



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING**

November 22, 2010

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. November 9, 2010
5. **PRESENTATION - None**
6. **REPORTS**
 - a. Updates from Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)
7. **ACTION ITEMS - None**
8. **DISCUSSION –**
 - a. Continued discussion of GE PLO (Melanie Parker)
 - b. Planning for Spring Welcome Back Day: February 4, 2011 (Melanie Parker)
 - c. Revised documents – Final drafts for review (Melanie Parker)
 - Revised SLO form
 - Revised PLO form
 - Suggested Questions for Discussion Related to SLO Evaluation and Analysis
 - Process for PLO Development
 - Proposed PLO Cycle of Assessment
9. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS - none**
10. **OTHER**
 - a. Remaining SLO Committee Faculty Professional Development Events for Fall 2010
 - PLO Write-In workshop – Monday, November 29, 9-11 a.m., SSV 151
 - PLO Write-In workshop - Monday, November 29, 1-3 p.m., L201
 - Learning Outcomes Update – Thursday, December 2, 7 to 9PM, SSV151
 - b. Spring Welcome Back Day – February 4, 2011
 - c. Spring 2011 SL Committee meeting dates:
 - February 14 and 28
 - March 14 and 28
 - 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
November 22, 2010
Room A141, 3:00 – 4:30 PM

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

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Ms. Melanie Parker, co-chair of the SLO Committee, called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

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

– Ms. Melanie Parker wished to thank Dr. Aviles for coming to the Learning Outcomes Update Faculty Professional Development event on November 19, 2010. It is always good to have an alternate voice. She wanted everyone to know that at every event, she and other members of the SLO Committee learn something new regarding faculty’s questions and concerns.

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

– Ms. Patricia Marquez relayed to the committee her trip to the Statewide Senate. She stated that there seemed to be quite a bit of talk going on about SLOs. She found that what was interesting about the sessions she went to in regard to SLOs, is that some colleges are still fighting and refusing to work with them. (Victor Valley College was one example). Their Senate President feels very restricted concerned that they will lose their accreditation. Campus response was that they will go to court over it, but there seems to be a question of “to do what”. Most colleges seem to be “in different places” in regard to their understanding of the SLO process. It is evident that some are further along than others. One of the questions that came up involved whether this process belongs to the Academic Senate or to the Union. The opinion on this from the Statewide Senate is that it is a professional matter so it should reside within the Senate, but when does it step into the faculty contract as far as their work schedule, adjuncts, etc. certainly becomes a Union issue. One issue is adjunct participation. At AVC we encourage all adjunct faculties to be a part of the process. Also, there is concern on the part of many that if SLOs become part of the faculty contract, they will be used to assess faculty effectiveness and will become part of the faculty evaluation process. Christos had relayed that most of the discussion he was part of centered on SB40 and eclipsed anything in regard to SLOs.

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Ms. Parker asked the members for any corrections to the minutes of the 11/8/10 meeting. Ms. Marquez requested that any place where her name is Sandoval, to change to Marquez. Ms. Parker asked for a motion to approve with corrections. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as corrected. With no further discussion, the motion passed.

5. **PRESENTATION** – No presentations.

6. **REPORTS**

Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker) – Mr. Voelcker and Ms. Parker relayed to the members that the quality of Action Plans entered into WEAVE needs to be thought through. Information entered should go beyond the revisions of the SLOs and include meaningful discussion of the data collected. Auditing WEAVE entries is process both Mr. Voelcker and Ms. Parker would like to institute. Should we bring back the technical review committee to spot check this throughout WEAVE? The members felt that this was a good idea and would provide helpful information as well as hold people accountable. Dr. Gat has volunteered to take on this task right now. We must decide how we plan on doing some random samples, so she and Mr. Voelcker will work together and then report back to Ms. Parker. If anyone else would like to assist, they are more than welcome to join in.

