



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING**

November 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. October 25, 2010
5. **PRESENTATION - None**
6. **REPORTS**
 - a. Updates from Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)
7. **ACTION ITEMS**
 - a. SLOs for approval: Auto 198A, 198C, 198D, 198E, 198F, 198H, 198N; Latin 201; Phil 109 (proposed course); NS 230
 - b. SLO revisions: Biology 201
8. **DISCUSSION –**
 - a. G.E. PLOs (Dr. Lee Grishman)
 - b. Proposed documents and processes – attached (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
 - c. Planning for November 19th and December 2nd Learning Outcomes Updates
9. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS - none**
10. **OTHER**
 - a. Dates of remaining SLO meetings:
 - November 22
 - b. SLO Committee Faculty Professional Development Events for Fall 2010
 - PLO Write-In workshop – Monday, November 15, 1-3 p.m., L201
 - PLO Write-In workshop – Friday, November 19, 9-11 a.m., L201
 - Learning Outcomes Update – Friday, November 19, 4 to 6 PM, SSV151
 - 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
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 8, 2010
President’s Conference Room, 3:00 – 4:30 PM

Members Present	Members Absent	Guests in Attendance
Melanie Parker	Maggie Drake	Tatiana Konovalov – ASO rep
Dr. Rosa Hall	Michelle Hernandez	Dr. Lee Grishman
Dr. Irit Gat	Rick Motawakel	
Ted Younglove	Aaron Voelcker	
Dr. Bassam Salameh	Kim Covell	
Dr. Fredy Aviles		
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 3:08 p.m.

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

Ms. Melanie Parker asked for a motion to add three newly submitted SLOs to the agenda for approval. A motion was made to add PE 118, 119, and 195 and seconded. With no further discussion, the motion passed and these SLOs will be included on the agenda. Ms. Parker also received an e-mail from the chair of the Faculty Professional Development Committee asking the SLO Committee to do a presentation at the Spring Welcome Back Day. The committee is interested in information regarding analysis of SLOs and what to do with the data procured. They have requested the session involve breaking into small groups for hands-on activity. We will discuss this again at the next meeting.

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 10/25/10 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. Younglove felt that overall the Accreditation Team seemed to be very happy. They spoke with him in the research office and as part of the SLO Committee. What they were most concerned about was the discussion of SLO data and how it was being documented. They

wanted to know who was using the data and in what context. They also asked who had collected data and not used it. We need to come up with a consistent way for us to document discussions, make decisions, and then document who had the discussion and made that particular decision. The team seemed to be satisfied that we are consistently procuring data in a number of different areas. Since we can enter meeting minutes into the document repository of WEAVE, we need to consider how to make that happen across campus. The team also wanted to know what we are going to do if we see assessment practices across divisions that are not working. What would we do about it and how would we document it? What changes would we make? They wanted to be sure that the committee was being responsive to needed changes, noting what changes should be made to correct a problem, and to make sure it was being documented. If there is only one person in a department and that person is adjunct faculty, discussions still need to occur within related subject areas in that division. If there are two or more faculty in a department, they could meet, take minutes of their conversation, document them, and place them in the WEAVE document repository. Changes could then be referenced back to previous documentation.

Dr. Hall brought up an issue that occurred in the Basic Skills Committee, chaired by Santi Taferella. They were reporting on the new eight week system incorporated this year. It appears we are keeping more students in the basic skills courses and they are being more successful under this eight week system, an encouraging result. Mary Rose Toll (Reading) stated that she was finding some differences that came about, through testing and observation, and that perhaps some changes needed to be incorporated. Changing how information is presented to students seems to be what is needed. Dr. Hall feels that any time Student Success and Equity and or Basic Skills feels that a change is needed, this discussion should also be documented.

As a final thought, what else can be done to document what we talk about, even if is an e-mail, a conversation in the hallway, a phone call, or an actual face to face meeting? The essence of these discussions need to be gathered, the date and who was present noted, the subject matter discussed and any decisions made documented. A chain of documentation must begin and be continually updated. The documentation does not have to be detailed, but must capture the major facts. Ms. Marquez stated that all of this dialogue and analysis is discussed at a number of committees and a standardized form needs to be created throughout campus so everyone is on the same page. She feels that the responsibility to decide this should reside with SPBC with possible discussion within Senate. A very broad format needs to be devised so that as it evolves through all the campus committee levels, it can be adjusted to meet each need.

