ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING
February 28, 2011
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. , A141 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. February 14, 2011

5.   **PRESENTATION -** None

6.   **REPORTS**
   a.   Updates from Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)

7.   **ACTION ITEMS**
   a. Approval of SLOs: VN109, 110, 111, 112 and 113

8.   **DISCUSSION –**
   a. General Ed PLOs - (Melanie Parker)
   b. Guidelines for PLO Development - (Melanie Parker)
   c. Proposed SLO Committee Faculty Development Presentations for 2011-2012 - (Melanie Parker)
   d. Comments on revisions to: "SLO Entry Made Easy". Do they make sense? - Melanie Parker

9**.**   **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS -** none

10.   **OTHER**
   a. SLO Committee Faculty Professional Development Events for Spring 2011
      - Learning Outcomes Analysis and Evaluation - Thursday, March 24, 6-9 p.m., SSV 151
      - Learning Outcomes Analysis and Evaluation - Friday, April 29, 1-4 p.m., SSV151
      - Learning Outcomes Update - Thursday, May 12, 4-6 p.m., SSV151
      - Learning Outcomes Update – Friday, May 27, 7-9 p.m., SSV151
   b. Spring 2011 SLO Committee meeting dates:
      - March 14 and 28
      - April 11 and 25
      - May 9 and 23

11**.**   **ADJOURNMENT**

![Antelope Valley College logo]

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME COMMITTEE MEETING
February 28, 2011
Room A141, 3:00 – 4:30 PM

Members Present	Members Absent	Guests in Attendance
Melanie Parker	Kim Covell	
Dr. Irit Gat	Michelle Hernandez	
Dr. Bassam Salameh	Ted Younglove	
Maggie Drake	Dr. Rosa Hall	
Dr. Fredy Aviles	Walter Briggs(proxy for Patricia Marquez)	
Stacey Adams		
Aaron Voelcker		
Rick Motawakel		

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
   Ms. Melanie Parker, co-chair of the SLO Committee, called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.

2. **OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SLO COMMITTEE CHAIR (MELANIE PARKER)** – Ms. Parker welcomed everyone to the meeting and wished to pass on greetings from Patricia Marquez who is teaching in Spain this semester.

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

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Ms. Parker asked the members for any corrections to the minutes of the 2/14/10 meeting. One correction was forthcoming on page 2. With no further corrections, Ms. Parker requested a motion to approve the minutes. A motion was made and seconded and with no further discussion, the motion was approved.

5. **PRESENTATION –** No presentations.

6. **REPORTS**
   Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker) – Mr. Voelcker relayed that he and Dr. Gat conducted a mini quality control survey, using randomly sampled 2009-10 courses in WEAVE. The purpose was to determine how many entries were complete and to identify areas in need of more support and direction from the committee. VAPA and Fine Arts still appear to be the divisions in most need of assistance. Divisions with the most complete entries are Technical Education and Health Sciences. Action plans need to be emphasized and the committee is hopeful we will see much improvement in this area at the end of the current cycle. Another survey will be conducted during June/July 2011. Ms. Drake is reluctant to stress the action plan level. She feels that people need to complete several cycles

of assessment before changing assessment plans and believes that watching the trend over time should take about three years. Ms Parker reminded the committee that even though we are looking for long term trends, faculty can enter that information in the action plan section to indicate they are at least discussing long term plans. There is also the possibility anecdotal evidence may be uncovered when formal assessments are done, and this may indicate revisions are needed to SLOs and assessments. That information could also become part of an action plan. Dr. Aviles reminded the committee that we need to make progress so we can show this to accreditation. Ms. Adams believes that a color-coded report should be shared and available at division meetings in order to encourage progress within each division or department. A question was raised regarding training for deans and administrative assistants on how to run WEAVE reports. Mr. Voelcker will continue to run reports at the end of each academic cycle (June) and perhaps as areas needing improvement are identified, needs can be communicated to those areas. Key is that we show growth in our data entry, action plans, and use of assessment data for decision-making, from cycle to cycle.

Ms. Drake mentioned that when we started the SLO process, we chose to have only one SLO assessed per cycle. She feels that we should be assessing all SLOs each and every cycle. SLO Reporting Guidelines for 2010-2011, available online and distributed via faculty emails, do indeed state that expectation. Another question came up about Flex credit for WEAVE Facilitators. Credit is still available according to the originally established guidelines, but some people have expressed they do not get enough credit for the hours they are putting in. Ms. Parker asked Facilitators on the committee to email her with the approximate hours they spend on these tasks and will email other Facilitators for that information. If needed, she will ask the Professional Development Committee for a possible increase in Flex credit. The issue of PLO entry in WEAVE was brought up. Mr. Voelcker explained that it will be possible to create an entity expressly for program level assessment. Programs will be listed alphabetically and each certificate program would be listed separately in this entity. Dr. Gat stated that we should do more flexes on PLOs. Ms. Parker commented that attendance in previously offered PLO Flex presentations proved to be extremely low and that she believes working with individual faculty and departments would be most beneficial. Ms. Drake mentioned that there is no easy way to proceed right now and that there are few models to go by. Right now, all division meetings are consumed with budget issues and not much concern is shown toward issues related to accreditation. Ms. Drake also mentioned that the two chosen transfer programs now under development are Communication Studies and Math.

7. **ACTION ITEMS –**
   a. **Approval of SLOs – VN109, 110, 111, 112 and 113 -** Ms. Parker requested a motion to approve these SLOs. A motion was made and seconded and with no further discussion, these SLOs are approved. Ms. Drake requested that the committee members receive a closer look at SLOs before approving. Ms. Parker reminded the committee that with few SLOs now coning through, she has been doing the technical review herself and working with individual faculty on needed changes. Newly revised SLO forms will indicate that faculty need to submit electronic copies for review and these will be distributed to the committee with meeting agendas. As soon as the forms are ready, they will be posted online and also distributed via faculty email. Faculty developing SLOs after the date of distribution and posting will be required to follow that process.