Another question is how PLOs should be entered into WEAVE. If you have just one degree or certificate, it is very straightforward. But if you have one or more of each, then it becomes more difficult. The area that is most hard hit with this type of situation is Tech Ed. It becomes an issue when you are entering information that could be applicable to one or more of the degrees or certificates. It entails a lot of work so a system needs to be devised where perhaps you just enter all of the PLOs into one entity and create a “map” that would direct which PLOs were applicable to which degree or certificate. Ms. Drake concurs that this is a problem but finds that WEAVE is a tool that is awkward to use. It seems like it cannot handle these complicated issues and right now, she does not have a specific answer, even by utilizing the solution presented by Mr. Voelcker. Dr. Aviles asked if WEAVE was capable of creating a level between the course and program levels and putting in bullets (with links) that would take the person to further explanation. Mr. Voelcker will take a page shot of WEAVE and forward it to everyone but for right now, he does not know if that would be a viable solution. The question still comes back to where do you put the PLOs? That needs to be decided before you can make any sense out of the system. Ms. Marquez also brought up the issue of using the correct definition of a “program”. Ms. Drake confirmed that all Tech Ed programs have degrees and certificates and the certificates all qualify as majors in an associate’s degree. Ms. Drake also pointed out that in a program with two certificates; the PLOs that are created are specific to each certificate and thus the associate’s degree. But right now, they are only working on the PLOs for the certificate level and have not reached the degree level. They are not even assessed yet. Mr. Voelcker remembered that a tier had been built into WEAVE (seven levels) with programs being the fifth level. Ms. Parker asked that he try to input the Tech Ed AC/Refrigeration certificates into this level and see how it would work. Mr. Voelcker still does not visualize how this would work for this instance being that both of these courses, which are under one program, have totally different courses (and thus PLOs) associated with them. The final determination is that we need to have something to tell faculty when they come to that point.

7. **ACTION ITEMS** – we had no actions items to approve at this meeting but Ms. Parker will forward a list of previously approved actions to the Academic Affairs Office for their records.

8. **DISCUSSION**

a. Continued discussion of GE PLO (Melanie Parker)– Ms. Parker has investigated to see if there is anything else at other colleges which we could utilize but her search was unproductive. No one else had any luck either. She recommends to the committee that we proceed with what Dr. Grishman has come up with. Mr. Younglove will contact the RP Group and Ms. Parker will contact the Statewide Senate Co-Chair of SLOs.

b. Planning for Spring Welcome Back Day: February 4, 2011 (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker relayed to the members that we will have a session on how to analyze data generated and how to implement changes. We need to come up with a title and a brief description. The FPD Committee asked that attendees be divided into small hands-on groups. Ms. Parker would like Dr. Gat and Dr. Aviles to do instruction/simulation for the first half. She would also like to have Mr. Younglove and Mr. Voelcker can bring practical information to finish the session. A question came up regarding the opportunity for faculty to bring their own data. This would be great but we will be prepared with other data if they do not. If perhaps they do, we could substitute it so we can visualize real data.

Ms. Drake suggested that she has a “widget” course (which they use for a model, but can fit all programs) that they use for simulation. They could do three rounds with certain scenarios then change the parameters to see what can be the possibilities. Most faculty do not have a lot of research yet as they have only assessed one or two semesters; not enough data to draw conclusions. Dr. Gat and Dr. Aviles have done five semesters of SLO research in psychology, but when used in a roundtable. Dr. Hall felt that the whole psychology scenario could be used to show real data and simulations to attendees. It was suggested by Ms. Marquez that each small group be given the set of data and see what they come up with and then all groups would then compare. It would also be a good time to bring up action plan changes and the idea of moving the success levels from just 70%. Mr. Voelcker suggested that the data from the 5 cycles of psychology could be altered or something could be made up altogether for each group to work on. It was also suggested that maybe we do the small group work first and then do the evaluation/discussion after. The Committee agreed that was appropriate.

Ms. Parker will go with the title suggested by the group of “Got Data – Now What?” The description should include analyzing your data and closing the loop, along with formulating action plans and revisions. This could include what an action plan looks like and how to write one, how to analyze their data and how to make decisions based on that data, and how to include documented dialogue for the process. The description should also give participants the opportunity to bring their own data. Ms. Parker will ask for the board room.

c. Revised documents – final drafts for review (refer to list on agenda) (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker does not have the drafts in their final forms, so when she has them completed, she will forward to the committee members

9. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS – none at this time

10. OTHER –

a. SLO Meeting Dates for Spring – February 14 and 28, March 14 and 28, April 11 and 25, May 9 and 23

b. Remaining FPD events for Fall:

- PLO Write-In Workshop – Monday, November 29, 9-11 a.m., SSV151
- PLO Write-In Workshop – Monday, November 29, 1-3 p.m., L201
- Learning Outcomes Update – Thursday, December 2, 7 to 9PM, SSV151

c. Ms. Parker extends an invitation to the “Making Learning Visible” flex event. It gives Std. 2 flex credit.

