



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE  
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING  
March 8, 2010  
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. President's 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 23, 2009
  - b. February 22, 2010
5. **PRESENTATION - None**
6. **REPORTS**
  - a. SLO Flex Events 2/26 and 3/5, 2010
  - b. Senate Meeting 3/4/10
7. **ACTION ITEMS - None**
8. **DISCUSSION –**
  - a. 2010-2011 Assessment Plan
  - b. Draft Spring Reporting Guidelines
  - c. Draft Assessment Form
  - d. “WEAVE Week”
  - e. WEAVE Coaching
  - f. Ideas for Adjunct and Staff Encouragement/Involvement
9. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS - none**
10. **OTHER**
  - a. Remaining SLO Meetings (all in A41) – 3/22, 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 8, 2010**  
**President's Conference Room, 3:00 – 4:30 PM**

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

**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) – None**

**3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – None**

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – The chair asked and received a motion and a second to approve the November 23, 2009 SLO minutes. With no further discussion, these minutes were approved as read. The chair asked and received a motion and a second to approve the February 22, 2010 SLO minutes. Ms. Parker asked Aaron if the numbers listed under item 6 are correct. He and Ted ascertained that they were. Patricia Marquez noted two corrections on page 4. These corrections will be noted on the minutes. With no further discussion, these minutes were approved as read.

**5. PRESENTATION – No presentations.**

**6. REPORTS**

**a. SLO Flex Events 2/26 and 3/5, 2010 (Melanie Parker/Aaron Voelcker)** – Ms. Parker relayed that we had six people (mostly adjunct) come to the flex event on 2/26. They had lots of questions and they were provided with guidance regarding the SLO website. Aaron Voelcker reported that we had 14 people for the WEAVE flex event on March 5th. He related that the workshop went the full two hours and that it went well.

The flex event that was originally scheduled for the morning of March 5th had to be rescheduled to March 12 from 1-4 p.m. in LC 113. The March 12th 9a.m. to noon flex event has been moved to L201. Both of these events provide Standard 1 flex credit. Ms. Parker requested that anyone with sample PLOs bring them to the morning event and reminded committee members that their attendance is always welcome, even if they can only attend a portion of the event. Ms. Maggie Drake indicated she will attend the morning PLO session.

**b. Senate Meeting 3/4/2010 (Melanie Parker)** – Ms. Parker attended the March 4<sup>th</sup> Academic Senate meeting and reported that the Senate representatives are behind the committee and the SLO process. Ms. Parker gave them the most recent SLO reporting rates and some representatives were astounded that they were so low. Representatives were told that some areas are holding off on reporting until the end of spring so that aggregate data for the entire 2009-2010 academic cycle can be reported at once. One issue could be that some numbers have been entered into WEAVE in draft form, but Ted Younglove mentioned that these numbers are being counted the same as if they were the final figures. Ted Younglove and Aaron Voelcker both stated that faculty can change their data in WEAVE, even after indicating they are “final” rather than “draft”. Hitting the “final” and then “save” buttons allow data and information’s transfer to the report section. The committee is looking for ways to continue to make the reporting process simpler and wants to be certain all faculty receive uniform instructions. Dr. Salameh mentioned that he will be involved in a biology meeting to discuss their SLO assessment and is working to get adjunct faculty involved in this process.

