

# ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING

September 12, 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. May 23, 2011 (attachment)
- 5. **REPORTS** 
  - a. Updates from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning Ted Younlove/Aaron Voelcker

#### 7. **ACTION ITEMS**

- a. PLOs:
  - · Administration of Justice
  - Welding
- b. SLOs (new):
  - POLS 200 Political Theory (new course)
- c. SLOs (revised)
  - AJ 103 Criminal Evidence
  - AJ 204 Juvenile Procedures
  - AJ 209 Public Safety Communications

#### 8. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

- a. Evaluation of Fall Welcome Back SLO Session M. Parker
- b. Action Plan Documentation Guidelines Aaron Voelcker
- c. Summer SLOs and the WEAVE Reporting Cycle Aaron Voelcker
- d. Foudnation Grant for Faculty Incentives Aaron Voelcker

## 9. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

- a. Revised SLOs received and recorded: AJ 103; AJ 204; AJ209
- b. Spring 2012 Welcome Back Day Planning Meeting (TBD)
- c. SLO Related FPD Events for fall 2011 Your participation is Welcome!!
  - "SIOs: From Data to Action Plans" September 22, 2011 and November 15, 2011
  - "WEAVE: Basic Training" October 26, 2011 and November 30, 2011
  - "WEAVE: Refresher Training October 12, 2011 and November 30, 2011
- d. Fall 2011 Assessment Week November 14<sup>th</sup> 18<sup>th</sup>, 2011
- e. Fall 2011 WEAVE Week November 28<sup>th</sup> December 2, 2011
- f. Fall 2011 WEAVE Data Days December 13 14, 2011
- g. 2011 2012 Reporting Guidelines (attached)

#### 10. **OTHER**

a. Future SLO Meeting dates for fall 2011: September 26, 2011; October 10, 2011; October 24, 2011; November 14, 2011; and November 28, 2011

#### 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 OUTCOMES COMMITTEE September 12, 2011

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Ms. Melanie Parker, Student Learning Outcomes Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

## 2. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR

- Ms. Melanie Parker expressed her gratitude to committee members for their assistance with the
  Welcome Back Day SLO breakout session. She indicated her appreciation for all the hard work
  performed to ensure a successful event. The committee will debrief about the experiences of the
  event, learn from the experiences, and make efforts to improve planning for future events.
- On September 9, 2011, Ms. Melanie Parker attended an Accreditation workshop at College of the Canyons. Workshop discussion focused on integrated planning, program review and role of SLOs in that process. Ms. Parker distributed a copy of the planning, program review, and SLO rubrics and requested committee members familiarize themselves with the updated requirements.
- The committee will look at revising the committee constitution due to the loss of the Vice President of Student Services and the consolidation of the Vice President positions. In addition, review the Ad Hoc position to make it a voting member of the committee due to the important work performed by the Research Analyst. It only makes sense to include him as a voting member. More information on this matter will be forthcoming for discussion. Ms. Parker indicated she would email the committee composition for review and input to finalize the revision expeditiously in efforts to move forward with SLO business.

## 3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

## 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. May 23, 2011 (attachment)

A motion was made and seconded to approve the May 23, 2011 SLO Committee minutes. Motion carried as corrected.

## 5. REPORTS

a. Update from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (T. Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)

Mr. Aaron Voelcker distributed a graph indicating the percent of courses with action plans. The results were a snapshot of percentages of action plans completed prior and after the Welcome Back Day (WBD) event. He has completed uploading all the action plans completed during the WBD event and distributed submitted hard copies to the Division Offices to provide to the WEAVE Facilitators. There were a total of 251 action plans completed during the WBD event. The totals by division were:

-	Business, Computer Studies, and - Kinesiolo		<ul> <li>Kinesiology, Dance and Athletics</li> </ul>	14
	Economic Development	36	- Language Arts	40
-	Counseling and Matriculation	7	- Math, Science and Engineering	48
-	Health Sciences	27	- Social and Behavioral Sciences	24
-	Instructional Resources and		- Technical Education	19
	Extended Services	4	- Visual and Performing Arts	32

