



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING**

October 11, 2010

3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. A141

To conform to the open meeting act, the public may attend open sessions

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
2. **OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SLO COMMITTEE CHAIR**
3. **OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. September 27, 2010
5. **PRESENTATION - None**
6. **REPORTS**
 - a. Updates from Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)
 - b. Program Learning Outcomes under development (Melanie Parker)
7. **ACTION ITEMS - None**
8. **DISCUSSION –**
 - a. G.E. PLOs (Dr. Lee Grishman)
 - b. WEAVE mapping functions (Aaron Voelcker)
9. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS - none**
10. **OTHER**
 - a. Dates of remaining SLO meetings:
 - October 25
 - November 8
 - November 22
 - b. SLO Committee Faculty Professional Development Events for Fall 2010
 - Learning Outcomes Analysis and Evaluation - Friday, October 15, 1 to 4 PM, SSV151
 - Learning Outcomes Update – Friday, November 19, 4 to 6 PM, SSV151
 - Learning Outcomes Update – Thursday, December 2, 7 to 9PM, SSV151
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
October 11, 2010
Room A141, 3:00 – 4:30 PM

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

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Ms. Melanie Parker, co-chair of the SLO Committee, called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

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

Ms. Parker, Ms. Marquez, and others have been working on an SLO glossary that is specific to our campus. Ms. Parker requested that all members review the document. The document was created because a number of faculty may not understand how we locally define these terms. Once the glossary is finalized it will be distributed and also posted on the SLO website.

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

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Ms. Parker asked the members for any corrections to the minutes of the 9/27/10 meeting. With none forthcoming, Ms. Parker asked for a motion to approve. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. With no further discussion, the motion passed.

5. PRESENTATION – No presentations.

6. REPORTS

a. Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker) – Mr. Voelcker and Mr. Younglove stated that there are no updates to report at this time.

b. Program Learning Outcomes under development (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker has been in contact with each division and Dean on campus. We have asked what they are in need of and indicated we will offer any assistance that they require. Ms. Parker mentioned that Tech Ed needs to complete assessment methods and curriculum mapping. Ms. Drake is working on these needs and will present this at her division’s next meeting. Health Sciences have completed PLOs and assessment, but need to work with curriculum mapping. Other divisions

are in need of PLOs in a number of certificate and degree areas. Tech Ed and Health Sciences will be participating in curriculum mapping this academic cycle. The plan is to use these divisions as models for other programs. It was suggested the term “curriculum mapping” be added to the AVC SLO glossary and Ms. Parker agreed to do that.

7. ACTION ITEMS – no action items

8. DISCUSSION

a. GE PLOs (Dr. Lee Grishman) – Dr. Grishman circulated copies of the three general education PLOs that were developed this past summer and the ILOs developed by the SPBC Committee and approved by the Senate in November, 2005. The committee discussed ways the six ILOs are integrated into G.E. requirements and could be incorporated into assessment of the GE PLOs. Ms. Marquez stated that she sees clearly how PLO # 1 relates to ILO #4, PLO #2 relates to ILO #5 and PLO#3 relates to ILO #3. The fact that students completed a degree is not in itself assessment of the GE PLOs. Mr. Younglove believes one way to accomplish assessment is through a survey. He introduced the most recent ILO Assessment Survey Results. A survey could be fashioned with similar questions as one means of assessing GE PLOs.

Dr. Hall asked if we could apply a meta-analysis approach which includes both quantitative as and qualitative data. Mr. Younglove stated that approach would certainly be possible. Ms. Adams mentioned that she has had students who passed her classes but did not successfully achieve SLOs. Ms. Marquez asked if we could put together a matrix of SLO assessment data from a cross section of all divisions. A random sample of the data put into WEAVE might be one way to accomplish this. Mr. Grishman could access this information in WEAVE to look at those PLOs which in turn might help measure the GE PLOs. The best way for him to proceed would be to locate the courses under each of the PLOs (such as critical thinking), cluster those courses, and proceed with clusters of courses under each of the PLOs. We could determine which of the ILOs applied to each of the GE clusters. We might then be able to connect the ILO survey questions and integrate examples from curriculum mapping. Mr. Grishman stated that while we can connect relationships between the ILOs and the PLOs, this could not be completed until all PLOs are written.

Mr. Younglove stated that previous ILO surveys are still a work in progress and it is possible questions could be changed to reflect more and different data. We must keep in mind that if we develop a survey tied to graduation application, we will not be getting results from students who are transferring or who took courses leading to employment or career advancement or for personal growth. Online surveys completed in conjunction with graduation application could be developed in a format that would not allow the applicant to move forward with the application until the survey was completed. SPBC is working on revising ILOs modeled after those from another institution. These ILOs are similar in content to our present ILOs but worded differently in order to facilitate more direct measurement. Currently, our only measurement of ILOs is through survey. Realistically we could have two of these measures, a graduation exit survey as well as the ILO survey, in place and ready for use by the end of Spring 2011. Ms. Parker stated that all members seem comfortable with the PLOs that have been written for the GE program and that we have been able to clearly connect the three PLOs to the ILOs. Since we are approaching assessment using multiple measures, we would hopefully add two more direct measures the following year. In this regard, Mr. Grishman will proceed with the clustering of courses under each PLO and then coordinate the PLOs with the ILOs. He will contact Mr. Younglove for any help with further measurements and assessments. Mr. Grishman will return for further discussion at the next meeting.

