ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING
September 26, 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. September 12, 2011 (attachment)

5. **REPORTS**
   a. Updates from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning – T. Younglove/A. Voelcker

7. **ACTION ITEMS**
   a. PLOs:
      - AFAB
      - Electrical
      - Environmental Horticulture
      - Interior Design
      - Music
      - Welding

8. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**
   a. WEAVE Accreditation Standard Integration– A. Voelcker
   b. Action Plan Documentation Guidelines (discussion continued from 9/12/11) – M. Parker/A. Voelcker
   c. Fall Assessment Week - T. Younglove/M Parker (attachment)
   d. Committee Membership – M. Parker (attachment)

9. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**
   a. EOPS revised SLOs received and recorded
   b. SLO Related FPD Events for fall 2011 – Your participation is Welcome!!
      - "SLOs: From Data to Action Plans -   November 15, 2011
      - "WEAVE: Basic Training" – October 26, 2011 and November 30, 2011
      - "WEAVE: Refresher Training – October 12, 2011 and November 30, 2011
   c. Fall 2011 Assessment Week – November 14th – 18th, 2011
   d. Fall 2011 WEAVE Week – November 28th – December 2, 2011
   e. Fall 2011 WEAVE Data Days – December 13 – 14, 2011

10. **OTHER**
    a. Future SLO Meeting dates for Fall 2011: October 10, 2011; October 24, 2011; November 14, 2011; and November 28, 2011

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES COMMITTEE
September 26, 2011

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
   Ms. Melanie Parker, Student Learning Outcomes Faculty Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.

2. **OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR**
   - Ms. Parker spoke with Ms. Kathryn Mitchell, Faculty Professional Development Chair, regarding reevaluating Faculty Professional Development (FPD) credit offered for WEAVE Data Managers. Ms. Mitchell indicated the committee would take the lead from the SLO Committee and agreed to allow the SLO Committee to determine allowable FPD credit for faculty WEAVE Data Managers. Ms. Parker indicated Mr. Voelcker will work to revise the established matrix that will better reflect hours required for data entry as well as faculty interaction. The matrix will include the same concept as previously approved which is based on the number of courses and course sections.
   - Ms. Parker stated she has contacted all Divisions with outstanding PLOs.
   - The issue previously discussed involving the Kinesiology, Dance and Athletics (KDA) Division has been resolved. Ms. Parker spoke with the Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs, Ms. Sharon A. Lowry, regarding the matter. Ms. Lowry indicated during the initial push to get SLOs established on campus, the committee was soliciting assistance from outside divisions during the writing process. The KDA Division was an area that needed assistance in writing and obtained assistance. This is likely how some of the expectation arose. Ms. Lowry stated that no faculty member from outside the division should be given flex credit for work performed but if a faculty member wants to volunteer to assist in mentoring a division faculty it would be fine, but no flex credit can be awarded. Flex credit can only be awarded to division faculty working within their own divisions. Ms. Lowry contacted the Division Deans involved so they were aware of the situation and decision.
   - At a recent FPD event on SLO Action Plans, a faculty member inquired on how faculty will be able to discuss action plans with the ease similar to committee members. Ms Parker recognized committee members are able to discuss processes with much more ease than campus faculty because they work with WEAVE and the SLO process much more than campus faculty. The committee needs to remember that the majority of faculty perform SLO/PLO work on an intermittent basis and must be cognizant of the language used when speaking with faculty. Committee members should use caution when using abbreviations or acronyms which the average faculty member may not be familiar. The committee must stay aware and explain the process in simple and clear terms.
   - Committee members were requested to take a moment to acknowledge Dr. Magdalena Caproiu when they see her for the tremendous task she recently completed. Dr. Caproiu took on a tremendous task in completing thirty-five individual SLO forms for segmented units of Math 99. The completion of SLOs required for Math 99 was a bit controversial during the writing process because it could not be resolved on who would be responsible for completing SLOs. Dr. Caproiu completed the task this past week which took a great deal of work. Committee members were encouraged to extend their gratitude to her for completing this task.