- d. Ms. Marquez would like to remind the committee that a replacement from Counseling needs to be sought for her position when she departs on her trip in February for the remainder of the spring semester.
- e. Ms. Drake – PLO assessment discussion. She stated that since her division has all of their SLOs done, along with their maps, they are now trying to grasp how they are going to assess PLOs. They want to pick one or two PLOs per program to pilot this spring semester. The discussions have been very trying but she states that there are a few things to steer clear of. They are: stay away from reliance on an outside examination because you do not have any control over it (most students do not go to outside sources to get certified and you cannot force that agency to give you data); did they get a job and is the employer happy; graduation rates with certificates (that tells you they only went through so many courses – it does not tell you, did they achieve a specific program learning outcome). They hit a point where a decision now needs to be made.

She pointed out that faculty should look through the list of required courses and notice all of the courses where information is introduced, then developed and then any courses where it is mastered, as well as the course sequence and which semesters courses are offered. Ms. Drake wants faculty to look at what they currently do, not to invent a new piece of work. What is something they already do in that course or tests that shows a student has mastered that PLO? Most faculty could come up with a number of sources (mid-term, final project, etc). that could show this. Then came the point at which a decision needed to be made on definitions. How do you determine the difference between program completers and those who do not complete the program? If you assess all students in a course that prepares them for mastery of that PLO, then you can say the assessment in that course is a valid measurement of the students exposed to the material who mastered it. You could statistically extrapolate those results to completers of an entire program with that mastery because all program completers would have to pass through that course. This was a hard sell because everyone seemed thinking in “the box” that program learning outcomes must be assessed at the end of the program on only the completers. They had to completely reverse their thinking in order to get out of “the box”. They are not certain they came up with the right answer but it has allowed everyone to move forward. Ms. Drake sent home with each faculty member the following action item for the February division meeting: they are to determine what PLO they are going to assess and in which course that is offered this spring. It must be kept in mind that these mastery courses are not offered every cycle. If they find that a particular PLO needs to be assessed out of cycle, they are going to have to figure that out. The discussion will continue at their division meeting.

Dr. Aviles asked if they are all going to assess PLOs the same way, but Ms. Drake relayed that they only have one full-time faculty per course so that particular person will have to figure it out on their own. Ms. Parker was pleased that so much “dialogue” was passing back and forth between her faculty members. Ms. Drake feels that, at this time, there is not enough dialogue or data to present it to the other deans. She reiterated that her division is somewhat different than all others so what they do may not apply to any others. Ms. Marquez and Ms. Parker felt that the whole process they are doing in Tech Ed should be relayed to other deans to show them the progress they have made. While their own areas may have other unique issues, it is a good example of the discussion and dialogue that must occur. Ms. Drake felt it was important to relay this information through the members of the SLO Committee, but that we must remember as yet we do not have a handle on how this should be entered into WEAVE. Ms. Drake mentioned that they are having difficulty with the PLOs of the courses under Neal Weisenberger due to some specific circumstances in each. Ms. Drake will need to work with him to rewrite them, but the main idea is to continue to work the issue not to feel like you’re in an immovable situation.

Another important issue is what date that must be given to divisions to have their PLOs written. Ms. Marquez and Ms. Parker believe that April 15th is an appropriate date. Ms. Adams asked if every program/certificate must reach the mastery level in a PLO? Ms. Parker relayed that mastery has been defined as being appropriate for graduation, even if it applies to furtherance of education or going directly into the working world. Mr. Younglove stated that if you know what the target is and you spell it out, that's all that matters.

Dr. Gat felt that we should remind the audience during the Spring Welcome Back Day that faculty can enter their data before the end of the cycle. It would be a good way to do some spot checks during the year. Also, the faculty need to turn in their data even if it is not finished.

11. ADJOURNMENT – the meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

pg