



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE  
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING**

**February 14, 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. November 22, 2010
5. **PRESENTATION - None**
6. **REPORTS**
  - a. Updates from Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)
7. **ACTION ITEMS**
  - a. Approval of SLO – AFAB 210
8. **DISCUSSION –**
  - a. Review and evaluation of SLO Committee Spring Welcome Back Presentation (Melanie Parker)
  - b. Review of Accreditation reaffirmation: brainstorm ideas to move us toward completion of SLO-related action plans – (Melanie Parker)
  - c. SLO Committee Faculty Development Presentations for 2011-2012; needs assessment – (Melanie Parker)
  - d. Revisions to: “SLO Entry Made Easy” and “Communicating SLOs to Students” documents (see attachments) – Melanie Parker
  - e. Scheduling for divisional/departmental PLO write-ins; volunteers needed – (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:
    - February 28
    - March 14 and 28
    - April 11 and 25
    - May 9 and 23
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**  
**February 14, 2011**  
**Room A141, 3:00 – 4:30 PM**

<b>Members Present</b>	<b>Members Absent</b>	<b>Guests in Attendance</b>
Melanie Parker	Kim Covell	
Dr. Rosa Hall	Michelle Hernandez	
Dr. Irit Gat	Ted Younglove	
Dr. Bassam Salameh		
Maggie Drake		
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 3:10 p.m.

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

Ms. Parker welcomed everyone to the first SLO meeting of the spring semester. She thanked all who came to the Spring Welcome Back workshop and will discuss later what went well and what needs further adjustment. She also asked that all faculty members of the committee think about applying for the position of SLO Committee co-chair. Ms. Parker has one more year to complete and feels that the person selected should come from the committee. Per new Senate policy, they should apply now and spend one year shadowing Ms. Parker. Ms. Kastner recently emailed calls for several Senate leadership positions. Job descriptions are included. Ms. Parker urged interested committee members to respond.

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

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Ms. Parker asked the members for any corrections to the minutes of the 11/22/10 meeting. With none forthcoming, she requested a motion and second to approve these minutes. After receiving this motion and second and with no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

**5. PRESENTATION** – No presentations.

**6. REPORTS**

**Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)** – Mr. Voelcker relayed that there is nothing new to report but he is receiving quite a few calls from faculty needing help with WEAVE. Ms. Parker asked if we know how many more WEAVE

facilitators are needed. Discussed was the need to consider breaking WEAVE training into two areas of emphasis: refresher training for those already trained and initial training for new facilitators. Dr. Gat has encountered some faculty who are totally on top of WEAVE and some who do not even have a clue. Since most only work with WEAVE once or twice each academic cycle, it is easy to forget the process.

## 7. ACTION ITEMS –

**a. Approval of AFAB 210** – Ms. Parker signed approval of this SLO during intersession. This was necessary as the course is being taught during spring semester under a grant that expires in June and time was of the essence. Ms. Drake gave a brief summary of the course. Ms. Parker requested a motion and second to approve. After receiving such and with no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously.

## 8. DISCUSSION

**a. Review and evaluation of SLO Committee Spring Welcome Back Presentation (Melanie Parker)**– Dr. Aviles and Aaron Voelcker were the main presenters for this presentation. They received a number of interesting questions, both specific and generic. Ms. Parker sent out an e-mail last week addressing some of the generic questions and will respond individually to a number of specific ones. As other questions arise they will be addressed in faculty emails.

One important issue posed is that in some areas a few faculty seem to be doing most of SLO work and others are doing it half heartedly or not at all.. Dr. Aviles stated we must continue to work with all who are in step with the system and not worry about those who are currently not participating. Mr. Voelcker suggested this is fine where several faculty are teaching a course but has concerns about the courses being taught by only one faculty member. They must be involved in the system or that course will not have SLOs, assessments, or action plans. While some deans seems to stay on top which faculty are participating, other deans do not. Where deans are proactively encouraging participation, more faculty seem willing to participate in the process.

Ms. Drake, Dean of Technical Education, commented that you can coach and encourage but if faculty won't participate, you can't force the issue and if you do you may possibly end up with false data. There is never 100% compliance. Our rate of compliance with the Accreditation goals was quite high and we should meet our projections for this year, based upon Aaron's analysis. How do we keep reporting rates up and increasing so that we continue to meet projected goals? Ms. Parker mentioned that the role of WEAVE Facilitators is not to be "SLO cops." Ms. Adams stated that it is part of an adjunct's evaluation criteria that they become involved with doing SLOs for their courses. Ms. Drake mentioned that her adjuncts in Tech Ed are not allowed to enter data into WEAVE and must report their data to the WEAVE facilitator. Dr. Aviles asked if you could take away a course from an adjunct for not participating in SLOs and Ms. Parker relayed that she believed you could not. Ms. Adams mentioned that proper perspective was needed; there are a number of full-time faculty who are not participating in the process either.