Mr. Voelcker indicated he is not sure how many of the completed action plans during the WBD were duplicates of action plans completed in WEAVE or have already been uploaded into the WEAVE database. Committee members reviewed the percentage increases and discussed the results. Ms. Stacey Adams reported the Business, Computer Studies, and Economic Development division totals should increase even more than what is indicated on the handout as more data is inputted into WEAVE

online. Ms. Kim Covell requested the Human Development courses be added to the Counseling and Matriculation totals indicated above. Ms. Maggie Drake indicated the results for the Technical Education Division in her estimation should reflect a larger increase than what is being depicted on the handout. The following division percentages or action plan totals did not change: Instructional Resources and Extended Services, Language Arts, and Visual and Performing Arts. The intent of incorporating a session solely to engage in SLO work was to provide faculty with the opportunity to begin talking about issues relating to SLOs/PLOs. Faculty must begin seeing the work that relates to SLOs, Program Review, and Accreditation as an integrated process. Mr. Voelcker stated when action plans are completed in the future the task of inputting data into WEAVE will be the responsibility of WEAVE Facilitators. He performed the task for this initial event to compile and acquire data results in a more timely fashion. Future data input for action plans can easily be entered into WEAVE online by WEAVE Facilitators in the future. Mr. Voelcker stated that it is a relatively easy process and will walk Facilitators through the steps if assistance is needed.

## 6. ACTION ITEMS

#### a. PLOs:

#### Administration of Justice

A motion was made and seconded to approve the PLOs for Administration of Justice. Motion carried.

## • Welding

Ms. Parker indicated the PLOs for Welding were returned to the division for revisions. Upon corrections to revisions the PLOs will be placed back on the agenda for committee approval. Committee members were in consensus to table this item until revisions were made.

## b. SLOs (new)

POLS 200 – Political Theory (new course)
 A motion was made and seconded to approve the newly established SLOs for POLS 200 – Political Theory. Motion carried.

## c. SLOs (revised)

- AJ 103 Criminal Evidence
- AJ 204 Juvenile Procedures
- AJ 209 Public Safety Communications

Ms. Melanie Parker reported the revisions required for committee approval were not addressed. She indicated the faculty did not specify achievement targets, therefore the SLO Form was returned to the initiating faculty member. Ms. Parker indicated the action for the above items would be tabled until the revisions are completed. Committee members were in consensus to table this item.

## 7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

## a. Evaluation of Fall Welcome Back SLO Session - Melanie Parker

Ms. Parker reported that overall the SLO break out session during WBD went smoothly. There were some minor technical issues and a few questions, but nothing major. This was the initial WBD SLO event and the intention is to continue to perform WBD sessions in the future. The most positive aspect of the day was getting faculty to begin discussing issues relating to SLOs/PLOs and start recognizing the integrated process of SLOs/PLOs, Program Review, and Accreditation. Ms. Parker requested committee members provide a brief assessment of individual workgroups.

Mr. Aaron Voelcker reported he facilitated the Counseling, Matriculation, and Instructional Resources and Extended Services faculty in the Boardroom (SSV 151). His session went very well with the exception that the EOP&S faculty did not have any data results for SLOs/PLOs for their respective area. These faculty members were asked to work with the Counseling and Matriculation faculty in their

discussions regarding SLOs/PLOs. All faculty were engaged and willing to work on the task of action plans.

Dr. Bassam Salameh reported he facilitated the Math, Science and Engineering faculty. He had a faculty member express his strong disagreement with the SLO information being presented. Mr. Christos Valiotis stepped in and provided a rationale on the importance of SLO/PLO reporting and assessments. There was a complaint about course data information being cut off and having to flip from one page to another to view data results. The entire group as a whole was very large and would be better suited to breakup into smaller groups (disciplines) with individual facilitators. It was very helpful having Mr. Valiotis available to assist in separating the group. Mr. Salameh stated he would like to have more knowledge regarding the process and rationale behind the decisions being made. He often found himself stating he didn't know the answers to questions but would acquire the answers. Overall, it was a good opportunity for faculty to cooperatively discuss SLO/PLO assessment data.

Dr. Fredy Aviles reported he facilitated the Visual and Performing Arts faculty. He reported the beginning of the session was a bit disorganized and he experienced some minor issues with getting the technology running. There were several discipline areas that did not have any faculty present to work on evaluating assessment data and establishing an action plan. Once the issue of technology was addressed the session was productive.

Ms. Kim Covell reported she assisted Mr. Voelcker with the Counseling, Matriculation, and Instructional Resources and Extended Services group. She made herself available to faculty and addressed any questions or concerns. She concentrated on emphasizing the importance of closing the loop as required for Accreditation purposes.

Mr. Ted Younglove reported he facilitated the Language Arts faculty. There were some uncooperative faculty who didn't want to participate in the process. The fact that no data was available for English was a complication. There was a good mixture of adjunct and full-time faculty.

