



ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING
September 27, 2010
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. 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 13, 2010
5. **PRESENTATION - None**
6. **REPORTS**
 - a. Updates from Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)
7. **ACTION ITEMS**
 - a. Acknowledgement updated revisions for NS110, 120, 240; AERO101
 - b. Approve “EASY Guide to Reading WEAVE” document (attached)
8. **DISCUSSION –**
 - a. G.E. PLO progress
 - b. SLO revision and approval process
 - c. Needs assessments – How and where divisions/departments need our input and support
 - d. Short term goal setting – Plans for reaching 2010-2011 long-term goals
9. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS - none**
10. **OTHER**
 - a. Dates of remaining SLO meetings:
 - October 11
 - October 25
 - November 8
 - November 22
 - b. SLO Committee Faculty Professional Development Events for Fall 2010
 - Learning Outcomes Analysis and Evaluation - Friday, October 15, 1 to 4 PM, SSV151
 - Learning Outcomes Update – Friday, November 19, 4 to 6 PM, SSV151
 - Learning Outcomes Update – Thursday, December 2, 7 to 9PM, SSV151
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
September 27, 2010
Room A141, 3:00 – 4:30 PM

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

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Ms. Melanie Parker, co-chair of the SLO Committee, called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

2. OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SLO COMMITTEE CHAIR (MELANIE PARKER) – Ms. Parker would like to thank everyone for their response to the newsletter.

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – No public comments.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Ms. Parker asked the members for any corrections to the minutes of the 9/13/10 meeting. With none forthcoming, Ms. Parker asked for a motion to approve. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. With no further discussion, the motion passed with one abstention.

Ms. Parker would like to ask for a change to the agenda. Under action items, she would like to add Work Experience 197. She requested a motion from the floor to add. A motion was made and seconded and with no further discussion, the motion passed.

5. PRESENTATION – No presentations.

6. REPORTS

a. Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker) – Mr. Voelcker is presenting to the Admin Council in preparation for the accreditation visit. OIRP plans to run their final data just before this. Mr. Voelcker and Ms. Parker have held two WEAVE training sessions and ocniue to offer individualized training for those unable to attend regularly scheduled sessions. Ms. Parker mentioned an issue that arose from discussion during one of the training sessions; faculty and staff need to be certain posted SLO documents do not contain anything of a confidential nature, such as exam questions. Since “read” access will soon be available campus-wide, this is an important issue. A question was raised

regarding WEAVE training for the deans, particularly to help in running reports and tracking data. Mr. Younglove relayed that the offer had been given but there had been little response. Ms. Drake feels that it is imperative that they learn this in case they are asked a question by the accreditation team and would not be able to answer them. Dr. Salameh stated that in the biology department, they have determined that a number of courses which have labs should be considered as one course and would not require an additional SLO for the lab. Dr. Aviles stated that the labs are a good source of information for measuring SLOs.

7. ACTION ITEMS

a. Acknowledgement updated revisions for NS110, 120, 240; AERO 101; WE197 – Ms. Drake made note that AERO 101 is not a revision. Ms. Parker asked for a motion to approve the revisions to NS110, 120 and 240. A motion and second was given and with no further discussion, the motion passed. Ms. Parker asked for a motion to approve the new SLOs for AERO 101 and WE 197. A motion and second was given and with no further discussion, the motion passed.

b. Approve “Easy Guide to Reading WEAVE” document – Ms. Parker asked the members if this guide would help if you knew nothing about WEAVE and wanted to review posted data. All felt that it contained sufficient instructions. Ms. Marquez suggested that we change the name to “Reading WEAVE: An Easy Guide”. She requests that when it is approved, that she receive a copy for her files. Ms. Parker requested a motion to approve. A motion and second was given for the corrected version and with no further discussion, the motion passed.

8. DISCUSSION

a. GE PLO progress (Dr. Lee Grishman) – Dr. Grishman stated that they are just beginning the process of GE PLOs and, as such, seeks the guidance of the committee. He handed out to the members a draft copy of PLOs for each area of the general education graduation requirements. He stated that he was not certain what the approach to campus-wide PLOs discussion needs to be. Members of the committee responded that after counseling had sufficiently discussed and contributed to the G.E. PLOs, they should go through the SLO Committee approval process and then be taken to the Academic Senate as an information item.

The first order of business would be to come to a consensus on what the G.E. PLOs should be. Dr. Grishman did research on a number of colleges up and down the state, some who are trying to find their way and others who are solidifying their program. Dr. Grishman passed out to the members a copy of the condensed section of the Accreditation Report dealing with GE program learning outcomes. This states what our philosophy is as it pertains to the general education requirements. Dr. Grishman has presented this to the AP&P Committee where he hopes that, through the representatives from all divisions, the word will filter back to all faculty for input.

It was brought up that at the very end of the last semester we decided three G.E. PLOs were sufficient. Members asked if they had been replaced by the six bullets now represented? Ms. Marquez stated assessing all these areas might be too complicated. Dr. Grishman stated that the three previous PLOs were just temporary and the six that he is presenting reflected what he saw other colleges doing. Dr. Grishman stated that Counseling could not come to any consensus so turned over the issue to him and this is what he felt could be a start; we can change and evolve from there. Ms. Marquez stated that the three original draft PLOs had already been discussed and she believed we had agreed to pursue that approach. She stated that the SLO Committee believed that 3 or 4 PLOs were sufficient with the philosophy as an umbrella over them. If the GE PLOs are tied into our ILOs and ILO assessment process, that might be a more straightforward approach. We had also discussed the possibility of using an exit survey at the time graduation application is made, as partial assessment of the PLOs. Dr.

