



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE  
OUTCOMES COMMITTEE MEETING  
March 10, 2014  
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.  
L 201**

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

MEMBERS PRESENT			
Dr. Fredy Aviles, Chair	David Durost	Dr. Irit Gat	Dr. Scott Lee
Stacey Adams	Jessica Eaton	Dr. Meeta Goel Dr.	Melanie Parker
Leslie Baker	Luis Enriquez, proxy	Glenn Haller	Wendy Stout
Kimberly Covell			
MEMBERS ABSENT		GUESTS PRESENT/EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS	
Carla Corona	LaDonna Trimble		
Diana Keelan	William Vaughn		
Dr. Tom O’Neil			

1.     **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**  
       Dr. Fredy Aviles, SLO Faculty Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.
  
2.     **OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE OC COMMITTEE CHAIR**  
       Dr. Fredy Aviles welcomed the representatives to the third meeting of the spring semester.
  
3.     **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**  
       No comments from the public were made.
  
4.     **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
  - a.    **February 24, 2014**  
       A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the February 24, 2014 Outcomes Committee meeting. Dr. Aviles requested clarification on whether SLO/PLOs can still be approved past the AP&P deadline. Mrs. Melissa Jauregui stated that SLO/PLOs can be approved at any time regardless of the deadline but if the course/program should be implemented in the coming catalog then faculty should attempt to receive approval by the deadline. Motion carried with one abstention.
  
5.     **REPORTS**
  - a.    **FPD: PLO Assessment**  
       Dr. Fredy Aviles indicated that there was no report for this item as he was not feeling well and cancelled the meeting.
  
  - b.    **Updates from the Department of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning – Dr. Meeta Goel**  
       Dr. Meeta Goel stated that she will report at the next meeting on this item.
  
6.     **ACTION ITEMS**
  - a.    **Revised SLOs: CIS 101, ELTE 135, ESL 099, ESL 101, HIST 107, HIST 108, Math 102B**  
       Dr. Fredy Aviles requested a motion to amend the agenda to add item 6b, new SLOs and move ESL 099 and ESL 101 to that item.

*A motion was made and seconded to amend the agenda as requested. Motion carried.*

A motion was made and seconded to approve CIS 101, ELTE 135, and MATH 102B. After a brief review of each course SLOs, the committee requested a motion to approve CIS 101, ELTE 135, and MATH 102B. Motion carried.

A motion was made and seconded to approve HIST 107 and HIST 108. The committee requested faculty to revise the SLO assessment methods for HIST 107 and HIST 108. It was noted that too many

assessment methods would make it difficult for faculty to aggregate the data once collected and suggested faculty decide on one to three assessment methods that will be common to all. Motion failed.

**b. New SLOs: ESL 099 and ESL 101**

A motion was made and seconded to approve ESL 099 and ESL 101. After a brief review of each SLO, the committee felt for ESL 099 SLO 1 and 2 the language which referenced total words minus errors to assess students critical thinking skills may not be the best form of assessment. Since this language is simply an example, some members asked if that language be removed and would it be sufficient for approval. Unfortunately the answer was no because the SLO calls out the ability to demonstrate critical thinking skills and writing accuracy rate did not seem to be an appropriate form of measurement. It was noted however that ESL 099 SLO 3 was fine as is.

As for ESL 101 SLO 1 and 2 the committee noted the same comments as above. Concern was also expressed for the following statement noted in ESL 101 SLO 1, 2 and 3:

"ESL and/or English faculty-development rubrics can also be used."

The committee had concerns with this statement because it seemed like it was optional and should be a requirement if the statement is used. The use of the word "can" did not agree with many members and it seemed they were in favor of changing this word to "will". Motion failed.

7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**a. Minor vs. major SLO/PLO revisions (attachment)**

Dr. Fredy Aviles requested the committee to review the document in the agenda packet, which had previously been reviewed, discussed, and revised. Dr. Aviles expressed his concerns with the language for minor and major SLO revisions. Since the committee currently does not differentiate between minor and major but rather reviews all SLOs fully, is it appropriate for this language to still be listed on this document. Mr. Glenn Haller indicated in the most recent revision of this document, this language was removed per discussions that occurred in this meeting. Dr. Aviles seemed surprised but still requested the committee to consider whether it is appropriate to review all SLOs fully as if new. It was noted that unfortunately a mass approval of SLOs without that review potentially puts poorly written SLOs into place. Mrs. Stacey Adams noted that while some representatives are fully reviewing SLOs some are not giving a thorough review but this seems to be more of a process issue.