Ms. Stacey Adams reported she facilitated the Business, Computer Studies and Economic Development faculty. She reported her faculty response was fantastic and felt that this session was highly successful and well received. There was a wonderful mixture of both full-time and adjunct faculty present. The only issue she experienced was the air conditioning was not working appropriately in the labs. Other than it being a bit uncomfortable all faculty present worked hard and collaboratively to complete action plans.

Ms. Maggie Drake reported she facilitated the Technical Education Division faculty. She reported the session went very well and was amazed at the number of adjunct faculty in attendance. Many of them have full-time day jobs and took time off work to attend the coordinated Welcome Back Day events. She was relieved the decision was made not to include the computer component in the workshop as originally discussed because it really forced faculty to discuss the assessment results. This was a great opportunity for adjunct faculty to be brought into the process of SLOs/PLOs. She stated that many faculty appreciated the opportunity provided during the WBD to discuss and work on SLO/PLO issues.

Dr. Irit Gat reported she facilitated the Social and Behavioral Sciences faculty. She reported she received positive feedback on the orientation video. Dr. Gat indicated it would have been helpful to have had examples of completed action pans to reference and provide as handouts during the session. One of the main concerns she expressed was the number of Psychology Adjunct faculty present and neither she nor Dr. Fredy Aviles were present as the full-time faculty for the discipline to engage in the discussion. She would like to ensure that if future SLO/PLO sessions are coordinated that one of them are present to participate in the discussion process with adjunct faculty. Ms. Parker indicated she recognized the problem and wants to ensure that this issue doesn't occur for future SLO/PLO events.

Ms. Parker reported she was originally scheduled to facilitate the Kinesiology, Dance and Athletics faculty group but realized it would be better if she was available to float around from area to area and address any issues that may arise. She arranged for a replacement to work with the Kinesiology, Dance and Athletics faculty. Overall, the process went very well and faculty worked cooperatively on their

action plans. Ms. Parker indicated there is an issue regarding the WEAVE Facilitator for this area that needs to be addressed. She is working to resolve the issue.

## b. Action Plan Documentation Guidelines - Aaron Voelcker

Mr. Aaron Voelcker reported there are a couple different ways of entering action plan data and wanted to discuss establishing committee approved guidelines for entering data for single or multiple SLOs. Action plans can be entered for individual SLOs or for aseveral SLOs and committee members need to determine and establish guidelines for entering action plan data. Mr. Voelcker provided an electronic demonstration of how a faculty member can access action plans through different three different entry sites. The discussion was opened to committee members to provide input on potential guidelines for how action plans should be entered and if they could be combined for a group of SLOs.

Ms. Stacey Adams responded that whether an action plan is completed for a single SLO or a group of SLO would depend on the established SLOs. Faculty need to holistically review SLOs to determine whether an action plan can be created for a combination of established SLOs, but it shouldn't be done simply because faculty don't want to establish individual action plans for SLOs. Faculty need to recognize the importance of integrating funding requests established for SLOs into Program Review reports. The committee should work on establishing an illustration of how SLO data leads to the Program Review process. Faculty have to be aware that funding resources cannot be distributed based on failure but should be based on proactive measures to improve course content or strategies to improve students success.

Ms. Maggie Drake stated the committee should establish a norming requirement and must take the lead in establishing a holistic approach.

Mr. Ted Younglove stated faculty need to complete at least one action plan per course.

Mr. Voelcker stated his concern involves the integration of action plans and funding requests. If faculty are allowed to combine action plans there is no way to segregate out funding requests for individual SLOs unless specified in written action plans. The committee needs to be mindful that allowing faculty to establishing one action plan for several SLOs can pose a problem without appropriate established guidelines.

Ms. Melanie Parker stated the holistic approach seems to make the most sense when establishing action plan guidelines. Any drafted guidelines for action plans must be carefully crafted to avoid any confusion. Ms. Parker will come up with drafted language and examples for committee members to review and discuss at the next SLO meeting.

## c. Summer SLOs and the WEAVE Reporting Cycle - Aaron Voelcker

Ms. Parker requested committee members to provide input on how to account for summer in regards to the WEAVE Reporting Cycle. Does the committee wish to include summer as the beginning or end of the reporting cycle? Courses taught only during the summer session will be impacted by the outcome of this decision. Committee members engaged in a brief discussion on how to account the summer session for reporting purposes. Ms. Kim Covell stated that if the committee establishes the reporting cycle similar to how Enrollment Services accounts the academic year, it will eliminate any confusion for the campus community. The fall semester is generally seen as the beginning of the academic year which would place the summer session at the end of the reporting cycle. Committee members were in consensus with accounting the summer session as the end of the reporting cycle being that there are generally fewer courses taught during this session and it shouldn't be too difficult to compile SLO data results for a smaller group of courses.