Dr. Hall brought up the improved program review system by Carol Eastin and asked if perhaps the information for reviewing SLOs could be contained there. This could then be forwarded to SPBC. This would be a way for us to tie all of the different components together such as SLOs, PLOs, ILOs, OOs, and budget. While SLOs are now being addressed in both the yearly and four year Program Review Reports, right now there seems to be no mechanism within SPBC to use that information. If we did have something like this, it could create a path that would tie in all divisions and functions on campus. It still comes back to the bottom line, which is dialogue. Nothing gets accomplished without this and if you do not document it, we can't verify what was actually said. The Accreditation Team found that a number of minutes from various committees across campus were missing the essence of the dialogue. Most just said that the "subject was discussed" without elaborating on any details or what actions might occur. There was no evidence to show how the discussion got from point a, b, or c on major decisions. Detail upon detail is what the accreditation team expects to see. Where does this discussion all begin and what is the appropriate starting point? Ms. Marquez stated that hopefully the discussion would begin with Dr. Fisher, once he has received the Accreditation Report.

Dr. Aviles also had a lengthy discussion with one of the members of the team. First, the team member wanted to see evidence regarding how assessment results would be tied to budget. Second, he asked how we arbitrarily began using 70% as the marker for course success. He made mention that sometimes a situation demands 80% or maybe even 100% in areas of absolute correctness, such as nursing. These numbers should be determined by data and discussion, and not pulled out of thin air. As we began writing SLOs, we needed a number to start with and many decided that 70% gave us a starting point. As we learn more and our data evolves, we need to set more meaningful targets. Dr. Aviles states that we should be able to expect that our students attain the 70% level, but data has already shown the psychology faculty, students did not even reach this point. Ms. Marquez reiterated that what is most important is the dialogue and how you came to determining those figures and seeing that the dialogue is documented. Third, this same team member did not like to see faculty use separate quizzes and papers “on the side” as our determination of meeting SLOs. He seemed to want a closer tie between achievement of the SLOs and grades. This immediately sent up a red flag with a number of committee members because they believe this would go against the essence of Title 5. Title 5 states that the grades given in a course must be based solely upon the measurable objectives as stated in the course outline of record. Dr. Salameh mentioned he randomly chooses several questions within a quiz/test that he feels are applicable to an SLO and derives his data from that source. Dr. Aviles mentioned again that the accreditation team members want to see what the students can do based upon what they learned in the course. Ms. Marquez feels that what this team member expressed is encroaching on the directives of Title 5. Ms. Parker mentioned the need to remember that our goal in assessing SLOs is not to judge each individual student, but to assess the learning of the whole group. Ms. Marquez stated that we should wait until we receive the report back after the first of the year, analyze the information in the report, and then determine our next steps.

7. ACTION ITEMS – approval of SLOs:

- a. Auto 198A, 198C, 198D, 198E, 198F, 198H, 198N; Latin 201; Phil 109 (proposed course); NS 230; PE118, PE119, PE 195
- b. SLO revisions: Biology 201

A motion was made and seconded to approve the above SLOs which passed the technical review process. All SLOs met established SLO rubric requirements instituted by the committee for formal approval. Motion carried.

8. DISCUSSION

a. GE PLOs (Dr. Lee Grishman) – Dr. Grishman reminded committee members that he was to return to the next meeting after accomplishing the following in regard to the GE PLOs: the first was to coordinate the various divisions of the college to the PLOs; second, to see how they related to the ILOs of the college; and then from those, to develop sample assessment questions. In that regard, Dr. Grishman passed out a draft assessment questionnaire. The first PLO, “students demonstrate critical thinking skills and the competencies to function effectively within society”, is associated with ILOs #1, 2, 3, and 4. He also listed the college areas involved. He created three survey questions for the student to use in self-assessing PLO #1. Questions were derived from the latest ILO survey. The other two GE PLOs were to be assessed in similar fashion. One concern is to how to gather information from students after the fact. This would involve comprehensive institutional research and could possibly require a substantial sum of money as well as personnel to gather and process data. Ideally, follow-up would need to be done a year after the student leaves AVC in order for students to answer each question based upon real world experiences.

Ms. Parker saw information on a GE assessment from another community college, where the first sample was taken when students first began taking GE units and was compared to a sample of students who had completed 30 GE units. Some felt that this would work in a 4-year environment but Ms. Parker stated that it was being tried in a two-year institution. Some members felt this could work as a beginning. Dr. Hall suggested that we could possibly utilize 100 level courses in each of the college areas, and then move up from there to 200 level, but Ms. Marquez stated that not all 200s have 100s as prerequisites. Dr. Grishman also stated that at the beginning of their college enrollment, many students may not even know where they stand in relation to these questions. The question of when to give the survey was asked. Most felt that the beginning should be at the start of a 100 course and then at the end of a 200 course, but a number of times these do not fall in the correct sequence. Ms. Parker encouraged the committee to investigate what other colleges are doing and to bring that information back as possible options. Ms. Marquez will be going to Statewide Senate this week and check to see if she can come up with anything. The group will continue this discussion at the next meeting.