3. **OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
   - Dr. Irit Gat inquired whether the committee can obtain any feedback on the Welcome Back Day SLO breakout session. Ms. Parker indicated she would request feedback results from the Senate Office for committee members to review.
   - Ms. Maggie Drake provided a brief update on Technical Education Division PLOs. She reported she has reviewed drafted PLOs for every discipline area in the Technical Education Division. Approximately 2/3 of division PLOs have been approved by the SLOs are or in the process of being approved. There are three

disciplines that are drafting revisions at the division level and will be forwarded for final approval in the next couple of weeks.

- Dr. Bassam Salameh indicated he spoke with Mr. Tooraj Gordi, the Math Faculty Chair, and provided examples and guidance on completing PLOs. Dr. Salameh and Mr. Gordi are trying to get all Math faculty working on completing PLOs for approval.

- Dr. Salameh requested current Math, Science and Engineering data results in efforts to personally contact faculty to ensure they understand the necessity to enter data into WEAVE.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. September 12, 2011 (attachment)

A motion was made and seconded to approve the September 12, 2011 SLO Committee minutes. Motion carried.

5. REPORTS

a. Department of Institutional Research and Planning - T. Younglove/Aaron Voelcker

Mr. Ted Younglove reported the Paul Revere video has been viewed and commended by the Accrediting Commission President, Dr. Barbara Beano. She indicated the video was a great example of creativity and making an extra effort to ensure the SLO/PLO progress requirement is disseminated to campus faculty. Ms. Lowry attended a recent Accreditation training opportunity where the Paul Revere video was mentioned and highlighted. Dr. Barbara Beano indicated the video demonstrated creativity and making an extra effort in ensuring SLO/PLO work is being completed.

Santa Monica City College has a research blog and posted the Paul Revere video on the blog for campus constituencies to view. They thought the video outlined the timeline well therefore wanted to highlight the information.

6. ACTION ITEMS

a. Approval of PLOs

- AFAB
  A motion was made and seconded to approve the corrected AFAB PLO. Ms. Stacey Adams expressed her concerns with the amount of "or's" included in the PLO. How would a faculty member decide which class will be assessed? Ms. Drake indicated if the PLO indicates "or" then it should be assessed in both courses because the skill set should be seen in both courses. Both courses include hands on components of constructing AFAB components. Motion carried.

- Electrical
  A motion was made and seconded to approve the corrected Electrical PLO. Ms. Parker indicated the revisions needed were made. Motion carried.

- Environmental Horticulture
  A motion was made and seconded to approve the corrected Environmental Horticulture PLO. Ms. Parker indicated the revisions needed were made. Motion carried.

- Interior Design
  A motion was made and seconded to approve the corrected Interior Design PLO. Ms. Parker indicated the revisions needed were made. Motion carried.

- Music
  A motion was made and seconded to approve the submitted Music PLO. Ms. Parker indicated she received an electronic copy of the PLO but couldn't open it. She presented hard copies of the PLO for committee members to review and critique for approval. The PLO only represents courses in the Associate of Arts Degree. Dr. Gat inquired if the last sentence is necessary to include in the PLO. Ms. Drake expressed concern about the assessment tool indicated in the PLO. It will be difficult to assess a PLO based on job placement because obtaining data on student that are no longer students will be very difficult to obtain. The PLO assessment tool should be based on skills students garner from courses. Mr. Younglove expressed his concern regarding the measure of the skill being dependent on the economy. Committee members were in consensus that the PLO requires revision prior to approval. Ms.

Approved: October 10, 2011 SLO Meeting

Parker stated she would contact Mr. Price to discuss the measurement tool and revision to language needed. Motion failed.

- Welding
  A motion was made and seconded to approve the corrected Welding PLO. Ms. Parker indicated the revisions needed were made. Motion carried.

