



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING**

May 9, 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. April 25, 2011
5. **PRESENTATION - None**
6. **REPORTS**
 - a. Updates from Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)
7. **ACTION ITEMS –**
 - a. PLOs for approval: Clothing and Textiles – Fashion Design; Electrical ; Interior Design; AUTO-Driveability; AUTO-Engines; Bookkeeping; Child and Family Education; Child and Family Education-School-Aged Child Care; Electronics Technology
 - b. SLOs for approval: PE 237
8. **DISCUSSION –**
 - a. Fall Welcome Back Proposal and Planning - (Melanie Parker)
 - b. Accreditation Concerns – Strategic Planning – (Melanie Parker)
9. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS - none**
10. **OTHER**
 - a. SLO Committee Faculty Professional Development Events for Spring 2011
 - Learning Outcomes Update - Thursday, May 12, 4-6 p.m., SSV151
 - Learning Outcomes Update – Friday, May 27, 7-9 p.m., SSV151
 - WEAVE Data Days – Wednesday, June 8 and Thursday, June 9, 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. and 1:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m., BE310
 - b. Spring 2011 SLO Committee meeting dates:
 - May 23
 - Pre-Welcome Back Day meeting TBA for summer
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
May 9, 2011
Room A141, 3:00 – 4:30 PM

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

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Ms. Melanie Parker, co-chair of the SLO Committee, called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

2. OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SLO COMMITTEE CHAIR (MELANIE PARKER) – Ms. Parker welcomed Dr. Fredy Aviles as the new chair of the SLO Committee beginning fall of 2012. He will be shadowing Ms. Parker during the next year to familiarize himself with the functions and issues of the committee. Ms. Parker found it to be very appropriate for one of the committee members to step forward to take on this role.

3.

She would also like to add to the agenda two items:

a. Report by Dr. Aviles, attendee at the SLO Basic Skills Symposium on May 6, 2011, to be labeled 6b. Ms. Parker requested a motion from the members to add this. A motion and second was forthcoming and with no further discussion, the motion was approved to add this agenda item.

b. Discussion item to be labeled 8a. Utilizing full-time faculty from another division who wish to volunteer as WEAVE facilitator for another division. Ms. Parker requested a motion from the members to add this. A motion and second was forthcoming and with no further discussion, the motion was approved to add this agenda item.

4. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – None

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Ms. Parker asked for any corrections to the minutes of April 25, 2011. With none forthcoming, Ms. Parker asked for a motion to approve the minutes. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes and with no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

6. **PRESENTATION** – No presentations.

7. **REPORTS**

Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker) – Mr. Younglove recently attended the ARC Research and Planning Group Conference. One of the discussions highlighted programs with promising SLO practices. One example was Mesa College in Arizona. They do an “Assessment Week” which Mr. Younglove would like to see us adapt for use at AVC. They publicize with posters and a website; the goal is to get everyone involved in completing assessments during a one week span. They provide as much assistance as possible and then they do a report on the findings from the week which is presented at a future date. Historical overviews of the different areas are highlighted, including where each area is in the process and what has been happening.

Mr. Younglove feels that our college should try something like this and if all concur, then he would start putting something together. He feels that ideally we would go with two assessment weeks, one in the late fall and one in the late spring. All areas of assessment are done, including programs and general education. One of the difficulties brought up was the different time frames of assessment for course SLOs. Some can be done just after the course starts and others have to wait until the end when final projects are completed. Doing two assessment weeks would help solve some of this problem and capture the time frame of the different assessment cycles. Hopefully, this might help the people who get really close to finishing their input into WEAVE and then start to procrastinate. It also might be a good idea to discuss this during our Welcome Back Days. Ms. Parker really likes this idea and feels that we can adapt it to our needs, especially with General Education assessments and would like to see the experienced faculty act as volunteers for the first assessment week. The program at Mesa has their students design their posters which are put around campus and online. We need to get moving on this right away if we plan to do this next year. We could announce and distribute information at Fall Welcome Back and the first assessment report could be done at the Spring Welcome Back Day. and any help from the committee members would be greatly appreciated. With the 2012 deadline coming soon, we need to do something that can motivate right away. All members gave their approvals for Mr. Younglove to proceed.