b. Proposed documents and processes – attached (Melanie Parker) –

- **Revised SLO Form** – Ms. Parker and Ms. Drake discussed eliminating the Corrective Actions column. If eliminated, would the corrective actions be replaced by action plans in WEAVE? Ms. Parker and Ms. Eastin (Program Review) discussed that a minor revision of yearly program review would be to ask programs to verify that updated information had been entered into WEAVE. Most do not know what to do with the corrective actions column anyway; perhaps it would be best to use this column for dialogue and then make a new column stating the date of WEAVE entry. This will help with documentation.
- **Revised PLO Form** – Committee members were in agreement as to making the same changes on this form.
- **Suggested Questions for Discussion Related to SLO Evaluation and Analysis** – The question is what do we do with the information now that we have it? Many of us do not know how to begin the discussion nor to ascertain what the data means. Ms. Parker compiled questions from a number of sources and believes this document could be used in workshops, faculty discussion, and posted on the website. Dr. Aviles feels that the word “budget” should be included. Ms. Marquez stated that this is not the place for budget. This information funnels to program review, along with quite a bit of other data, and once that is all put together, budget enters the discussion. Dr. Gat also had a suggestion under Assessment Process. Should we add the name of the person entering information under the last bullet? Ms. Parker felt that it was not a necessary concern. Dr. Aviles asked whether we should include a meeting date and contributing members. Ms. Parker stated that we have an SLO Assessment Study form posted online, that would document this information. It is suggested that faculty use this form when discussing outcomes. Ms. Marquez went back to the subject of budget. She feels that we could create parallel questions for discussion on PLO evaluation and analysis. Then how would your program benefit by having additional faculty to make your program stronger? Or by adding a new course? This is not designed to be busy work but to open up the door for faculty to see new possibilities.
- **Instructional Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs): Development Process** – Ms. Marquez recommends that the first two paragraphs be reversed because staff don’t write educational PLOs. Dr. Salameh asked if there would be a difference if the student were earning a two year degree student or transferring? It all depends on the student and the degree or certificate they plan to earn. Are they going to use it to finalize their education or use it as a stepping stone to higher education? Ms. Parker asked each member to review the steps and see if the form makes sense. Dr. Aviles asked about the letters, “I”, “D”, and “M” used for curriculum mapping and who determines those in

regard to each course. Ms. Parker relayed that it is faculty teaching in that course or area who determine at which level each PLO is addressed. Faculty will do curriculum mapping for each program. Ms. Adams asked in what step do you develop the assessments? The draft document does not address this specifically, but it is considered to be covered by the first step. It was agreed that this should be spelled out so there is no confusion.

- **Proposed PLO Cycle of Assessment** – Does this cycle of assessment get our PLOs assessed fast enough? Mr. Younglove is a little hesitant about pushing PLOs when we are still somewhat behind on our SLOs. Programs that are already to this point, should begin to do their assessment of PLOs, even if that makes for a number of differing cycles across campus. Depending upon the program, there may be differing cycles anyway. If some divisions are lagging behind, they will need to work with Mr. Younglove to bring them up to speed so that we are on track for 2012. All assessment targets still need to be set so there is something concrete to work toward. Ms. Marquez recommended that the committee ask Ms. Lowry and Dr. Hall for this information from their divisions by the end of February. The divisions would set their assessment cycles for each program, return them to the committee for review to conform to timelines, the committee would suggest any needed changes, and return the approved cycle. This would make the faculty more committed to the system. Ms. Adams mentioned that it has been discussed in division meetings that people want firm deadlines, not just some obscure date in the future. This will help us get the process going so we have a viable chance to meet our deadlines for 2012.

c. Planning for November 19th and December 2nd Learning Outcomes Updates (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker requests that committee members to choose one of these dates to attend and participate. She is also interested in knowing what committee members believe people need to hear. Please be prepared to assist wherever you can. Ms. Parker will e-mail committee members with needs for these events.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS – none at this time

10. OTHER –

a. SLO Meeting Dates for Fall – The remaining SLO Committee meeting date for Fall is November 22.

b. Remaining FPD events for Fall:

- PLO Write-In Workshop – Monday, November 15, 1-3p.m., L201
- PLO Write-In Workshop – Friday, November 19, 9-11 a.m., L201
- Learning Outcomes Update – Friday, November 19, 4 to 6 PM, SSV151
- 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

11. ADJOURNMENT – the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

pg