7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**
   a. **WEAVE Accreditation Standard Integration – A. Voelcker**
   Mr. Voelcker stated that some changes have been made to WEAVE to integrate Accreditation Standards with PLO/OO data. When the WEAVE database was established there were sections of the database that was not utilized and left unpopulated. The original database template included connections made to Institutional Learning Outcomes but now have included the possibility to create associations with Accreditation Standard language and other key documents on campus. Mr. Voelcker indicated he is not sure that including Accreditation Standard associations would be relevant for constructed SLOs, but these associations would definitely be relevant for PLOs and possibly OOs. If there is additional Accreditation Standard language that needs to be included in WEAVE Mr. Voelcker should be contacted to add the necessary language. Creating associations with pertinent key document will begin integrating campus documents as a means to create connections and evidence of institutional effectiveness.

   Mr. Voelcker provided a demonstration on the action plan section in WEAVE in efforts to simplify and integrate the Program Review and SLO processes and eliminate duplication where possible. Ms. Eastin stated she wants to create a mechanism to strengthen communication and understanding of the purpose of Program Review. The SLO and Program Review process feed into each other and should not be seen as separate processes. Over there years many efforts have been made to create advances in the process but its time to reevaluate all process and make connections between Program Review, SLOs, and Accreditation.

   b. **Action Plan Documentation Guidelines (discussion continued from September 12, 2011 – M. Parker/A. Voelcker**
   Ms. Parker stated at the previous meeting committee members engaged in preliminary discussions regarding establishing action plan guidelines. There are many issues to address on how faculty should document action plans. Ms. Parker inquired if committee members had any feedback or examples which should be provided to the faculty.

   Dr. Salameh indicated if there are examples of completed action plans in various disciplines it would be helpful since this is new territory for faculty. It would be helpful to committee members to see language used by others schools and action plan examples. In addition, it would be helpful to see completed action plans depicting Course Outline of Records revisions needed, as well as demonstrating the differences between humanities courses versus science courses.

   Ms. Adams indicated she would like to see a basic Word document form created with a large data field to enter course discussion used for action plan documentation. In addition, she indicated it is important to include clear instructions for faculty on how to upload documented information to WEAVEonline. Ms. Parker indicated a formatted action plan form has been posted to the SLO website for faculty to use and will work on drafting instruction language to detail clearly what is expected after faculty document discussion.

   Ms. Drake indicated committee members need to keep in mind a great deal of what is included in action plans is dependent on the frequency of the course schedule. Many courses in the Technical Education Division are scheduled once a year or once every other year. Several division faculty inquire if they can simply state they will continue to assess because they don't have enough data sets to determine trend over time.

   Ms. Parker stated one of the major complaints regarding the action plan process is the unfamiliarity with new form. This is understandable being that it is a new process which will require working with the form to gain a semblance of comfort with the new process.

   c. **Fall Assessment Week – T. Younglove/M. Parker (attachment)**
   Ms. Parker distributed a drafted handout on scheduled SLO and WEAVE training opportunities scheduled. Mr. Younglove stated he has been considering what training should be performed during the Assessment Week. He determined that in the end it was important to address what the campus needs in terms of assessment training and then determine how to go about establishing training sessions.

Administration training – Mr. Younglove indicated there will be two sets of training for Administration (Deans and Administrative Council members). The Deans training will emphasize effectiveness. He will demonstrate and describe what they should be experiencing at the division level in regards to Program Review, Planning, and SLOs. Outlined examples will be provided to division Deans which will demonstrate how to achieve the Accreditation requirement of proficiency. The training session for Administrative Council members will be a modified presentation offered for Deans and will emphasize academic impressions. He will engage committee members in discussion about data sources, how to compile data, and how to use data results. A working example will be provided where they will be provided a data set to a pivot table where they will be asked to make their own data and then draw their own conclusions on a program. They will be asked to make a decision on whether to continue funding the program or choose not to fund the program based on the data results. This training session will demonstrate the necessity of evaluating a given data set to determine an outcome based on results.

