



ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING
March 23, 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 9, 2009
- 5. REPORT**
 - a. T. Younglove/Aaron Zentner
- 6. ACTION ITEMS**
 - a. Acknowledgement of the following SLOs: CIS 159, COMM 109, PE 152, PHTC 211, PHTC 298, THA 150; acknowledgement of Child and Family Education PLO Matrix (attachment)
- 7. DISCUSSION**
 - a. March 13 SLO Coordinator Meeting (Melanie Parker)
 - b. Incorporating Learning Outcomes into Program Review (Carol Eastin, Program Review Coordinator)
 - c. Learning Outcomes Timeline for 2009-2010 (Melanie Parker)
 - d. Progress on PLOs/OLOs (Melanie Parker)
 - e. Scheduled Division Presentations (Melanie Parker)
- 8. SLO COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**
- 9. OTHER**
- 10. 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
March 23, 2009

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

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Ms. Melanie Parker, co-chair of the SLO Committee, called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. Since a quorum was not present, this meeting is unofficial and for the purposes of discussion only.

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

Ms. Parker gave a warm welcome to Michael Jacobs who is attending his first meeting representing deans from instructional areas. Ms. Parker also introduced and welcomed Mr. Rick Motawakel from the Tech Ed Department. He will assume the position of liaison between the SLO Committee and the AP&P Committee.

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – None

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – No minutes were approved as we had no quorum.

5. REPORT – Fall 08/Intersession '09 (Ted Younglove) – Mr. Younglove was on an accreditation team visit and unable to attend.

6. ACTION ITEMS – No acknowledgement could be made of the listed SLOs or of the CFE PLO matrix as we did not have quorum.

7. DISCUSSION

- **Incorporating Learning Outcomes into Program Review (Carol Eastin, Program Review Coordinator)** – Ms. Parker introduced Ms. Eastin to the committee. Ms. Eastin distributed copies of the March 5, 2009 draft of the Systematic Program Review Procedures from Academics Affairs. This draft document was recently presented to the Academic Senate. Ms. Eastin requested

that SLO committee members go to page 10, Area 6. Sections 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4 highlight procedures that are pertinent to SLOs and assessment. Ms. Eastin explained that 6.1 is the “heart” of what we are doing with SLOs. She stated that since most courses now have approved SLOs, faculty should be assessing their SLOs, looking at what they have learned from the assessments, and considering how they should be implementing that information into their program. Faculty and staff should consider what SLOs are telling us about student learning and how to improve it. Program Review will now be conducted on a four year cycle; one comprehensive review every four years with an abbreviated annual review. SLO assessment data will be reported as part of the annual reviews. Annual analysis of SLOs and PLOs will occur within each division and the data used as evidence to support strategic planning and budgeting. SPBC will require this information as foundational to any budget requests. Senate representatives are bringing the Systematic Program Review draft to divisions for comment. The document was brought to the SLO Committee for comments and recommendations regarding SLO/PLO issues that might need further clarification. Ms. Eastin will bring any recommendations or approvals to the April 2 Senate meeting. Members of the SLO Committee should e-mail their thoughts, concerns, changes, recommendations, etc. before the April 2nd date. Ms. Eastin stressed that SLO data feeds right into program review. Accreditation standards have changed and as we move towards becoming increasingly data driven, it is pertinent SLOs be assessed and discussed. Ms. Parker stated that this has been a “missing piece” and that examining how SLO data is influencing decisions made further down the line is important. Committee members expressed that the four procedures in Area 6 seemed well-written and thought out. Ms. Eastin stated that questions were made more global in nature so they would not encounter so many n/a responses. There is an emphasis on identifying what is relevant to your department and what is currently happening within your area. Dr. Gat mentioned that she was impressed section 6.2 specifically speaks to including adjunct faculty in the process. Ms. Parker stated that this was important as it was a requirement of accreditation and that there should be campus-wide discussion on learning and assessment. Ms. Eastin stated that everyone must be brought to the table for discussion as soon as possible. The process of annual review will keep everyone on track and moving toward their goals. Once self-studies are submitted to Ms. Eastin, they go through peer review and are sent to SPBC. The timeline for submittal has also changed. The administration now requests that self-study reports be finished by the end of October. The peer team will finish their peer review in November/December or possibly early spring, so that data is available in time for the coming years’ budget decisions. Ms. Parker encouraged people to volunteer for peer teams because she felt it was such an important learning experience. Peer review teams will be established for both the annual program reviews and for the four year reviews. Ms. Easton has been able to procure a rubric that should prove helpful in this process. Dr. Gat wondered if there would be a process put in place to give feedback to the faculty with information on results and any budget they may receive. Ms. Eastin expects this information will flow through the deans.