b. SLO Revision and Approval Process (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker and Mr. Voelcker have been working on curriculum mapping. WEAVE provides a curriculum mapping module but it is necessary to go from screen to screen to enter data and it is somewhat cumbersome to use. Mr. Voelcker gave a demonstration using the WEAVE module. Each course must be listed and each PLO and ILO integrated appropriately. This proved to be a time consuming process when Ms. Parker attempted it for the CFE program. Ms. Parker felt it was far more useful to enter and view the information all on one page. Mr. Voelcker developed an Excel template that could be used as a substitute for the WEAVE function. Since all information is entered on one page, it can be viewed as a whole. The committee asked if this format could work with OOs. Mr. Voelcker responded that it would as long as columns were expanded. Ms. Parker was concerned that if we did not use the WEAVE function, it might affect how some reports were run or the linkage needed as part of planning functions. Mr. Voelcker investigated this issue and as far as we know, our use of a different format will not hinder evidence used in reports or planning. He contacted WEAVE for further information and only received back a standard reply. Ms. Parker stated that using the Excel template would require far less training than using the WEAVE function and since we want to use whatever will be easiest for faculty and staff, she was a proponent of the Excel approach. The Excel template and completed map can be posted in the document repository of WEAVE for each campus program. Mr. Voelcker will continue to work on the template, ensuring the functionality we require is present. As soon as we are satisfied the template is finalized, we will distribute it to those working with PLOs.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS – none at this time

10. OTHER –

a. SLO Meeting Dates for Fall – The remaining SLO Committee meeting dates are October 25, November 8, and November 22. Please remember that the November 8th meeting will be held in the President’s Conference Room.

b. Remaining FPD events for fall:

- Learning Outcomes Analysis and Evaluation – Friday, October 15, 1 to 4 PM, SSV151
- Learning Outcomes Update – Friday, November 19, 4 to 6 PM, SSV151
- Learning Outcomes Update – Thursday, December 2, 7 to 9PM, SSV151

c. Ms. Genie Trow attended today’s meeting to speak on behalf of the Visual and Performing Arts division regarding SLOs and assessment. She stated that from the perspective of theater, once a performance is over, there is nothing left to evaluate. Since performances leave one with affectively based information, she believes assessment can be very difficult to do. Ms. Trow passed out several documents from a theatre appreciation textbook. She stated that the author has come up with a description for this situation called “theatriculism” to name what traditionally has been called non-realistic theatre. The author talks about the actor’s craft. It states – “Analogy is often used to describe acting because it is difficult to define the actor’s process with precision. First, many forces intervene: the text, the director, the other actors, the rehearsal structure and duration, and the playing space. Second, acting is such a personal and individual endeavor that it can be impossible to identify with certainty what has taken place internally to produce the result that the audience sees.”

This is what makes it so difficult to come up with measurable objectives. How do you evaluate an actor’s performance? When a person is asked to evaluate the different portions of the program, it interferes with the process you have as being an attentive audience member. The instructors are having a very difficult time pinpointing an exact way to evaluate a performance and then put that into words. Dr. Gat felt that research done in psychology determining the quality of therapy as related to the therapists relationship with the client, was a related point. Dr. Gat will look for more research and pass this along. Dr. Aviles felt that recording the

performance and then going back and evaluating it would be a good method. He also felt that assessment at a performance could be done using a checklist. Ms. Trow appreciated the comments but still felt that this could not be done if you were an audience member.

Ms. Trow also passed out a paper with two of her favorite quotes. The first one comes from a professor of archeology, Steve Lekson, which states “What has been neglected is an appreciation for the unquantifiable”. This professor was criticized for his work of connecting migration dots of ancient southwest where the results could not be quantified, but stated that just because they could not, does not mean that they do not have value. The second quote comes from jazz trumpeter, Dizzie Gillespie, who stated “It took me my whole life to learn what not to play”. This goes to the premise that even if you leave aspects out of a performance, it can still be a very satisfying experience.

The question was then asked “How do instructors go about giving grades in their courses?” Ms. Trow stated that it is very easy in Theatre Appreciation as there is a textbook from which homework is assigned and tests are given. But other courses have to be graded on the aspect of insightfulness where the instructor must determine if they feel the student has put in the time to think of what they saw or heard. Dr. Aviles felt that the analytical evaluation needs to come from the ability of each performer, whether in the arts, music or theatre. The instructor must keep in mind the objectives that have been stated in the COR and keep to those requirements when assessing. Ms. Marquez also feels that broader characteristics can be quantified using a checklist system and can be translated into words, whether it be a piece of pottery or a theatre performance. She feels that instructors can come up with a set of 2 or 3 broad SLOs for each course that by using a checklist turns it into quantifiable results.

Ms. Parker thanked Ms. Trow for sharing this perspective, commented that more discussion needs to take place among faculty teaching these courses, and asked if Ms. Trow was willing to help facilitate the discussion. Dr. Aviles indicated his willingness to be a resource in this process.

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

pag