## **7. ACTION ITEMS** – None

## **8. DISCUSSION**

**a. 2010-2011 Assessment Plan (Melanie Parker)** – Ms. Parker asked for help in developing an assessment plan. Ted Younglove relayed that the information should be simple, containing clear instructions and confined to just one page. The first suggestion is that we need a reporting cycle with an e-mail to the dean and a carbon copy to Institutional Research. The assessment plan should outline our policy for the 2010-2011 academic cycle and must include information such as when and how often data is to be reported, how many SLOs are to be assessed, and to whom will data be reported. The committee agreed that every SLO should be assessed at least once during the academic cycle. It will also be essential that deans know which faculty member is responsible for gathering and reporting data for courses within each division. It will be important for the Office of Institutional Research to have a list of who will be reporting within each division. That way if SLOs for certain courses are not reported, faculty can be contacted for the information. Aaron Voelcker recommended that there be as few people as possible entering data into WEAVE, so that data is not compromised. Dr. Hall asked if there should be one person per course or one person per subject area. The committee was reminded that since the number of courses and sections taught vary from division to division, it should be up to the deans and division members to decide how these responsibilities are to be divided. Ted Younglove reiterated that the fewer people handling data, the better off we will be, and reminded the committee that action plans will need to be entered as data is discussed and analyzed. As a reminder, all SLOs for every course taught during an academic cycle should be reported. If a course is only

taught once during the cycle, then all SLOs are to be assessed and reported for that term. All information regarding SLO data will now be kept electronically in WEAVE.

To review, the assessment plan should have the dates when data is due, a reporting mechanism, responsible people identified from each respective division for reporting purposes, and a standard in terms of number of SLOs being assessed over an academic cycle. This process will also include SLOs from Student Service areas and OOs.

Ms. Drake suggested that we need a time line regarding data we accrue to show “trend over time”. She also asked about the process for revisions to the SLOs. Ms. Parker reminded the committee that these are still being sent to the SLO Committee for acknowledgement. The committee wants to be certain changes are not arbitrarily being made on WEAVE. Revisions to SLOs should be made only at the beginning of an academic cycle and not semester to semester. SLOs and revised SLOs will continue to be posted on myAVC and paper copies kept on file in the Office of Academic Affairs. Dr. Hall asked if SLO reports on WEAVE could be tied to the program review cycle. A number felt that this was a plausible solution. Since this data needs to be incorporated into program review, that would make sense. If you are doing the program review one year, you would follow up the next year with analysis of the previous year’s data and a related action plan. Ms. Drake felt that if you were allowed to tinker with the data on a yearly basis, then it would distort your “trend over time” data. Mr. Younglove recommended that at this time we need to stabilize SLOs and not go further than that. This information on data reporting will also be integrated into reporting mechanisms for Student Services, HR, Business Services, etc.

**b. Draft Spring Reporting Guidelines (Melanie Parker)** – (Please refer to SLO Reporting Guidelines for Academic Courses Spring 2010) – This information will be supplanted by the assessment plan for 2010-2011 next year, but right now we need to give people guidance for the spring semester. Dr. Gat felt that bullet #4 should be removed since we no longer wish to have data directed via email to Aaron Voelcker. Ms. Marquez suggested language be made consistent rather than using both “faculty” and “instructor”. A question was raised about action plans and the verbiage needed to address them. Ms. Drake believes that we are not yet ready to go to that step, even though it is an important step in the process and without that information it will make our reports useless. Some areas may be ready to go to this step. One issue that many have discovered is that in our rush to establish SLOs and assessment methods, some find that the methods or tools they established are not workable. In those cases, people may need to make changes that will allow more appropriate measurement. Ms. Marquez feels that in order to get people in the proper mindset, we should not be asking them to take elaborate action but getting them in the habit of actually doing something meaningful with that assessment. After people have done several assessments and understand the point of action plans, they will have learned from it and it should not seem like such a huge project that must be done. For the time being though, we will ask faculty to assess spring 2010 semester using the same methods as Fall 2009. Ms. Covell brought up the deadline date. Since faculty are often off campus and unavailable once final grades have been submitted, the committee believes SLO data should be submitted by the same deadline as grades are to be submitted. Since much of the assessment data often will not come until the same time frame as grades are done, faculty need to understand that grades

and SLO data must be submitted by the same deadline date. Dr. Hall recommended that the date be stated “on or before” and agreed the dates must stay consistent.