## d. Foundation Grant for Faculty Incentives – Aaron Voelcker

Mr. Aaron Voelcker reported every year the Institutional Advancement and Foundation Office sends out a call for campus constituents to submit a grant requests. Mr. Voelcker would like the committee to consider submitting a grant request for funding to be used to incentivize discipline faculty who

complete their SLO action plans based on merit of comprehensive plans. Committee members expressed concern regarding the work required to review all submitted action plans and determining what would be considered comprehensive. Instead, they suggested making the funding based on timeliness of submitted assessments of SLOs, PLOs, OOs, and the development of related action plans. Committee members were in complete support of forwarding a grant funding request to incentivize faculty to submit SLO, PLO, and OO data information and enable faculty to acquire funding needs to promote student success in their courses. Specific funding rubric requirements will be determined at a future meeting. Mr. Voelcker indicated he would complete the grant application and forward to committee members for input. He needs all input completed immediately in efforts to meet the deadline set by Institutional Advancement and Foundation Office.

## 8. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

- a. Revised SLOs received and recorded: AJ 103; AJ 204; AJ 209
- b. Spring 2012 Welcome Back Day Planning Meeting (TBD)
- c. SLO Related FPD Events for fall 2011 Your participation is welcome!!
  - "SLOs: From Data to Action Plans" September 22, 2011 and November 15, 2011
  - "WEAVE: Basic Training" October 26, 2011 and November 30, 2011
  - "WEAVE: Refresher Training" October 12, 2011 and November 30, 2011
- d. Fall 2011 Assessment Week November 14<sup>th</sup> 18<sup>th</sup>, 2011
- e. Fall 2011 WEAVE week November 28, 2011 December 2, 2011
- f. Fall 2011 WEAVE Data Days December 13 14, 2011
- g. 2011 2012 Reporting Guidelines (attached)

#### 9. OTHER

a. Future SLO Meeting dates for fall 2011: September 26, 2011; October 10, 2011; October 24, 2011; November 14, 2011; and November 28, 2011

## 10. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the September 12, 2011 Student Learning Outcomes Committee meeting at 4:33 p.m. Motion carried.

MEMBERS PRESENT		ABSENT MEMBERS		
Stacey Adams	Melanie Parker	Vacant VP of Student Services	Vacant AP&P Faculty Liaison	
Dr. Fredy Aviles	Bassam Salameh	Vacant SSV Faculty	Vacant Conf. Mngmt. Rep.	
Kim Covell	Aaron Voelcker	Vacant SSV Faculty	Vacant Classified Union Rep.	
Maggie Drake	Ted Younglove			
Dr. Irit Gat				

# SLO/PLO Reporting Guidelines for Academic Programs and Courses 2011-2012

- Please note that because of Accreditation reporting deadlines and requirements, every SLO for each course taught must be reported at the end of both Fall and Spring semesters this year.
- PLOs must be reported according to the assessment cycle submitted during the PLO approval process.
- Each division has designated WEAVE Facilitators, specific faculty members who are responsible for gathering, aggregating, and reporting SLO data for each department <u>or</u> for a specific group of courses, if numerous courses are offered within the same department.
- Faculty will submit SLO data for each course to their designated WEAVE Facilitator. Contact your course Facilitator if you need further information. If you do not know the WEAVE Facilitator for your course(s), please contact your division office.

## FALL 2011 Reporting Cycle – July 1 through December 31

- Deadline for Action Plans from 2010-2011: September 30, 2011
- Deadline for PLO Development: September 30, 2011
- Fall Assessment Week: November 14 through 18, 2011
- Fall WEAVE Week: November 28 through December 2, 2011
- Fall semester ends: December 10, 2011
- Fall WEAVE Data Days: December 13-14, 2011
- Deadline for Fall semester WEAVE entry: *December 16, 2011*

## **SPRING 2012 Reporting Cycle – January 1 through June 30**

- Spring Assessment Week: May 7 through 11, 2012
- Spring WEAVE Week: May 21 though 25, 2012
- Spring semester ends: June 1, 2012
- Spring WEAVE Data Days: June 5-6, 2012
- Deadline for Spring semester WEAVE entry: June 9, 2012

Contact Melanie Parker at <a href="majorater">mparker@avc.edu</a> with SLO/PLO-related questions OR Aaron Voelcker at <a href="avoelcker@avc.edu">avoelcker@avc.edu</a> with WEAVE-related questions or for WEAVE training and assistance.