficiency, and Sustainable Improvement, but we need to start filling in the holes that remain.

11. ADJOURNMENT – the meeting was adjourned at 4:22 p.m.

pag