Grishman felt that the three original PLOs were too broad for assessment and came up with the six that are presented, but he is well aware that this may not be the absolute solution either. Ms. Parker believes we should stay with the original three PLOs and work from there. She indicated we still need to depend on each program to develop PLOs that would assess the major for the degrees and certificates we award. Ms. Marquez agrees that the three PLOs capture the overall content of our ILOs and expressed her support for continuing in that direction. We all realize that this process will take most of the year to evolve but for right now, the main point is we are moving the right direction. Ms. Parker reiterated her belief that working with three PLOs to assess G.E. PLOs, along with PLO assessments established by each major area, is an appropriate approach.

Dr. Grishman stated that Counseling only administers the GE program and did not develop it. He also called a number of schools for their assessments and all stated they do not have them in place and if we come up with anything to let them know. Ms. Drake stated that they had written Tech Ed PLOs five years ago, but put a hold on developing assessments until there was more definite direction on how to do this. She mentioned that it is too expensive to follow up on graduates after they have left the institution, but it could be possible to embed questions into the final exam of a mastery course that could be utilized for assessment. The question came up that when looking at the ALS degree, you do not see that the person has accomplished enough mastery in any one area to become proficient in the outside world. It might be possible to put a graduation survey online that students need to answer before proceeding with graduation application, even though the best place to ascertain what students have learned is when they are in the working in real world. Ms. Marquez requested that we bring back the three PLOs, the current ones from Dr. Grishman, and the ILO survey and see if we can determine what will work best. Once the committee has approved the PLOs, then they will be sent to the Senate for inclusion as an information item.

b. SLO Revision and Approval Process (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker followed up on the previous discussion regarding the approval process within the WEAVE program. Who is the appropriate person to do the approval when revised PLOs, goals, SLOs, and measures and findings are entered? Ms. Drake stated that it should not be a dean, nor should it be the SLO Committee. Some suggested that it should be the faculty facilitator for that area but others were not comfortable with this. We have run into a problem where we have two facilitators over two overlapping areas that are in disagreement on what their SLOs and assessments should be.

One idea express is that a faculty discipline meeting could be held, or an email discussion conducted, where faculty could discuss appropriate changes and then come to a consensus to approve the change. However, there is several areas in which only one full time faculty member teaches and in some disciplines there may be only adjunct instructors. Another idea was to invite faculty from other disciplines to give their input on revisions Ms. Marquez suggested that maybe a division rep or AP&P rep be assigned to do the approvals. Ms. Covell suggested in a conversation after the last meeting, that it might be time to institute an electronic document approval process, with results forwarded to the SLO Committee for their records. Dr. Aviles felt we should check to see if there are functions within WEAVE that might track changes and revisions. Mr. Younglove will check on this. This would allow us to keep track of previous cycles. When we run reports, we are finding a number of areas where there is no approval and we believe this needs to be corrected. Dr. Hall came up with the scenario that we may end up with a “committee of one”. This is not ideal since that one person may not be the appropriate person for determining what the SLOs and assessments should be for that particular course. Ms. Adams asked again which approval boxes are the most important to be checked. Ms. Parker stated that the measures/findings and outcomes/objectives seemed to be the main

areas of concern. Mr. Younglove also mentioned that someone should be appointed to review the data that has been entered to make sure that it appears to be actual valid data, not just gibberish. All members felt that this was a good idea, especially since we might have quite a number of “committees of one”. Ms. Drake mentioned that it would seem to be a good idea to let faculty know that someone is looking over their data so they should do an honest job with it. Dr. Hall also questioned if this would be done with OLOs and the answer was in the affirmative. We also still need to keep in mind that some areas, such as Facilities and Maintenance may meet on a regular basis.

c. Needs assessment – how and where divisions/departments need our input and support (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker stated to the committee members that we have a few divisions across campus that still struggling with SLOs and assessments, mainly VAPA and PE. A large portion of the SLOs for both divisions have been written and assessed but have not been input into WEAVE. This leaves a very large hole in our reports. Ms. Parker requests that if there is anyone who has the time and inclination to help them, she would be very grateful. Dr. Aviles, Dr. Salameh and Ms. Adams would consider doing this and are willing to attend division meetings if their schedules allow. Ms. Adams suggested that she would be able to help with training. We may also be able to encourage Ms. Covell to help. It would mainly entail sitting down with faculty and helping them learn to use WEAVE. Ms. Parker will ask divisional deans what help they believe is most needed and will forward this information to committee members.

Ms. Parker also queried Ms. Drake about using WEAVE mapping functions. Ms. Parker has been working with Mr. Voelcker on this and when they have the process streamlined a bit, will then include Ms. Drake in the process. Ms. Drake will then take it back to her division. Since one of our Accreditation goals by FALL 2011 is the full implementation of WEAVE mapping functions, we need to continue moving ahead on this.

d. Short term goal setting – plans for reaching 2010/2011 long term goals (Melanie Parker) – The GE PLOs need to be in place by the end of our current academic year. Mapping of Health Sciences and Tech Ed programs in WEAVE also must be done within the same timeframe. These programs will then be used as models for the rest of the campus. By the next meeting, Ms. Parker will bring a breakdown of programs and certificates which still need to establish PLOs.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS - none

10. OTHER –

a. SLO Meeting Dates for Fall – The remaining dates for meetings are October 11 and 25 and November 8 and 22.

b. Ms. Parker hopes to schedule more WEAVE training events.

c. Ms. Parker mentioned an opportunity to attend a conference in Virginia on February 1 and 2, 2011. The conference is being held in conjunction with Virginia Tech and WEAVE. The conference will be discussing assessment designed to improve teaching and learning and also satisfying accountability and accreditation. Mr. Valiotis would be willing to support, through Title V funds, a team of three or four people to attend this conference. It is very restricted attendance so we must act soon. Ms. Parker will forward the information to each member and see if there is any interest.

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

pag