ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING
April 13, 2009
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 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. March 23, 2009 minutes were unofficial as we did not achieve quorum. The informational items listed will be acknowledged as reported.

5. **PRESENTATION**
   a. Accreditation Priorities – Dr. Ed Beyer
   b. Accreditation Team Perspective – Ted Younglove

6. **REPORTS**
   a. Ted Younglove, Institutional Research

7. **ACTION ITEMS**
   a. Acknowledgement of the following SLOs (from 3/23/09 agenda): CIS 159, COMM 109, PE 152, PHTC 211, PHTC 298, THA 150; acknowledgement of Child and Family Education Matrix (attached)

8. **DISCUSSION**
   a. Integrating Learning Outcomes into Program Review (Melanie Parker)
   b. Progress on SLO/PLO Submittal and Assessment (Melanie Parker/Ted Younglove)
   c. Revision of SLOs
   d. Outcome and Assessment Goals for 2009/2010
   e. Communication Strategies
   f. Guidelines for PLO Development

8. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**
   a. 2009/2010 Reporting Guidelines
   b. Announcements

9. **OTHER**

10. **ADJOUNRMENT**

Members Present	Members Absent	Guests in Attendance
Melanie Parker	Sharon Lowry	Dr. Ed Beyer
Michael Jacobs	Rick Motawakel	
Dr. Irit Gat		
Yvette Cruzalegui		
Dr. Fredy Aviles		
Dr. Rosa Hall		
Dr. Bob Harris		
Michelle Hernandez		
Ted Younglove		
Kim Covell		

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
   Ms. Melanie Parker, co-chair of the SLO Committee, called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

2. **OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SLO COMMITTEE CHAIR (MELANIE PARKER)** –None

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

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – A motion was made (Dr. Gat) and seconded (Dr. Harris) to approve the March 9, 2009 meeting minutes. Motion carried without any further discussion. There were a few corrections on the unofficial minutes from the meeting of March 23. Dr. Aviles corrected on the Mt. SAC Meeting information, line 3, word qualitative should be quantitative. Also, the fourth bullet under Other, Mr. Motawakel's first name should be corrected from Rock to Rick.

5. **PRESENTATION**
   a. **Accreditation Priorities (Dr. Ed Beyer)** – Dr. Beyer was invited to speak to the committee members on the subject of evaluating institutional effectiveness – SLOs. He passed out a rubric used by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). The rubric is divided into four levels: awareness, development, proficiency and sustainable continuous quality improvement. Dr. Beyer stated that he believed AVC should have been at the proficiency level but their recent report puts us at the development level, which they found to be acceptable. He felt that this occurred because we had been at a "0" and then zoomed to the levels we attained last year. This will not be adequate next time. He stated that we will need to

be at or near the sustainability level. Dr. Beyer reviewed some of the bullets in the development and proficiency levels to review what we have and have not done and how that might guide us in what we need to do next. First, he drew our attention to the development box, bullet #2. He stated he believed that we had most of our course SLOs done and that now we need to focus on assessment and writing Program Learning Outcomes. Dr. Beyer was told that we have some of our Program Learning Outcomes finished (Nursing, Tech Ed, most of the Health Sciences, as well as some others scattered throughout campus). Dr. Beyer stated that in hearing from faculty, they do not have any idea of how to go about writing outcomes and assessment or where to go in that we do not have a user's manual. Mr. Younglove mentioned that he has a draft of an SLO handbook which is almost ready. Dr. Beyer felt this would go a long way towards simplifying the process. Ms. Parker also mentioned that she and Ted are visiting division meetings to impart information and answer questions. Dr. Beyer made a point that this should be documented in the minutes of each division meeting. Next, Dr. Beyer highlighted the 5ᵗʰ bullet in Development. He stated that we have not gone through enough SLO cycles to take advantage of assessments, so we should take note of this as we move along. He then made note of the second bullet under Proficiency, which states assessment results are being used for improvement and alignment of institution-wide practices. He does not see that we have done this enough or how we are defining how to do that. Ms. Parker feels that is where Program Review will come into play. She made mention of the draft of the new program review document from Carol Eastin. One section specifically addresses Student Learning Outcomes and as part of the program review process, they are to be revised yearly. This would connect SLOs to budgeting in that SLO assessment would demonstrate and support the need for services and materials. Dr. Beyer wondered if there was some way in which a primer could be made to show the process from start to finish. It would show someone the path that leads one item to the next and clarifies it. Ms. Parker stated that it could be done. The last bullet Dr. Beyer highlighted is the last one under Development. He questioned the fact that in the beginning many of the faculty were "fully engaged" in the process but it now seems to have quieted down. It has become apparent that there may be faculty who were not in on the process in the beginning and are now just learning what is going on and saying "wait a minute". Ms. Parker feels there needs to be ongoing communication with faculty and staff from both she and Ted Younglove. Dr. Beyer stated his willingness to participate. He suggested we outline SLO and assessment success and failure examples and post them online. Many faculty, particularly adjuncts, cannot make actual scheduled professional development events but posting opportunities online so they could view it at their own leisure may be an alternative to consider. Dr. Beyer also likes to do "dog and pony shows" and he would be willing to do that also. If he were to state the needs as he sees them in one word, it would be "educate". We must educate people on the process, educate them on how much fun the process can be, and hopefully they will follow along. Dr. Beyer also questioned the format of assessment documentation and what this is going to look like. Ms. Parker and Mr. Younglove then mentioned that is where WEAVE will come into play. It will make the information a lot easier to document and use. Dr. Beyer questioned how the process would work. Mr. Younglove stated that it appears that the best route is for one person designated in each division to handle all data and to be the person to input that into WEAVE. The Institutional Research Department can handle all of the input