Classified and Confidential Management Staff training – These campus constituencies do not require individual training therefore will be included in the general training session.

Faculty training – A modified training opportunity will be established similar to what was performed for Directors at the Research and Planning group over the summer. Faculty participants will be provided a booklet with four to five case studies from different areas and a couple of guiding questions at the end prior to the training sessions. Participants would perform small group discussions on how case study results would relate to their areas. In addition, faculty will work on case studies to cover successes and failures of SLO assessment. Faculty will be asked to perform all functions required for the SLO process from determining SLO for course, writing the SLO, collecting data for SLO, determining whether the SLO succeeded or failed, possibly having to revise SLO language, detailing how the SLO was assessed, and completing an action plan. This training session will demonstrate the entire SLO process so faculty clearly understand the cycle and the importance of each element involved in the cycle.

Panel presentation – this element of training sessions will be difficult to facilitate due to the varying schedules of committee members. It may be easier to create a video panel presentation used for all training sessions. Committee members were in consensus that a panel presentation video would be easier to facilitate for all anticipated training sessions.

General training – this training session will be a modified version of the SLO process and work required to assess a program. Some of the results will be presented in a PowerPoint presentation from the SLO session. This session will focus on allowing anyone from the campus community to get an overview of the assessment of SLOs/PLOs.

Ms. Parker provided an overview of the Assessment Week training sessions being offered during the week of November 14 – 18, 2011. She indicated that within this time frame the committee will plug in the various training sessions Mr. Younglove described. In addition to the Assessment Week training sessions the committee also has a Faculty Professional Development event scheduled on Tuesday, November 15, 2011 titled, "SLOs: From Data to Action Plans." This is the week that the committee will be making efforts to hit the campus hard with assessment issues. Mr. Younglove and Ms. Parker have discussed the possibility of including short email messages sent out on the importance of assessment. They would like to involve various campus constituencies from Administration, Faculty Leadership, and Faculty so the campus is hearing from different people on campus on the importance of integrating assessment into the budget and planning process.

Feedback on Fall Assessment Week –

Dr. Gat stated it is great to include several mini training opportunities throughout an entire week, as well as individualized training for Division Deans so they are aware of the entire integrated process of Program Review, Budget, Planning, SLOs, and Accreditation. This is a complete look at the process where they can get a clear understanding from a management perspective.

Ms. Adams inquired whether there is something the committee can do for students during the established Assessment week. There are training events for all campus constituencies but how can the committee involve the student population? She suggested we include some basic communication to students since one of the major issues is communicating SLOs to students. Ms. Parker stated it will be a difficult time for students to participate in any training sessions being the week prior to Thanksgiving and the academic workload generally experienced during this timeframe preparing for the end of the semester but an email communication can be coordinated to distribute to students during that week.

Ms. Patricia Márquez stated she is not sure that the committee needs to demonstrate students actually know what an SLO is but simply needs to demonstrate the campus has made an effort to help students understand course SLOs and have communicated SLO information to them. It may be more beneficial to include a page in the Student Handbook on SLO information. In addition, she suggested emphasizing the connection between SLOs and Accreditation not necessarily a Title 5 requirement but a requirement for Accreditation to integrate with the Program Review process. The SLO Committee may want to create a pictorial snapshot of the entire process similar to that used for the *Blueprint for Planning*. This would provide the campus community a physical snapshot of the entire process and assist those that don't understand the process. The created pictorial snapshot depicting the SLO cycle could then be used by everyone involved in the SLO process in future presentations.

Ms. Carol Eastin, Program Review Coordinator, stated if the training events are open to students the committee should extend an invitation to the college newspaper to include an article in the student newspaper.

