ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING
March 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. February 28, 2011

5.   **PRESENTATION -** None

6.   **REPORTS**
     a.   Updates from Office of Institutional Research and Planning – WEAVE PLO Entity (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)

7.   **ACTION ITEMS**
     a. Approval of SLOs: THA 120C; THA 205

8.   **DISCUSSION –**
     a. PLO Development Packet - (Melanie Parker)
     b. SLOs for Umbrella Courses - (Melanie Parker)
     c. GE PLOs - (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:
      - March 28
      - April 11 and 25
      - May 9 and 23

11**.**   **ADJOURNMENT**

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

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 asked Walter Briggs to introduce himself to the committee and committee members in turn introduced themselves. She also stated that we would move the report from Institutional Research and Planning to later in the meeting, giving Mr. Voelcker additional time to work out difficulties posed by the computer and projector.

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

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Ms. Parker asked the members for any corrections to the minutes of the 2/28/10 meeting. Ms. Parker requested a motion to approve the minutes. A motion was made and seconded and with no further discussion, the motion was approved.

5. **PRESENTATION –** No presentations.

6. **REPORTS**
   Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker) – please refer to Item 8a.

7. **ACTION ITEMS –**
   a. Approval of SLOs – THA 120C; THA 205 - Ms. Parker requested that the approval for these SLOs be taken off the table. She found changes were needed and has returned them for corrections. Corrected copies have not yet been returned.

8. DISCUSSION

a. PLO Packet Development - (Melanie Parker and Aaron Voelcker) – Ms. Parker stated that Mr. Voelcker would explain the new program entity for academic programs and also demonstrate the Excel PLO files that will be used to document PLOs with related assessment cycles and curriculum maps. Mr. Voelcker explained and demonstrated how he built academic programs into the system. He indicated there is likely unnecessary duplication in several programs where both certificates and degrees are awarded. However there are instances where the program required for a certificate and related degree may differ significantly and therefore require separate listing. We will contact divisions and ask which entries are duplicates and can be eliminated. Once determined, the corrections will be made in academic program entity of WEAVE.

Mr. Voelcker demonstrated how the program level entity can be accessed and stated that the process for entering PLOs is identical to that for entering SLOs. Once the faculty and staff who will be doing PLO entry are identified, he will grant individuals access to the entity.

Mr. Voelcker then demonstrated the Excel PLO files that will be required for each program. Ms. Parker stated these files should be available in the document repository as well as being posted to the website. Ms. Drake mentioned that improvements are still needed before the forms are distributed. One issue recognized is the inability to print appropriate hard copies of the signature page. Mr. Voelcker will work with this and when he finds out the solution for a majority of computers on campus, he will be able to communicate how to set the parameters.

Ms. Drake provided sample PLOs from Tech Ed to use as an example and also demonstrated the assessment cycle and curriculum mapping pages. Ms. Parker stated that when PLOs are developed, all three pages will be required. Only the signature page will need to be submitted as a hard copy. All three pages will be submitted electronically for committee review.

ILOs have been removed from the curriculum map. Ms. Drake felt that it made more sense to enter the ILO associations on a separate page, thus the "ILO/SLO Crosswalk". This information is necessary for the program review process. The committee agreed that this form would be easy for committee members to fill out, using associations that faculty had already submitted. It was decided not to require another form for faculty and that the committee would handle responsibility for documenting and posting this information.

The next issue discussed was whether to use the term "course name" or "course number" on the curriculum map. In the college database, there is a subject code and course number. Ms. Drake believes that most faculty understand what we are asking for. There may be confusion amongst faculty trying to type in the full name of the course (which can be very lengthy), as opposed to the course department prefix and number. Dr. Hall suggested that providing an example to follow would alleviate that problem and discussion occurred regarding where that example was best given. Ms. Drake mentioned that once the PLO workbook file is completed, we could provide a file as an example, along with the blank templates. She mentioned that even with interruptions, it took her less than an hour to complete the sample file.

Ms. Parker stated that some instructions should included with the forms. Ms. Drake recommended that creating a page and tab titled "instructions" would be the best way to communicate this information. A phone number could be added if people need additional help but may not be necessary since the examples and forms seem to be fairly self-explanatory. Dr. Hall suggested adding a comment to each cell and mentioning this in the instruction tab. Ms.

Parker will work with Mr. Voelcker on how to best do this. Ms. Drake said that if she was given a clean copy, she would take it to her division meeting the next day to show her faculty. She will come back with problems that they encountered, especially since her division deals with a multitude of certificate programs. She finds that faculty are trying too hard to create something that does not need to be done over again so this might help to straighten out the situation.