such as SLOs, etc. but since many of them do not yet have assessment data, that should be handled by someone familiar with curriculum content in each division. Professor Valiotis's course SLOs were recently input into WEAVE and perhaps could be taken as a primer for others to learn from. Ms. Parker mentioned her belief that the SLO Committee be restructured along the lines of the AP&P Committee where each division would be represented and that each divisional designee could be the point person for the WEAVE process. Changing the committee format would need to go to Senate for approval so if this were to happen, we need to move on it soon. Both Ed Beyer and Ted Younglove agreed that it would be beneficial to have at least one designee from each division represented on the committee to work with WEAVE. The Institutional Research Department has come to the conclusion that they do not have the type of intimate knowledge from each division or subject needed. Dr. Beyer stated that if we have a consistent step-by-step process, this will facilitate our goals. Mr. Jacobs mentioned that he sees no stated urgency or timeline happening to get this accomplished. Dr. Beyer stated that our deadline is 2012, but we are not advertising that as this will give the impression that we have time on our hands. In reality, we need to be at the Sustainable level for a few years in order to be in compliance so there is an urgency regarding the whole process. We are finding that some things we have been doing are not correct and are having to go back to refine them. However, we gain knowledge from this also and the accreditation committee should see that we are making progress. By the 2010 visit, we need to be solidly in the Proficiency level. We need to be able to define as well as implement each criterion in that category. Attaining the Proficiency level should be our goal by the end of Spring 2010. Dr. Beyer suggested that an online form be created for each faculty member to input data that could then be sent to their respective division designee for input into WEAVE. He suggested that Stephen Burns would be able to create one. Dr. Gat mentioned that the last bullet under Proficiency would make a great assessment; students' demonstrating awareness of the goals and purposes of the courses and programs in which they are enrolled. This led into the current discussion which affects both AP&P and the SLO Committee: where to record and communicate the SLOs. Dr. Beyer's belief is that SLOs should not be put on the COR. CORs are reviewed on a regular cycle, which includes a very formal process of curriculum review. Since SLOs should be flexible and revised more frequently than the COR, going through the same AP&P process so often would be cumbersome. In his estimation, a far better solution is placing a notation on the COR stating that the SLO for this course can be found online. The same thing would hold true for the syllabus as well; placing a notation on the syllabus that the SLOs can be found at a particular website. Dr. Gat asked what happens when they have SLOs that have been revised three or four times but the original one is still the one online. Ms. Parker stated that would be a subject of discussion today since we need to better track the changes to the SLOs. Dr. Beyer stated that since you must review a COR every few years, that it should also trigger the need to review and revise your SLO. It was acknowledged that we are doing much of the start up work right now but once processes are in place for WEAVE, documenting things should become easier and require just maintenance. Dr. Beyer also recommended that the CORs and SLOs be listed in the same location online, not in separate committee locations as they are presently. This will give a much better impression to the accreditation team. At this point, Ms. Parker passed out copies of the Accreditation Notes article from Spring 2009 titled *"Where Do*