Secondly, Mr. Younglove discussed assessment of the General Education PLOs. He has worked with Dr. Grishman and we have actual survey questions linked to the ILOs. We can not just go with a survey but need to come up with student measurements in the various subject areas. He would need faculty in each area help, especially with working on critical thinking skills. He would like to try and take a random sample of GE students within courses that promote this skill. Help from faculty would be needed in order to determine which G.E. courses are heavy on critical thinking skills. We would then need to come up with a hard measure to gauge this to. Dr. Gat asked if we were not going to do the self-survey. Mr. Younglove replied that accreditation does not like to see just surveys alone. They expect you to come up with ways to sample each of the areas in general education. Ms. Drake feels that the assessment tools that we have formulated for the mastery courses could be applied for this. Mr. Younglove mentioned that a possible option would be a multiple choice question that could be administered in various required GE classes. Ms. Drake mentioned that you could take the results from those students and compare them to see how well they did in understanding the basis for each of the GE sections. A target could be set that would be the same measure across all courses in a certain area. But it must be kept in mind that a separate target must be used in different areas and utilized by all faculty in that area. Ms. Adams mentioned that faculty who

are teaching these courses may be using something already which could be incorporated into the GE areas. Mr. Younglove will check on this further.

6b. Report by Dr. Aviles on attending Basic Skills Symposium, May 6, 2011 – Dr. Aviles stated that many people were discussing the problems they are encountering. Included in this discussion were issues of sample size, using the same assessment vs. multiple assessments, and issues where you have programs with only one or two students graduate per year. With such a small number, how do you go about trying to do an assessment? There did not seem to be a good answer to this.

Dr. Aviles passed out handouts he received from the symposium. Some contained good examples of SLO and PLO assessment, including some from GE areas. He also learned about an online link called “the cloud” that is to be forwarded to him. On this link, colleges are posting creative ways to solve problems. This will be the “go-to” site for all other colleges to see if they can find something that will help them. There was also an east coast college that had put together a very good video on how to explain SLOs to students. He also was informed of work being done at Barstow College which created a website of successes and failures.

Another great example and award winner (CHIA Award) was a comprehensive assessment report from the chemistry department at this particular college. They put together an exit exam to assess their program and found out during this that their performance was going down. They realized that the manuals they were using were too long and took time away from learning other things. They decided to eliminate the manual and create their own. This improved their performance which is reflected in their report where they show the progression from start to finish. All of this will be listed on the link that will be forwarded to everyone once he receives it. We should check it out to see if there is something that our college can use to help solve our own problems.

Colleges are struggling with assessment just like we are but there was very little talk on solutions to GE assessments. All stated that it cannot be solved with surveys alone. The main thing coming from the speaker was that when you report something and what it is meant for, it is causing discussion which will lead to change or improvement. He stated that there are many ways to do assessments, including multiple assessments. But the main idea is to get people to talk and encourage them to try something. His final statement was “Failure is OK – then you can improve”.

Ms. Parker also mentioned that Ms. Cynthia Kincaid has offered to do videos for and of our events. This could provide a great resource for the committee.

7. ACTION ITEMS –

a. PLOs for Approval:

- **Clothing and Textiles – Fashion Design, Electrical, Interior Design** – Ms. Parker has received the corrected PLOs back from faculty and all appear to be in good order. Ms. Parker asked that if members were in agreement that all concerns had been addressed, a motion be made to approve these three PLOs. A motion was made and seconded and with no further discussion, the PLOs were approved unanimously.
- **AUTO - Driveability** – Dr. Gat and Ms. Adams had concerns about using 60% of students as the assessment level. Ms. Drake stated that she was not happy with this number either but was willing to accept the reasoning from the faculty member. They did not want to set a number that was too high and create a high level of failure. To start off with 60% will give him a start base to see where he needs to go from there. Ms. Parker asked that if members were in agreement that all concerns had been

addressed, a motion be made to approve this PLO. A motion was made and seconded and with no further discussion, the PLO was approved unanimously.