Ms. Parker stated these are all great ideas and she will begin setting them into motion. Ultimately, there will be three large SLO information opportunities. It will begin with Assessment Week, WEAVE Week, and Weave Data Days. The WEAVE Data Days will be an opportunity to sit with faculty to enter data into WEAVE. It will be a very busy time in the semester and any assistance from committee members would be greatly appreciated.

d. Committee Membership – M. Parker (attachment)

Ms. Parker stated there is a need to reevaluate and discuss the established committee composition. Historically, there have been a few positions on the committee that have been vacant for years. The committee needs to determine if the constituency of the committee is sufficient in completing the necessary responsibilities required to address. It might be a good time to broaden the constituency to represent the campus community, similar to the committee composition of the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee (AP&P) or the Academic Senate.

Ms. Márquez stated the committee may want to expand the committee composition to include representatives from Operational Outcomes (OOs). The committee is charged with ensuring the establishment of OOs therefore it would be helpful to have a representative from this constituency group as well as divisional representatives. The committee has grown and established itself on campus which warrants evaluating whether the composition should be expanded based on the responsibilities. The committee may want to consider establishing the requirements and responsibilities of committee member as well as review the current mission, purpose, and Faculty Chair job descriptions to ensure they accurately reflect the work of the committee. At this point it would also be important to establish an SLO Handbook or Manual to emphasize the fact that the SLO Committee has shifted to a working committee similar to AP&P.

Ms. Drake stated from her perspective when considering the work performed by the SLO committee members there is no question the committee needs to expand its current membership to be more in line with the AP&P model. As a Dean serving on the committee it has become more difficult to be the primary SLO contact for the division and she cannot see this continuing for much longer and really sees the need for faculty representatives to assist in the process. Many divisions don't have a representative on the committee which may be why some faculty areas haven't bought into the SLO process.

The committee engaged in a brief discussion regarding revising the constituency of the committee and whether certain positions were necessary. They were in consensus that the committee composition needs to be revised and established similarly to AP&P or the Academic Senate. Ms. Parker indicated she would draft a committee member template for further discussion. The work of the committee has grown over the years and warrants including division representatives and other pertinent constituencies on campus. She will research the composition of SLO Committees at other community colleges and provide an overview of the findings. Ms. Parker has been in discussion with Ms. Maria Clinton, AP&P Co-Chair, and Ms. Gloria Kastner, Academic Senate Coordinator, on possibly implementing a routing form to document committee work relating either the AP&P and/or the SLO process instead of requiring an AP&P Liaison on the SLO committee. It is becoming increasingly difficult to find a faculty volunteer willing to serve on both committees and incorporating a routing form will document and track work performed at one committee which may potentially impact the work of another. In addition, Ms. Parker will look into evaluating the Faculty Professional Development credit awarded to committee members and seek to align credit to what is awarded to AP&P Committee members.

8. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**
   a. **EOPS revised SLOs received and recorded**
   b. **SLO Related FPD Events for fall 2011 – Your participation is Welcome!!**
      - **"SLOs: From Data to Action Plans" – November 15, 2011**
      - **"WEAVE: Basic Training" – October 26, 2011 and November 30, 2011**
      - **"WEAVE: Refresher Training" – October 12, 2011 and November 30, 2011**
   c. **Fall 2011 Assessment Week – November 14 – 18, 2011**
   d. **Fall 2011 WEAVE Week – November 28 – December 2, 2011**
   e. **Fall 2011 WEAVE Data Days – December 13, 2011 – 14, 2011**

8. **OTHER**
   a. **Future SLO Meeting dates for fall 2011: October 10, 2011; October 24, 2011; November 14, 2011; and November 28, 2011**

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
   A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the September 26, 2011 Student Learning Outcomes Committee meeting at 4:37 p.m. Motion carried.