Course SLOs Live?" since this was appropriate to the current discussion. Dr. Beyer brought up the issue of "must the SLOs appear in the faculty members' course syllabi"? ACCJC says the answer is "yes", based upon the wording of Standard II.A.6. This Standard states "In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning objectives consistent with those in the institution's officially approved course outline." One issue is, where do students find this information when deciding what course to take? No matter what the interpretation, it seems clear that course SLOs ought to be accessible to students who are contemplating taking the course, either in the catalogue or through a link or other reference found in the catalogue. There are different interpretations of what has been said by ACCJC and a number of strong opinions to each. Christos Valiotis is attending the state Academic Senate Meeting at the end of the week and will report back regarding any discussion that comes from the Academic Senate. The committee discussed showing consistency in listing SLOs on the syllabi either in their entirety, as an attachment, or by providing an online link. This would show the Commission there is consistency from each section of each course. If a link is listed, it gives students the ability to see all the SLOs and assessments listed. In addition, how do we demonstrate linkage of SLOs to the mission statement, which is quite lengthy? Dr. Hall noted that if you just provide links, there may be a lot of students who do not go to that link to read them. She felt it better to place the information in front of them so you can say you gave each student the opportunity of reviewing it. Dr. Beyer stated that at the beginning of each course, he goes over the syllabus with the students and talks about the student learning outcomes. They may not be listed but they have heard the explanation and if questioned at a later date, they should be able to confirm that they know what they are. There are many differing viewpoints on this issue and Ms. Parker stated that after hearing back from the statewide Senate meeting, decision-makers need to come together and decide which path will be followed at AVC. Once that decision is made, all will be informed and the precedent will be set. Dr. Hall suggested that placing a catchy graphic poster in each classroom reminding students to look up their SLOs might be useful. Dr. Beyer also suggested using blank walls of certain buildings around campus to display the college vision statement. Ms. Covell added that you could make use of the AVC website and create a My Stuff page. Ms. Hernandez suggested that a screen saver could be utilized to display SLOs, mission statements or vision statements on computer lab desktops. Dr. Hall stated that any place we could think of to display these so the students come into contact with them on a constant basis would be great. When many students are asked if they know what SLOs are, they answer with a blank stare and say "I don't know". Ms. Hernandez also stated that Student Services does not have the "capability" to relay SLOs to the students in the same way classroom faculty do, so more discussion needs to take place in this regard. Ms. Hernandez stated that even though there may be an initial training period regarding SLOs, the information needs to be updated as we go along. This may be another role divisional designees could play. Ted Younglove mentioned the connection of assessments to budget requests and stated that WEAVE will be helpful in determining if you have met your goals. Mr. Younglove mentioned that if you do not tie assessments into budgets, we are "going down" in terms of Accreditation. Dr. Hall mentioned there needs to be multi-faceted approaches, though that does not mean inconsistency. She envisions our communication of SLOs as a broad tapestry, created with several different approaches. The main thing is that the message needs to

be put out there and basically gets "in their face". She also made note that Human Resources, Business Services, and Student Services have outcomes and do not have a classroom-based mechanism for communication. There needs to be a broad-based way of communicating. She suggested a sub-committee be formed to bring back to the SLO Committee recommendations that they could utilize to communicate outcomes and goals. Ms. Parker then summed up this discussion by saying we need a consistent message, but we need to approach it from all different angles so we are communicating it in different ways. She feels that we do need this sub-committee, but do not have the time to discuss this approach in the present meeting.. Ms. Parker asked all to consider and e-mail each other their own ideas for communication of outcome and assessment information. We need to consider how we are going to communicate the process of learning outcomes and assessments, tied into the mission statement and ILOs, plus how we are going to present this as an integrated process. Dr. Beyer suggested the analogy taking a "box" and describing it, not worrying about what is in the "box". Then when you are done, you will then open the "box" and educate people from there. Ms. Parker agreed this was a productive approach.