Ms. Parker believes strongly that the SLO process be part of an adjunct's orientation and that it also continue to be included in welcome back sessions. Ms. Drake commented that we need to keep SLOs and accreditation in the forefront of our conversations. It cannot be pushed off into a corner and forgotten. Dr. Aviles commented that there was a lot of conversation at the Spring Welcome Back session and he felt badly about cutting the people off due to time constraints. He suggested doing two sessions in the future, due to the large number of people participating

and the varying levels of understanding. Spring Welcome Back Day was a learning experience for all and we can take the lessons learned and expand on them.

Ms. Adams mentioned that people in her small group could not move past the point of discussing why a certain number or percentage was picked for the passing rate. Once she gave participants a pep talk, they were able to comprehend it better and could move on. They then had the following questions: Question #1 - When should the data be collected? Should faculty count all students enrolled at the time of assessment, only those who participated in the assessment, or only record assessment for the students who made it to the end of the course? Ms. Drake has the opinion that it should be at the end of the course but others have differing thoughts on this. The committee concurs it should be a department determination and that all faculty in the department stick with it for consistency. Question #2 – What assessment tool should be used and can they differ within the same course? Faculty were reminded assessment tools should be consistent unless faculty could prove they be different for a reason. Dr. Aviles stated that we should work toward standardization but some people are resisting. He suggested that we offer rewards at the end of each cycle as an incentive. How could we make that work?

**b. Review of Accreditation reaffirmation: Brainstorm ideas to move us toward completion of SLO-related action plans (Melanie Parker)** – Ms. Parker read committee members the requests from the Accreditation letter that pertains to SLOs. She also read verbatim Recommendation 1A pertaining to action plans and program review. She stated she was unsure of the committee role in this issue and that conversation with the Program Review Chair and Committee should take place. We know we must document a reporting rate of at least 50% by the end of this academic year and then continue to improve from there. Our Accreditation report states we will have all PLOs developed by Spring 2011 and that Tech Ed and Health Science will begin the process of PLO assessment. WEAVE mapping is to be completed by the end of Fall 2012. A problem has arisen with Tech Ed due to the many certificate programs they have to offer. Mr. Voelcker will determine how we can record the results for the various Tech Ed programs in WEAVE.

Dr. Salameh mentioned that he has done the PLO mapping for programs he is facilitating and has received some positive comments from faculty. Ms. Adams has sensed that faculty seems to be scared of assessment. It was recommended that her business faculty meet with the committee members to discuss their concerns and to facilitate completion of their work.

**c. SLO Committee Faculty Development Presentations for 2011-2012; needs assessment (Melanie Parker)** – Ms. Parker asked members what flex presentations we should provide for the 2011-2012 academic cycle. Committee members suggested:

- PLO workshops- development and assessment
- More information on WEAVE – second half of action plan – closing the loop
- When and how often should SLOs be assessed?
- Real examples of SLOs used – providing data and how to document it
- Intro to SLO basics- still needed by many
- Assessment strategies – give examples so they practice strategies
- Analyzing data – give scenarios and possibly use a dummy course for practice
- If you have more than one section of a course taught by different instructors – how do you handle different questions and outcomes on SLOs? Should you aggregate? Do you need to use the same tool to assess?

Ms. Parker will write up proposals and forward to members for review.

**d. Revisions to: “SLO Entry Made Easy” and “Communicating SLOs to Students” documents (see attachments) (Melanie Parker)** – First referring to the “SLOs Made Easy 5 Step Guide”, Ms. Parker stated that it had originally been a 4 step guide. A fifth step was added to stress action plans. She asked members to try following the instructions to determine

if they make sense for those new to WEAVE. Hopefully, after time, it will become second nature. A question came up about where to put evidence. Dr. Gat suggested that a possible Step 6 be added to show where to post evidence such as e-mails, reports, meeting minutes, etc.

In referring to “Communicating SLOs to Students”, Ms. Parker changed the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet under “Students need to know” to read: “SLO assessments are not a measure of an individual student’s performance in a course or program.” Dr. Hall pointed out that there are some circumstances where the student can ace all of the written work but when it comes to doing the practical, such as with EMTs or nursing, they cannot do it.

Ms. Parker will make changes and return the examples to the committee members for review. We also need to be certain faculty and staff are aware of the SLO Committee website. There is helpful information posted on the site and some questions could be answered if faculty and staff will read what is posted. It was suggested that if ITS could determine the number of hits the web page is receiving, that would be helpful information.

**e. Scheduling for divisional/departmental PLO write-ins; volunteers needed (Melanie Parker)** – Ms. Parker passed out to the committee members a sign-up sheet asking for volunteers to work with divisions. She asked that members specify their preference for doing group presentations, one-on-one work with faculty, or both. She stressed the importance of keeping our Accreditation goals in front of us and completing our plan to complete PLOs this semester.

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

**10. OTHER** –

**a. SLO Meeting Dates for Spring** – February 28, 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

Ms. Parker asked members to suggest other days of the week or times that might increase audience participation in the future. As always, she would welcome the participation and assistance of committee members in these presentations.

**c.** Dr. Hall wished to give kudos to members who contributed to the Accreditation report. She also encouraged all to attend the Town Hall Meeting on Tuesday at 9:30 a.m.

**11. ADJOURNMENT** – the meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

pg