MEMBERS PRESENT		ABSENT MEMBERS	
Maggie Drake	Bassam Salameh	Dr. Fredy Aviles	*Vacant AP&P Faculty Member*
Dr. Irit Gat	Aaron Voelcker	Kim Covell	*Vacant Confidential Management Member*
Patricia Marquez	Ted Younglove	Dr. Robert Harris	*Vacant Classified Union Member*
Melanie Parker		**WEAVE DATA FACILITATOR**	**GUEST PRESENT**
		Stacey Adams	Carol Eastin

General Information:

This informational file must be completed and submitted when PLOs for your program are developed. **See examples posted in the PLO Sample File for additional guidance when completing your program information.**

Once completed, post the entire file in the WEAVE Document Repository for your program and submit a signed hard copy of the PLO and Assessment page to the SLO Committee mailbox. When the SLO Committee has reviewed the completed file and verified appropriate completion of each page, email acknowledgement will be sent to the area dean. At this point, PLOs and assessments should be entered in WEAVEonline under the appropriate program degree and/or certificate entity.

Please contact Melanie Parker, SLO Committee Faculty Co-Chair, at mparker@avc.edu should you need assistance.

Instructions:

PLOs and Assessment:

Use this page to document the PLOs and assessment strategies developed for your program. Once the file is complete, submit a hard copy with the area dean's signature to the SLO Committee mailbox. **See Sample PLO and Assessment page if you need additional guidance.**

Program Assessment Cycle:

Document the expected assessment cycle for your program. **See Assessment Cycle Samples #1 and 2 if you need additional guidance.**

Curriculum Map:

List each course that is part of your program. Indicate which courses are required. Use I, D, and M designations to indicate the level at which each PLO is addressed and assessed in each course. **See Curriculum Map Samples #1 and 2 if you need additional guidance.**

Faculty/Staff Member (Please Print): Maria Clinton   Date Submitted: 09-13-2011

PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

Program: Aircraft Fabrication & Assembly Technician

Indicate, by number, the Institutional Learning Outcome(s) each Program Learning Outcome will support.

Submit a signed copy of this form to the SLO committee mailbox.

Specifically describe the assessment method(s) used to measure each outcome and specify the achievement target that will determine successful completion of the outcome.
If this is an instructional program, a curriculum map must be completed. All programs must attach a proposed cycle of assessment.

ILO	PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES	ASSESSMENT METHODS and ACHIEVEMENT TARGETS
4	1. Plan, design, and construct aircraft structures to industry standards using sheet metal and composites materials.	Grading of final project in AFAB 115 or AFAB 120. A grade of 70% or higher will be considered as meeting the PLO. The achievement target is that 80% of all students assessed will have met the PLO.
4 & 5	2. Analyze and evaluate critical aspects of the aerospace industry related to safe work practices, standards and tolerances, standard shop practices, proper use of tools, power equipment, and personal protective equipment.	Standardized questions embedded into the final exams of AFAB 115 or AFAB 120. A grade of 70% or higher will be considered as meeting the PLO. The achievement target is that 80% of all students assessed will have met the PLO.
4	3. Use, read, and interpret industry standard blueprints to construct aircraft components.	Standardized questions embedded into the final exam of AFAB 110, AFAB 115 or AFAB 120. A grade of 70% or higher will be considered as meeting the PLO. The achievement target is that 70% of all students assessed will have met the PLO.
4 & 5	4. Assure that actions and decisions are based on ethical work practices and human factors directly related to proficiency level degradation in the work environment.	Standardized questions embedded into the final exams of AFAB 130 or AFAB 210. A grade of 70% or higher will be considered as meeting the PLO. The achievement target is that 80% of all students assessed will have met the PLO.

Area Dean Approval: _____ Date: _____ SLO Committee Approval:_____ Date: _____

Program Assessment Cycle

Program Name: Aircraft Fabrication & Assembly Technician Program

Spring 2010	Fall 2010	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013
		Pilot PLO #1	Assess PLO #1	Assess PLO #1	Assess PLO #1	Assess PLO #1	Assess PLO #1
		Pilot PLO #2	Assess PLO #2	Assess PLO #2	Assess PLO #2	Assess PLO #2	Assess PLO #2
		Pilot PLO #3	Assess PLO #3	Assess PLO #3	Assess PLO #3	Assess PLO #3	Assess PLO #3
		Pilot PLO #4	Assess PLO #4	Assess PLO #4	Assess PLO #4	Assess PLO #4	Assess PLO #4