b. **Accreditation Team Perspective (Ted Younglove)** – Mr. Younglove reported his recent experience as an accreditation team member and relayed to the committee his feelings that we are not in as secure a position as we previously thought. He believes we need to be ready to present a defense and documentation for everything we do. He reported that many questions were asked of the SLO Coordinator at the institution such as: "This is where you were a year ago and at what percent are you now?" "From the report, we had you at __93__ percent, so how are you doing and at what percent now?" Detailed questions were asked about each division and the progress made in each. "Are there some who are leading and some lagging or is it campus wide"? "Now give me an example of an SLO assessment where they made a corrective action and it worked and improved things. Questions continued: "How did you measure it?" "Who supplied the data"? "Do you have the documentation"? "Was the data widely discussed"? "Was it widely disseminated"? "Were there broad-based discussions"? "Can you prove it"? "Did you keep minutes"? "Do you have e-mails"? "Show us". Ted stated these questions were for potentially every division and every course on campus that had an assessment. More questions: "Now give us an example of an assessment where they did the corrective action and it did not work. You must have somewhere where it didn't work; what did you do"? "What was the process you followed"? "How did you discuss it"? and "How broadly based was it"? The accreditation team mentioned that while there were students on committees they were almost always absent. Answer: "Well, you know how students are." Question: "What steps did you take to make sure the students attended?" Answer: "Well, we tried to advertise more." "Then show me the poster, show me the e-mail." The committee then asked the deans what process they followed in going over the SLOs with their people. "Did you have discussions?" and "How do you perceive it is going?". They approached a teacher in the hallway who was not teaching at the moment saying "Hello, can we talk to you for a moment? What can you tell us about the SLOs for your class? How are you measuring them? What assessment are you using? Where does the data come from? Do you discuss it and with whom?" Ted made the point that questions were not asked simply of the committee chair or the researcher but of potentially anyone on campus. Ted stated that there will be a random element to this and you will never have everyone up to speed. It appeared that if the team got just

one bad answer, that did not seem to bother them. But if they asked a random number of people on campus and did not get answers they were looking for or if what the lower level person and upper level person stated did not agree, then they kept asking questions. The visiting team wanted to see e-mails, they wanted to see broad-based discussions, minutes from meetings, who spoke, who was there, what steps did you take to make people attend, the posters, the e-mails, etc. He relayed that it was a very brutal process. It kept him thinking very hard about what information he could come up with to answer their questions (and he kept thinking of Psychology and how their on-going conversations with him document what they are doing in these regards). Ted and Ms. Parker spoke about the possibility of beginning an online forum that so that evidence of these discussions can be preserved. Ted mentioned that Student Services was also scrutinized. "OK, now what data are you using to measure registration, what corrective action are you taking, and how is it tied into the budget?" Dr. Beyer recommended that for each campus division an SLO "Lessons Learned" folder be available on MyAVC for online discussion. Mr. Younglove mentioned that when the visiting team mentioned they saw the same names present in meetings over and over again, they wanted to know what was done to broaden the discussion and include others. "Was it broad-based?" The team kept coming back to that point. Ted believes we would benefit by a visual that shows progress division by division over time. That would have answered many of the questions the team had and believes they would not have needed to speak to as many people as they did. Dr. Hall mentioned all the times they have gone over their mission statement and made corrections but did not keep copy to copy. She believes we need to keep everything showing our progress and document all of the people who received the information or were involved in the discussion. Ted said they had many questions on how assessment was tied into budget and what funding decisions were made. The committee also asked for examples where budget recommendations were sent back for not being thorough enough. Ted believed that if they saw a rubber stamp of approving everything, they did not see the committee doing a proper job. They wanted to see some rejections and reasons for the rejections. Dr. Beyer did mention that we will soon be going into another divisional reorganization and that this may affect progress we have made; we cannot be starting over again from scratch and must be cognizant of a division's history and as it might set back the process of program review. Dr. Hall made exception to this as Student Services was recently re-organized but still went through program review. Ms. Parker commented that we should be able to make things work, even with divisional re-organization, but that we need to be cautious in how we proceed. Dr. Gat asked if campus re-organization will mess up the organization on WEAVE? Ted stated the answer is yes but it should be easy to reshuffle, though we must be very careful in how it is done. The WEAVE tree is set up so that it links department goals to everything beneath it. As SLOs and department goals shift from one division to another, and if there are different division goals, it could potentially create some difficulties. Dr. Hall mentioned that even if you write your SLO and do your assessment or make changes or start over, what the accreditation team will be looking for is the cycle. That means do something with your assessment and look for ways improvements can be made, because if you do not complete this "cycle", you are just wasting time and effort. This ties into the sustainable section of the rubric. It was also mentioned at the AVC Board Meeting several weeks ago that California's budget problems are not an excuse for poor