Ms. Drake also mentioned that though a number of WEAVE training sessions have been held she still receives "blank stares" from faculty struggling to understand the concepts. Dr. Gat felt that we should present this at division meetings, but Ms. Parker pointed out that only a few people from each division meeting would be responsible for inputting program information into WEAVE. She and Mr. Voelcker will also be presenting the Excel file to Senate on Thursday. Ms. Drake also invited Ms. Parker to her division meeting.

b. SLOs for Umbrella Courses (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker was contacted by the AP&P Committee with questions regarding our policy for SLOs on courses that reside under an umbrella course such Work Experience, AUTO and HD courses/seminars. One set of SLOs was written for each Work Experience umbrella and seems to work for that program. Also, in Mr. Motawakel's area of Tech Ed, several auto tech seminars with different subject titles and different hours of credit exist under AUTO 198 umbrella. The Human Development 198 umbrella covers different subject areas. This committee needs to set a policy for SLOs on umbrella courses and communicate the policy to the AP&P Committee. Ms. Parker, noticing the differing subjects covered in some umbrella courses, asked whether a separate set of SLOs should be written for each course or seminar. Ms. Drake stated that this could create unnecessary work for faculty. Dr. Hall mentioned that if a set of SLOs was well-written for the umbrella course, she believed one set was all that should be required. Ms. Parker polled the members and asked their opinion on this. The committee felt that one set of general SLOs could be written that would cover the subject areas of each seminar and would make more sense when it came to WEAVE data entry. Dr. Aviles commented that this would be similar to the process used for PLOs, where the SLOs would be general enough to cover all courses offered under the same umbrella.

Ms. Parker asked for a motion regarding an SLO umbrella course policy. A motion was made and seconded. The motion stated that it will be the policy of the SLO Committee to require one set of SLOs as an umbrella for all topics in existence under that umbrella. Faculty would still be free to set separate SLOs if they so choose. With no further discussion, the motion was approved. Ms. Parker will communicate this information to AP&P. Dr. Hall noted that in each umbrella area, the skill set would need to be defined so it could be assessed.

c. GE PLOs- (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker distributed the GE PLOs Dr. Grishman presented to the committee in Fall 2010. She stated that we need to proceed posthaste what asked what would be the best way to proceed with an assessment tool for this measurement She has asked Ted Younglove to work on this. Next goal is to develop PLOs for Areas A through F of the Associate Degree. This will need to be handled collaboratively by the division(s) represented in each area of emphasis. She believes that presentations will need to be made to each division, with specific direction regarding how this should occur. Ms. Parker stated that we should provide examples of PLOs and assessments from other colleges, or examples created by the committee that will provide direction. Help from the Institutional Research Office will be needed as to how and when we assess these. While she acknowledges we will not be ready to assess these areas until next academic cycle, we need to move forward as quickly as we can

with this process. The committee was reminded we have been given a 2012 deadline by the Accreditation Commission.

While it is somewhat easy to find PLOs established by community colleges, it has been more difficult to find examples of how they are being assessed. Dr. Hall asked if we had information from four year colleges. Ms. Parker relayed that some four year institutions co are using exit exams, some are using employer surveys, some are using admittance rates to graduate programs and some are using a particular sampling of courses. Dr. Hall suggested that a college could take a random sample, for example, of six courses that satisfied the GE area requirements, and choose a percentage of students in those courses to survey. Would that give us an adequate sampling to provide us with data? We know we cannot use grades as an assessment and we would have to specify what information we want to capture. She mentioned that they do capstone projects in Canada. Ms. Parker felt that it would not be a suitable choice here, due to the multitude of course combinations possible. We believe we can use surveys as part of this process, but realize we need to provide multiple assessment strategies beyond surveys. The initial draft from Dr. Grishman, linked to ILOs, is a place to start and we need to get moving on this.   Ms. Covell suggested that we could attach a survey to the online graduation application to gather information. A question came up about assessment and how it applies to each area. Ms. Parker relayed that it could be just one assessment that would apply to each college area within that particular GE requirement. Questions would have to be made conceptual rather than too specific. Dr. Hall suggested that 3-4 questions could be placed on the final exam in each course where the first 2-3 are specific to the subject of the course and the last one would be very general to the GE requirement. That data could then be collected to show how each course complied with that particular GE requirement.

Dr. Aviles relayed that he had conducted a survey for program review where they chose random courses and asked instructors to administer the questionnaires. He was surprised that he received a majority of them back. He was able to gather the data from each of the courses to tabulate for their review. Ms. Parker felt that since what we are doing with GE PLOs is integrated closely to program review, maybe there were some ideas used for program review that we should consider. Dr. Hall still feels that each division can come up with three questions across the board but the answer would be different in each discipline. She feels that they should be survey-type questions but Mr. Voelcker feels that we should steer away from surveys.   Dr. Gat feels that they could be essay-type questions where the answer would basically be true or false. The PLO could be the same across the board but the assessment tool would be different in each subject area to come up with data specific to the subject.   Dr. Hall stated that the skill set is cumulative and sequential. You must learn step 1 before you can move to step 2 and it does not matter what the subject is. It could be math, English, tech ed, science, etc.

The question came up of who would grade this and how; the age-old assessment problem. Answers could be tabulated similar to what we have done for SLOs so it is possible this might become another responsibility for WEAVE facilitators to handle. This would represent quite a bit of additional responsibility. Dr. Hall mentioned that we should make an effort to explore what other colleges have been doing as examples for our instructors. This item will be included for further discussion on the next agenda.

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

10. **OTHER** –

a. **SLO Meeting Dates for Spring –** March 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

11. ADJOURNMENT – the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

pg