Ms. Melanie Parker indicated that at the last SLO meeting Dr. Scott Lee expressed his concerns with this committee over stepping bounds and not trusting discipline faculty. At the time Ms. Parker did not agree but after giving it more thought, she feels that he is correct and perhaps this committee should not be reviewing each SLO with such a critical eye. Mrs. Adams indicated that the committee has not established what a non-substantial revision is and cannot determine what type of review is needed. While it was brought up that the AP&P committee has a technical review level, the Outcomes Committee felt that one more committee would not be appropriate. Ms. Melanie Parker reminded the committee of a rubric that was used in past years but representatives when reviewing SLOs/PLOs and suggested that rubric be used again to ensure a thorough review is done by each representative.

Dr. Aviles did not feel this was necessary but rather wanted to remove the notation of minor vs. major and in the future make the review of SLOs and PLOs so automated that the review and approval can be done by the AP&P committee. He indicated that if the representatives felt a process needs developing then bring concrete examples to a future meeting for discussion and implementation. Dr. Meeta Goel recommended that the committee continue to review and revise the current process so to simplify the SLO/PLO link. Perhaps in 2016 the committee should revisit this suggestion and determine whether the approval of the SLO/PLO can be done through the AP&P process. Dr. Goel also asked about the goals that were rewritten last fall, perhaps those should come forward for review and approval so they can be measured.

**b. The Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) (attachment)**

Dr. Aviles attempted to introduce the Degree Qualification Profile (DQP) as a topic for discussion in the last 15 minutes of the meeting. He stated that the DQP is a tool that should be used by faculty to determine if the degrees offered by their program, meet certain established criteria. The DQP states that students that receive an AA, BA, or MA should have achieved 5 proficiencies: 1) Specialized knowledge (Knowledge acquired in a specialized field of study to attain "depth of learning/mastery")

competencies), 2) Broad, integrative knowledge (Knowledge acquired in general education fields to attain “breadth of learning/liberal education” competencies), 3) Intellectual skills (analytic inquiry; use of information resources; engaging diverse perspectives; quantitative fluency; communication fluency), 4) Applied learning (Experience from outside the class is brought to bear on classroom material; classroom material is brought to bear on outside the class experiences); and 5) Civic learning (Developing a readiness and acceptance of each person’s understanding of and obligation to contribute to their community). These proficiencies are addressed at higher levels of complexity at the BA and MA levels. Dr. Aviles mentioned that the discussion at hand will only apply to the DQP at the AA level.

Mrs. Stacey Adams asked where this is coming from and who requires us to revise our PLOs. Dr. Aviles stated that he has been attending a series of 7 conferences hosted by ACCJC on this topic. The training on the DQP has been conducted by the Lumina Foundation. Dr. Aviles thus believes that ACCJC is requiring that we revisit how we have defined our degrees and the program learning outcomes for such degree, particularly the transfer model curriculum degrees. The DQP should be used as a guide to make sure students who receive an AA degree are proficient in the 5 established areas. He noted that it has been mentioned at the conferences that this is not an attempt to standardize degrees because department faculty determined how these are defined and assessed for their particular degrees. The 5 areas are written very broadly to allow for the flexibility different degrees would need in different areas of emphasis. Mrs. Stacey Adams asked what all this has to do with the Outcomes committee. Dr. Aviles noted that it is the job of the committee to approve program learning outcomes and we need to find a way to get faculty to revise them so that they address the 5 proficiencies established by the DQP.

Ms. Kimberly Covell asked if this was mandatory and whether a timeline of expected implementation has been developed. Dr. Aviles commented that if it is coming from ACCJC we should do it, however, currently there is no mandate that requires that programs be revised. Dr. Scott Lee mentioned that ACCJC is currently revising its standards and this may be part of the new guidelines. Dr. Glenn Haller asked why we should do this before the new standards are established. He also mentioned that they (his area) already do what the DQP requires.

Dr. Aviles mentioned that we will have to continue this discussion at the next meeting due to lack of time. To prepare for that meeting, Dr. Aviles requested the committee members to review the document in totality and bring discussion points and comments to the next meeting.

8. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**

a. **SLO-Related Events –**

i. FPD:

1. General Pedagogical Strategies (3/17/14, 7-10 pm in SSV 151)
2. Why Grades are Not enough (4/21/14, 7-10 pm in SSV 151),

ii. ACCJC Conferences on Degree Qualification Profile Project (3/21, 4/4, 5/1-5/3 in CSUSB)

Tabled due to lack of time.

9. **OTHER**

- a. OC Meeting dates for Spring 2014: 3/24, 4/14, 4/28, 5/12

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the March 10, 2014 Outcomes Committee meeting at 4:42p.m. Motion carried.

**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.