ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING
October 13, 2008
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. Room 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 22, 2008

5. **REPORT**
    a. SLO Review Sub-Committee (M. Clinton)

6. **ACTION ITEMS**
    a. Approve the following SLOs: MKTG 101; MKTG 121; RADT 101. Also, make note that the following Program Learning Outcomes have been received for acknowledgement by the SLO Review Sub-Committee: Radiologic Technolgy Program; Medical Assistant Program; Clothing and Textiles Program

7. **DISCUSSION**
    a. WEAVE Presentation (Ted Younglove)
    b. WASC/ACJCC Conference (conference participants)
    c. Program Learning Outcomes – (1)definition of programs; (2)strategies for working with staff and faculty

8. **SLO COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**

9. **OTHER**
    a. November Professional Development SLO Workshops: 11/7, 11/14, and 11/21 – 1 to 4 p.m.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

<table>
<tr><th>Members Present</th><th>Absent Members</th></tr>
<tr><td>Melanie Parker</td><td>Kim Covell</td></tr>
<tr><td>Dr. Irit Gat</td><td>Dr. Fredy Aviles</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ted Younglove</td><td>Mary Rose Toll</td></tr>
<tr><td>Dr. Rosa Hall</td><td>Sharon Lowry</td></tr>
<tr><td>Maria Clinton</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Yvette Cruzalegui</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Dr. Robert Harris</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Guests
None

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
   - There were not enough members present to make quorum so informal discussions commenced at 3: 50 p.m.
   - Maria Clinton reported that she conducted an e-mail meeting with the members of the Review Committee. Three PLOs are ready to be acknowledged by the SLO Committee; three SLOs are ready for approval. The Review Committee had questions about four SLOs and those are being returned to the respective faculty for correction/clarification. If further questions remain, the Review Committee will hold an in-person meeting to discuss the issues. Dr. Hall reported that Igor Marder will soon be forwarding the GED SLOs to the committee. Since we did not have quorum, these approval items will be brought forth at the next scheduled meeting.
   - Committee List – Christos Valiotis suggested in an e-mail to Melanie Parker that there be discussion regarding the elimination of open positions on the SLO Committee membership list. Christos believes that a committee with 11 members (with 6 needed for quorum) is appropriate. Positions to be eliminated would include the confidential rep and one union rep. There is currently a V.P. of Academic Affairs designee position open and the committee discussed the possibility that this position be filled by a Dean. Melanie Parker will discuss the issue with Ms. Lowry. The Committee wants to be certain we are following appropriate membership guidelines for a shared governance committee.
   - Program definition – The Committee needs to establish recommendations for the appropriate definition of a "program". After several faculty members attended the WASC/ACCJC Conference in Emeryville, there was a better understanding of how programs can be defined. Bob Harris reminded the committee that the Chancellor's Office defines programs as those courses of study leading to a degree or certificate. When a course of study does not lead to a degree or certificate, or in program areas such as Student Services, each college is free to apply their own definition. In fact, each program area or department in a college can freely define what constitutes a program as it applies to their area, as long as the Chancellor's definition does not apply. Dr. Hall stated that in Student Services, programs are already in place. Discussion seemed to support the idea of letting individual programs make determinations such as deciding the number of

Approved: October 27, 2008 SLO Committee Meeting

programs they wished to identify or whether one program could act as an umbrella with specialized programs underneath it. Bob Harris and Irit Gat discussed the possibility of faculty putting together a series of courses (such as psychology, math, etc.) that would prepare students for transfer in a particular subject area. A program like WEAVE is essential for tracking data in all areas. It was also mentioned that faculty must establish outcomes if you have a program. There are a variety of trends at other colleges. Dr. Hall stated that Student Services is using Riverside as a model. Presently, in areas such as Tech Ed, Nursing, and Student Services, programs and outcomes are already in place, but in other academic areas of the college, the definition of programs is still cloudy. This committee hopes to approve a definition of programs at the October 27th meeting and later present it to the Academic Senate as an action item. There was also some discussion regarding Operational Outcomes and whether it is the provenance of this committee, as a standing committee of the Academic Senate, to approve or acknowledge them. Melanie Parker and Ted Younglove will explore this issue.

- WEAVE – Ted did not yet have a visual presentation to give but stated that his office is getting the tree set up (starting with President, through the VPs and other administration areas, down to the division levels). Courses will be listed along with appropriate PLOs and goals. Once this is installed for all divisions with their respective SLOs, it will begin to come together. For now, Ted is requesting that all information be forwarded to him and to Aaron. They will currently be inputting data since we are in the early stages of getting the program up and running. Once everything is in place, a designee for each division could then be assigned to handle inputting for their respective area. Since assessment data for this semester will be reported to accreditation, we need to get all updated information entered as soon as possible. It was stated by Dr. Hall that Student Services is enthusiastically doing their SLOs and making changes to mission statements. They are also planning to write rationales with supportive data to show how things will relate to the ILOs of the college. Dr. Hall also stated that some Student Service areas may be writing rubrics. She stressed that this is a process in which change should be inherent.

- Our April report to the accreditation committee came back with high marks and comments on our SLO progress. It was suggested that something be done to send kudos to all faculty on a job well done. Next steps are to work with faculty on the approximately ten percent of courses still needing SLOs, to support faculty in revising the first rounds of SLOs if indicated by assessment results, and to begin focusing on the development of PLOs. It was emphasized during discussion that establishment of SLOs is only part of the process; we need to show that campus decision-making is part of an integrated data-driven process.

- Next meeting is October 27th , when we are hopeful a quorum will be present.

2. **ADJOURNMENT** – the meeting ended at 4:40 p.m.

pg for mp

Approved: October 27, 2008 SLO Committee Meeting