- **AUTO - Engines** – This is the same as the previous PLO. Ms. Parker asked that if members were in agreement that all concerns had been addressed, a motion be made to approve this PLO. A motion was made and seconded and with no further discussion, the PLO was approved unanimously.
- **Professional Bookkeeping** – Ms. Adams answered questions of committee members in regard to rubrics used by all instructors for the essays and a comprehensive problem done in class, very similar to a lab project. It takes about two hours to complete and is a complete bookkeeping cycle. This problem is done in ACCT 113. Dr. Aviles asked if the essays, comprehensive problems and financial presentations are something the instructors came up with. Ms. Adams replied that they are already built into the courses. A question also came up about PLO #3 in regard to the grading of financial presentation in ACCT 113 and practice sets in ACCT 115 and 131. How are they going to be weighed? Ms. Adams replied that all are equally important but to different portions of the PLO. She did not want to have separate PLOs and assessments. They all address different things and even if you could do one, you may not be able to do the other. Ms. Drake stated that there could be a problem if you combine too much into one PLO. Dr. Gat asked if the courses are taught every semester. Ms. Adams replied that ACCT 115 is taught in the spring, ACCT 131 in the fall and ACCT 113 is taught every semester. She stated that it is not easy to aggregate when it is spread out, but is workable since it is all within one year. She feels that she is at a comfort level with this and will proceed as planned. The Committee was reminded that we see faculty in each area as best suited to make these decisions. Ms. Parker asked that if members were in agreement that all concerns had been addressed, a motion be made to approve this PLO. A motion was made and seconded and with no further discussion, the PLO was approved unanimously.
- **Child and Family Education PLO and Child and Family Education–School Aged Child Care PLO** - Ms. Parker was the person who wrote these PLOs. She explained that there are two certificates and/or degrees. They are both very similar except that that School Aged Childcare program has two courses in school-aged child care as part of the program. The PLOs themselves are the same for both certificates and degrees because the only difference is the age group addressed. The curriculum maps are different but the cycles of assessment are the same. Dr. Gat pointed out a typo on PLO #1. Ms. Parker also went on to explain that there are two capstone courses, CFE 201 and 202, which are the practicum courses where students are assigned to mentor teachers in the field. Students meet in class two hours a week and complete four hours of fieldwork each week. PLO assessments are happening in those two courses. There are two different assessments for PLO #1 as students must pass both courses to satisfy this PLO. There are only 20 students per semester with two instructors and they work as a team. They track each student in both semesters. During the first semester, the student is given the basis for what the project is going to be and the second semester they must decide what the basis is going to be and so that is why a higher level of performance is expected.

All felt that the PLOs were great. Questions were asked regarding the tracking of data. Both courses are usually taught back to back. Dr. Gat asked if a student drops out, do you drop their data since she is keeping track of each student? Ms. Parker stated that is undecided. However, students who drop have almost always dropped by the time assessments are completed, so the problem may solve itself. Ms. Drake asked if they were expecting 85% of CFE 201 students and 95% of CFE 202 students to complete the

PLO? Ms. Parker indicated that is what they would like to see from each student who completes these two courses. Ms. Parker explained that she is team-teaching the courses. They are each present in each other's class so they become very familiar with students in each of the courses. It was asked if they have a large number of non-completers in the first semester. The answer is yes and that is because fingerprinting is required so this is a deterrent. Also, a number of them do not understand what is will be required of them out in the field as well as the number of class hours and homework they are responsible for. AVC's CFE students are well known in the community and are often employed in Head Start and state pre-school programs. School districts have been cooperative in helping us track the students' employment in those programs. Ms. Parker asked that if members were in agreement that all concerns had been addressed, a motion be made to approve this PLO. A motion was made and seconded and with no further discussion, the PLO was approved unanimously.

- **Electronics Technology** – Instructor Rick Motawakel was present to explain his PLOs. One of the questions that was raised was the issue of using “and” or “or” in his PLOs. An explanation ensued but it became apparent and with suggestions from Ms. Parker and Ms. Drake that a revision was needed. There appear to be too many courses that are combined and tracking them would be difficult. There was also a course listed on the curriculum map that is an elective (ELTE101). It should be taken off because it is not a core course of the program. It was agreed by Mr. Motawakel that he re-work his PLOs and resubmit.

b. SLOs for approval – PE237 – Ms. Parker stated that this was the last PE SLO that needed to be done and looks fine to her. Ms. Parker requested a motion to approve this SLO. A motion and second was forthcoming and with no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

8. DISCUSSION

a. Volunteers from one division to be WEAVE facilitator in another division - (Melanie Parker) – All of us are very aware of the difficulties that have been occurring in PE. Ms. Parker relayed that there has been a flurry of communications over the past ten days about getting their SLO assessment done, who was going to facilitate, etc. She has received word from the PE Division asking if two student workers could enter the initial SLOs into WEAVE. Ms. Parker spoke with Mr. Voelcker they decided this would be acceptable. Mr. Voelcker then followed through with training the two students. This prompted more discussion on the part of the committee to see what could be done to provide more training specifically for PE. Specific training sessions were set up for May 18th and 19th. Ms. Parker received a phone call from their administrative assistant to inform her that they had received an offer from a full-time faculty member in another division who volunteered to be their WEAVE facilitator. Ms. Parker's first thought was that it would be a great idea, but upon second thought, she realized that it could cause issues. This would include creating a dangerous precedent by having someone outside of the division doing their WEAVE input. Second, it would create a situation whereby those faculty members in that division are being held to different expectations than other divisions. The question came up about the motivation behind this offer. Ms. Parker feels that other divisions have various difficult working hours so just because PE feels they do not have the time to do their own is unacceptable. Everyone's first reaction was that it would be great to accept this offer but they also had second thoughts and felt that it would be setting a bad precedent. It was also brought up that if you take away all duties related to the accreditation process, faculty would not be able to answer the questions when we had a visit from the team. This might also encourage faculty to just come up with bogus assessment data to say all students passed and did fine according to the SLOs when in fact this may be totally erroneous. Mr. Voelcker has gone out of his way to train extra WEAVE facilitators. We appreciate the

faculty member's offer but believe it would be best to decline. It is not just a matter of getting the numbers in, but it also discussion and dialogue documentation. It was also suggested that Ms. Lowry be involved closely with this issue. Ms. Parker agreed and will talk to Ms. Lowry.

b. Fall Welcome Back Proposal and Planning – (Melanie Parker) – The first question brought up by Dr. Gat was planning for the upcoming flex event on May 12. Ms. Parker stated that she was going to model it after the fall event and simply add some new information. She welcomed Dr. Gat's attendance and assistance.