8. **DISCUSSION**
   a. **General Ed PLOs - (Melanie Parker) –** This item will be tabled until the next meeting, pending more information.

b. Guidelines for PLO Development (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker handed out to the members the "Instructional Program Learning Outcomes: Getting Started." This was designed as reference for faculty but she stressed individual discussion and support will still be needed. Ms. Parker asked all members to look through the document and let her know of needed changes. Dr. Salameh stated that he has been working on the biology program outcomes and has forwarded paperwork to other science faculty. To date he has only received two responses. He would like to receive more so he will put the actual paperwork in their boxes. Ms. Parker stated the deadline for PLO development is April 30th. At that point the committee will review PLOs, make suggestions and ask for changes, then return revised material to WEAVE facilitators for entry into WEAVE. Ms. Parker stated that at this point we are only requiring PLOs for degree and certificate programs. Dr. Gat believes we should have concrete PLO samples for faculty. Ms. Drake stated that they have them in Tech Ed but there is not yet a standardized form for the PLO, the PLO assessment cycle, and the curriculum map that could be used across divisions. Ms. Parker stated that we do have a form for PLOs and the curriculum map. Ms. Drake mentioned that hers does not look like the form, and believes all should follow the same format. Mr. Voelcker stated that when he completes the program level entity in WEAVE, he will upload forms, including the mapping template, into the document repository for each program. Ms. Parker asked him to present this information to the committee once he has completed this work in order for committee members to become informed as to how the process works.

When asked how to help faculty start developing PLOs, Ms. Parker stated that telling faculty to look at their overall program and identify commonalities in program courses is a good place to begin. She has found when working with faculty that completing the curriculum map helps tremendously in identify the skills, knowledge, and abilities that have priority in the program. Ms. Drake mentioned that looking at the map gives you all the information you need in order to do your assessments. When all three documents are available for faculty use, the picture will hopefully be more complete. Ms. Adams wondered if using a survey that is done in a classroom setting would constitute adequate assessment data. Ms. Parker felt that it could account for part of the assessment. Dr. Aviles expressed that surveys are good for some things and not others. He also mentioned that on mastery courses, once you hit on the important things in the SLOs and incorporate them into PLOs, you are simultaneously assessing them. Ms. Drake stated that all you need to do is look at your data and choose what is important. She emphasized not trying to invent a new system to try to put it all together. Students also do not need to be at the mastery level in order to pass the course. We must keep in mind that the word "mastery" does not mean the same thing for us as it would in a university setting.

Dr. Salameh stated that what helped him most was going to other community colleges and 4 year institutions to see what they were using for PLOs. Ms. Parker asked him how those PLOs are assessed and being that is where he got stuck. From Ms. Parker's most recent look at the development of PLOs in other institutions, she sees PLOs being communicated but not much in the way of related assessments. Ms. Parker believes we must continue the discussion and document how we are learning through this process. Hopefully that will provide evidence to accreditation that shows we are moving forward. Dr. Salameh stated that he feels the PLOs act more like a general umbrella for the more specific SLOs. If the SLOs are very specific for each course, what you are looking at when you work on your curriculum map should correlate to the more general PLOs. Ms. Parker mentioned that she has found some of the current SLOs seem more like course objectives, and that as SLOs are revised we need to help faculty see the "bigger picture". Faculty may need to broaden some SLOs and look at higher level applications instead of being so specific. Dr. Aviles has looked at what VAPA has submitted for their SLOs and he feels that they are already assessing them since they are mostly

performance based courses. They just need to find a way they want to write up an assessment. Dr. Gat also feels that when SLO-related dialogue occurs during a division meeting, this should be submitted to the appropriate WEAVE document repository by faculty.

c. Proposed SLO Committee Faculty Development Presentations for 2011-2012 - (Melanie Parker) – Ms. distributed members proposed SLO Committee Flex presentations for the 2011-2012 academic cycle. The proposals include:
- SO Basic Training (Emphasizing a hands-on approach rather than lecture)
- SLOs- From Data to Action Plans
- WEAVE, both basic training for those who are newer to the system and a refresher for those more experienced
- Learning Outcomes Update at the end of the academic year

The committee suggested a 6 hour SLO session during Intercession that would incorporate information from the first three trainings listed above. Ms. Parker is submitting the proposals and will also ask for direction from the Faculty Professional Development Committee regarding SLO-related Fall Welcome Back presentations.

d. Comments on revisions to: "SLO Entry Made Easy" – do they make sense? – (Melanie Parker – Some members did not have the opportunity to review it so they will do so and return to the next meeting with comments. Ms. Parker would like to post this on the website as soon as possible.

9. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS** – none at this time

10. **OTHER** –
   a. SLO Meeting Dates for Spring – March 14 and 28, April 11 and 25, May 9 and 23 – all meetings to be held in A141 unless otherwise notified.
   b. FPD events for Spring 2011:
   - Learning Outcomes Analysis and Evaluation - Thursday, March 24, 6-9 p.m., SSV151
   - Learning Outcomes Analysis and Evaluation - Friday, April 29, 1-4 p.m., SSV151
   - Learning Outcomes Update - Thursday, May 12, 4-6 p.m., SSV151
   - Learning Outcomes Update – Friday, May 27, 7-9 p.m., SSV151

11. **ADJOURNMENT** – the meeting was adjourned at 4:21 p.m.

 pg