**c. Draft Assessment Form (Melanie Parker)** – Ms. Parker felt that this form could be helpful in reporting out to divisions. If the assessment information is not communicated to others, it cannot be discussed. The form is very simple, straightforward and on one page. It can be saved easily and then be made available for documentation in regard to accreditation. One suggestion, though, was a box for a narrative. This form can be used for all divisions and similar forms customized for Student Services and operational outcomes. Aaron recommended that in order to keep the form consistent with the WEAVE process, the lines for data collection and data analysis should reflect the order that information is entered into WEAVE.

Now the question comes up of who uses the form, how often and where should it be kept? It was suggested that whoever collects the data use the form and that it should be filed at the divisional level. Since the committee’s intent is not to overwhelm people with more forms, it may be best leaving this as optional. Some divisions may choose to use it as a basis for reports back to departments or divisions and it could be used for communication among various faculty who are assessing the same course. Once the committee approves a final form, it will be posted on the the SLO website.

**d. “WEAVE Week (Melanie Parker)** – After discussion with Ted Younglove and Aaron Voelcker, the week of May 17-20 has been suggested to promote WEAVE. These dates will coordinate with the end of the semester when faculty will start to pull data together for input into WEAVE. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning and SLO Committee will schedule a hands-on opportunity for faculty from each division to receive coaching and instructions on inputting SLO data into WEAVE. Whoever is responsible for working with WEAVE within their division can receive Standard 1 credit for this training. If anyone is unable to attend the event during their division’s scheduled training, they can come to another division’s training time. Computer lab space will need to be arranged. A sign in sheet will be created in order to get Mr. Voelcker names ahead of time. The reason this time frame was chosen is so that training can occur close to the reporting time frame; this should increase the possibility trainees will be able to use the process without forgetting important steps.

The question also came up from Dr. Hall about operational outcomes (OOs) and if those departments have been approached regarding WEAVEonline training. She asked when this type of training event could be set up for them. The week before WEAVE Week was suggested, but since the time frame for these areas is not as critical as the time frame for academic course data, it may be better to set this up during the summer or whenever a feasible time is determined. There is much more flexibility to working with these departments than in academic areas. The earlier the dates can be worked out with each, the better. The suggestion was made that we train during the summer, we have many more computer labs to choose from. Ms. Drake also pointed out that with class reductions, she will have many opens labs in TechEd 7 103.

**e. WEAVE Coach (Melanie Parker)** – Ms. Parker would appreciate anyone’s assistance during WEAVE week to give an hour or more to help other faculty. She asked committee members to write their names down if they would be willing to take on this task. (Bassam Saleme, Fredy Aviles, Irit Gat, and Maggie Drake volunteered Thank you!) Once people within divisions are trained, the committee would like to see them

help others across campus get trained. Next year we can look for WEAVE mentors who could get flex credit for assisting with this process.

**f. Ideas for Adjunct and Staff/Encouragement/Involvement (Melanie Parker)** – (1) coffee “work sessions” at Starbucks; (2) change focus of an upcoming SLO flex event to an SLO social; (3) do a social after or in conjunction with the SLO Spring Update; (4) do an SLO social event in Palmdale; (5) continue to send out e-mails; (6) Dr. Salameh will speak with Dr. Uhazy about what could be done in his own division; (7) Melanie and Ted will do another division meeting presentation run; (8) send e-mails to deans about adjuncts who are involved (cc: adjuncts) and give them positive feedback regarding their adjunct faculty’s involvement; (9) try to make pod casts or videos out of the SLO flex events (ours have mostly been hands-on this year, though); (10) a personal thank you from the deans to participating faculty; (11) “house calls” to all deans and/or going to dean’s meetings (Ted); (12) get your name out there and adjuncts will seek you out; (13) invite adjuncts to a late afternoon/evening meeting. Melanie would like committee members to send her any more ideas if they have them.

**9. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS – None**

**10. OTHER –**

**a.** Remaining SLO meetings (all in A141) – 3/22, 4/12, 4/26, 5/10, 5/24

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

pag