- **Mt. SAC SLO Meeting (Melanie Parker)** – Dr. Aviles related his feedback from the conference. He felt that people need to have a better explanation of the definition of data, especially the difference between qualitative and quantitative data. Dr. Aviles believes there is resistance to using quantitative data and we

need to communicate more about how to use it. He brought up a comment made by Claude Gratton about tying SLOs to grades, especially with papers required in class. He feels that the SLOs now being assessed with 10 or so embedded questions should eventually become actual exams. If students are successful in passing assessments, they should be qualified to pass the class. Ms. Parker talked about the draft vocabulary/glossary terms that were distributed at the last meeting. It is the goal of the State Academic Senate to have all of us speaking one common language regarding outcomes and assessment; therefore the glossary was developed. A final version of the glossary should be ready by fall 2009. Ms. Parker mentioned that one of the benefits of attending this conference was attending with Ms. Eastin. It helped clarify the role of SLOs in the program review process. Ms. Parker posted a helpful website on the board: www.sloassessment.com. The purpose of this website, managed by State Academic Senate, is to communicate assessment and outcome issues and to provide a forum for discussion on these issues.

8. SLO Committee Administrative Business

- Remaining meeting dates: April 13th and 27th, and May 11.

9. OTHER –

- Ms. Parker requested a list of courses that have reported SLO data from the Office of Institutional Research. While we know the percentage of courses reporting results, more definitive information will help the committee determine where to focus attention and encouragement.
- Timeline – Ms. Parker would like to establish a timeline for achieving SLO and assessment goals. For instance, the committee has already strongly recommended that all courses assess one SLO this spring. Ms. Parker communicated this with Ms. Lowry. Ms. Lowry indicated that she and Dr. Hall will send out campus-wide e-mails to lend their administrative support to that recommendation.
- SLO Reporting Guidelines – Spring 2009 – This document was distributed to all attendees. It is fairly self-explanatory and spells out the process and due date for submitting course data to Ted Younglove. Since this document addresses submittal of instructional SLOs, Ms. Parker stated she hoped a second version could be written soon that will apply to Student Services. She will request help from Dr. Hall.
- Two big goals for the coming semester and year – The first goal is making certain programs granting certificates or degrees have established Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs). Certain areas are very much up to speed in this process but others are not. Ms. Parker is accumulating considerable information on program learning outcomes and is more than willing to give help and guidance where needed. The second goal is to analyze the data from our SLOs. People in different subject and content areas need to begin discussions regarding what their assessment results mean and how they will begin to use the information. Of importance is that faculty and staff keep records of any informal meetings and conversations held on the subject of learning outcomes. These do not need to be formal minutes; they can just be notes documenting the date of discussion, who was present, and in a nutshell, the content of what was discussed. This could be information jotted in a calendar, written as e-mails, or be online discussions. The more evidence we have of campus discussion, the better. Ms. Parker asked Rick

Motawakel to share this information with division reps on AP&P. Mr. Motawakel questioned whether this information had to be turned into the AP&P Committee. Ms. Parker stressed it does not. Each group can decide how they wish to preserve the information. As part of the accreditation process, we must show that we are having campus wide dialogue on the process and any documentation we can provide will be helpful. Ms. Parker recently visited a Social and Behavioral Sciences Division meeting to relay this information. More division presentations are scheduled in the near future. Ms. Parker and Mr. Ted Younglove hope to tailor presentations specifically to the needs of each division.

- Item for next meeting's agenda – **Communication** – Ms. Parker would like committee members to continue thinking about the priority issues we need to be communicating and how we can communicate more clearly.
- Announcements – A WEAVE webinar will be held April 1st from 9 to 10 a.m.. It is apparent that some members of the committee are unable to attend due to class conflicts. On Wednesday (March 24), we will open up spots to deans or their representatives. Dr. Gat requested that the webinar be recorded. Pat Gordon has investigated this with IMC and an e-mail has been sent to Mr. Younglove to contact WEAVE in that regard. The topic of the webinar is writing program learning outcomes; very important to us in our process right now. A second announcement is that our next meeting will be held April 13th with Dr. Ed Beyer, Accreditation Coordinator, as our guest. He will be discussing accreditation with us and giving us guidelines on priority items to consider before the visit. Ms. Parker is hopeful that Dr. Beyer can give us direction and help us establish committee priorities. As a reminder, program learning outcomes are only required if programs offer a degree or a certificate in that subject area. Courses of study that do not could still establish PLOs for the benefit of the program and students, but it is not required. Refer to the chart in the front of the AVC catalog to determine which subject areas offer degrees and certificates.
- Format for SLO submission – Dr. Aviles gave mention of the Excel format used by Tech Ed as being an excellent example for others to follow. Ms. Parker suggested we post this format online. Spring 2009 reporting guidelines have already been posted on MyAVC. A campus wide e-mail regarding SLO submission will be sent in conjunction with the Vice President's offices soon. Dr. Gat also mentioned that faculty do not need to wait until the end of the semester to send in SLO assessment results; if you have already assessed SLOs, you are encouraged to submit early.
- WEAVE -- During spring break, Christos Valiotis, Ted Younglove, and Aaron Voelcker hope get WEAVE up and running. Once this is accomplished, they will be able to institute more hands-on training.
- Adjuncts – Dr. Gat mentioned the need for adjuncts to be involved in the SLO process. They are not contractually obligated to do so, but it is a very major factor in our accreditation process in that we have so many adjuncts teaching courses. Ms. Parker stated we need the assistance of all fulltime faculty and adjuncts to move the process forward and need to find creative ways to facilitate involvement.

10. ADJOURNMENT – the meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.