As far as the planning for Fall Welcome Back Day, we have received a list of all of the computer labs across campus. This also gives us the number of computers in each and if they are PC or MAC labs. Ms. Parker will create a spreadsheet with this information. She also stated that we need to get an estimate from each division on the number of faculty who will be participating. We then need us this information to decide who will work in each lab. The next question was how are we going to give them their data? Mr. Voelcker stated that all of this information can be drawn out of WEAVE through reports. Hopefully in the future they can pull their own reports but this will get us started. It was also suggested that we could use a webcast or podcast to give them the overview information they need in order to start. Also, a number of the labs are conducive for breaking into small groups. The groups will be divided into discipline areas so they can work together. We need to customize these various groups because they are not all going to be in the same place in the process.

Ms. Parker feels that the SLO COmmittee needs to meet at least once during the summer to finalize these details. She requests that all respond to her with their availability. A question came up about the fact that not everyone has been assigned a password and knows how to log into WEAVE. Mr. Voelcker stated that he was hoping that each group would have a facilitator who is has already gone through that process and is capable of inputting their data. This should not be focused on WEAVE access but is more about the discussion and documentation. If there are areas that have just one faculty instructor, they should be combined with others in similar areas. Ms. Parker will work with Mr. Voelcker by viewing which people have been inputting into WEAVE quite a few times and seek them out for mentors throughout this process. It would probably be a good idea to have more than one meeting this summer to bring those people into the process. Ms. Drake requested that Mr. Voelcker let the committee know who the strong divisions are and who are weak. He replied that definitely Tech Ed and Health Sciences are up at the top with VAPA and PE down at the bottom with the rest of the divisions somewhere in the middle. He does admit that he has been receiving a large number of e-mails recently from Digital Media regarding WEAVE training so interest has been picking up.

Ms. Parker knows that thid event will be a huge task for the committee but it will be a definite learning experience. What we do wrong can be corrected the next time around but the whole event should provide the committee with the knowledge that they did something to help the process move forward. Mr. Voelcker questioned the aspect of everyone being at computers. It helps in that if the group is ready for input, it can be done right then and there they will not have to create another step somewhere down the road. If perhaps there are groups who do not have facilitators, Mr. Voelcker will provide a worksheet that they can use to complete their data. Ms. Parker stated we need to think and plan well so that things can run as smoothly and quickly as possible due to the time limit. Even if discussion focuses on simply one course, thwy they can then take knowledge back to their own divisions and continue from there. Ms. Parker also mentioned we need to wait until after June 10, which is the deadline date for submitting academic course assessment data, before we know what each area needs to complete. Ms. Drake hopes this will give faculty a tie-in to program review. It would be a good idea to put information about Welcome Back Day as a teaser to help faculty get their assessments done

and be able to close the loop. Dr. Gat clarified that any faculty member can come to the June PLO Data Days on June 8-9 during the hours listed. Ms. Adams also mentioned that the Business Division will be doing a PLO Write-In on May 17, starting with pizza at 12:30 and working from there. The committee was reminded about building closures for summer that could be affecting your office or your capability to submit your grades. Ms. Drake gave a short description of how you can do it from home and reminded people check again to make sure that BANNER did not “eat” your grades.

c. Accreditation Concerns – Strategic Planning - (Melanie Parker) – The meeting ended without any further discussion on this subject. Ms. Parker relayed that we have already addressed a lot of these concerns and will continue to do so as we go along.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS – none at this time

10. OTHER –

a. SLO Meeting Dates for Fall 2011 – September 12 and 26, October 10 and 24, November 14 and 28. All meetings to be held in A141 unless otherwise notified. The meetings will be from 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.

b. SLO Meeting Dates for Spring 2012 – February 13 and 27, March 12 and 26, April 9 and 23, May 14. The second meeting of May lands on Memorial Day. Ms. Parker will probably schedule a different day to meet to finish the year. Room and meeting times remain the same.

c. FPD events for Spring 2011:

- Learning Outcomes Update – Friday, May 27, 7-9 p.m., SSV151

11. ADJOURNMENT – the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

pg