PROGRAM NAME		Aircraft Fabrication 7 Assembly Technician				
DIVISION		Technical Education				
DEPARTMENT		AFAB				
DATE APPROVED						
DEGREE		☑				
CERTIFICATE		☑				
REQUIRED FOR PROGRAM	COURSE NAME (Ex: AERO 120)	: I = Introduced D = Developed M = Mastery				
		PLO 1	PLO 2	PLO 3	PLO 4	PLO 5
☑	AFAB 110			I,D		
☑	AFAB 115	I, D, M	I, D, M	M	I	
☑	AFAB 120	I, D, M	I, D, M	M	I	
☑	AFAB 130				D, M	
☑	AFAB 210		D		D, M	
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						
☐						

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

College Coordinating Council
Committee Information Sheet

Student Learning Outcome Committee 2011 – 2012

Committee Name

	Appointed By	Individual	Term	Expiration Date
Co-Chair	Academic Senate – Faculty	Melanie Parker	3 of 3	June 30, 2012
Co-Chair	V.P. of Academic Affairs or designee	Ted Younglove	Standing Member	Standing Member
Admin. Member	V.P of Student Services	*VACANT*	Standing Member	Standing Member
Faculty Member	Academic Senate	Dr. Irit Gat	1 of 3	June 20, 2014
Faculty Member	Academic Senate	Dr. Bassam Salameh	3 of 3	June 30, 2012
Faculty Member	Academic Senate	Dr. Fredy Aviles	2 of 3	June 30, 2013
SSV Faculty Member	Academic Senate	Patricia Marquez	1 of 3	June 30, 2014
SSV Faculty Member	Academic Senate	Dr. Robert Harris	1 of 3	June 30, 2014
AP&P Faculty Member	Academic Senate	*VACANT*	1 of 3	June 30, 2014
Research Analyst	By position – adhoc (Non Voting)	Aaron Voelcker	Standing Member	Standing Member
Confidential Mngmt.	Confidential Management Rep.	*VACANT*	1 of 3	June 30, 2014
Classified Member	Classified Union – Representative	*VACANT*	1 of 3	June 30, 2014
Classified Member	Classified Union – Representative	Kim Covell	2 of 3	June 20, 2013

Type of Committee/Authority:
Academic Senate Standing Committee.

Purpose:
Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) provide specific observable characteristic developed by faculty and staff that allow them to determine or demonstrate evidence that learning has occurred as a result of a specific course, program, activity, or process. The SLO Committee will determine a campus-wide process for the uniform implementation and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes at the course, program, and department level. A Faculty Co-chair and Vice President of Academic Affairs or designee are responsible for chairing the committee and overseeing that the functions of the SLO Committee are met.

Function:
- Provide support and training
- Recommend and provide samples of effective assessment tools

- Provide connections to current campus practices
- Provide support and data in program review
- Provide support and data to the accreditation reports
- Ensure that Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are connected to Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)
- Act as resource group and maintain liaisons to AP&P

Committee submits recommendations to:
(To whom does the committee submit recommendations?)
Academic Senate

Composition:
Faculty Co-Chair
Vice President of Academic Affairs or Designee – Co-Chair
Vice President of Student Services
Director of Institutional Research and Planning
(3) Academic Affairs Faculty
(2) Student Services Faculty
(1) Academic Policies & Procedures Faculty Representative
(1) Research Analyst – Adhoc member (Non Voting)
(2) Classified Representative
(1) Confidential Management Representative

Terms:
Three-year terms for all committee members.

Quorum:
A simple majority of the committee's voting membership.

Meetings:
Meetings are held on the 2nd and 4th Monday of each month during the fall/spring semesters from 3:00 p.m .to 4:30 p.m.

Minutes/Records:
Minutes are posted to the public Senate website and are housed in the Academic Senate Office.

Prepared by: **Christos Valiotis / gmk**   **Date: August 22, 2011**