accreditation compliance. Our accrediting agency is the Western Association of Schools and Colleges and covers more than just California. WASC does not care that budgets have been cut; you still need to do certain things and do them regardless. If you say you don't have enough money to do it, their answer is "just figure it out". Dr. Beyer and Dr. Gat made mention that we need to have a complete picture to show others so that they will understand the steps they need to take. Placing a sample on the SLO website to show the process of SLO development, assessment, and analysis would be helpful.. Dr. Hall reminded the committee that previously, before Ms. Parker's tenure, writing a regular SLO newsletter had been suggested. Dr. Beyer mentioned doing a pod cast for faculty to view online and there was some discussion over whether or not this technology would be widely used. Ms. Parker said she was willing to put together a monthly one page "newsletter" that could be also put online and that it could include samples showing the correct SLO process and sequence. Ms. Parker stated that we have a lot of ground to cover and only a few months to do it in. She urged that we engage others in communication, dialogue, and documentation and to keep accreditation requirements in mind. We need to include all facets of the AVC campus in our conversation. Highlighted copies of program review documents were made available for those who were not in attendance at the last SLO Committee meeting. Ms. Parker mentioned that SLOs and PLOs are going to be reviewed on a yearly basis as part of the program review process. Dr. Hall also stated that this needs to be updated in the Educational Master Plan.

6. **REPORTS**
   a. Ted Younglove, Institutional Research – Mr. Younglove stated that it has become apparent that they will need the expertise of "local experts" (faculty and student services) to help with WEAVE. They need intimate knowledge of each respective division to supply the information that needs to be documented. Staff and faculty are the ones with firsthand knowledge of the assessment process and specific corrective actions that have taken place within their respective areas. Once all of this information has been put in place, we will then be able to pull summaries. Those summaries will itemize what changes need to be made and what dollar amounts are needed in budget requests. This makes reporting easy because it ties it in to your SLO targets and looks at the budget implications. Ms. Parker asked how close we were to seeing this model. Mr. Younglove responded that Mr. Valiotis was not quite ready yet to go with what had been prepared, but hopefully will be soon. Mention was also made to include a module from student services as part of the first model.

7. **ACTION ITEMS –** a motion was made (Dr. Hall) and seconded (Dr. Harris) to approve the listed SLOs: CIS 159, COMM 109, PE 152, PHTC 211, PHTC 298, THA 150. The motion carried without any further discussion. Also, a motion was made (Dr. Harris) and seconded (Yvette Cruzalegui) to acknowledge submittal of the Child and Family Education Matrix. Motion carried. Dr. Harris asked the question if the Technical Review Committee was still needed. Ms. Parker stated she felt it was not due to the smaller volume of submittals and stated most of the new SLOs are written in line with what had been previously approved.. If any submittals appear to need further review, she will contact members by e-mail. Also, Dr. Harris asked about the percentage of approved SLOs. Dr. Harris also had questions about PLOs and their format. Ms. Parker will make available PLO samples she is compiling. While all programs need to develop

curriculum maps/matrices, the format in which they have been submitted varies division to division. Once the information is recorded in WEAVE, it will be in more standardized format.

8. **DISCUSSION**
   - Due to the lateness of the meeting, Ms. Parker will e-mail members information regarding the discussion items and ask that they hold them until the next meeting. Ms. Parker passed out SLO Reporting Guidelines for Spring 2009. She requested that all read the ACCJC position on syllabus and SLOs, etc. so we are ready to discuss that information at the next meeting. Christos Valiotis will be reporting at the next meeting.

9. **SLO Committee Administrative Business**
   - Due to the lateness of the meeting, administrative business will be delayed until the next meeting.

10. **OTHER –** None

11. **ADJOURNMENT** – the meeting was adjourned at 4:26 p.m.

pag