



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE  
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING**

**April 11, 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** – none available for this meeting
5. **PRESENTATION** - None
6. **REPORTS**
  - a. Updates from Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)
7. **ACTION ITEMS** – approval of the following: ADN Program Learning Outcomes
8. **DISCUSSION** –
  - a. SLOs for HD Umbrella Courses - (Melanie Parker)
  - b. Continuing Discussion of GE PLOs – (Melanie Parker)
  - c. PLO Rubric– (Melanie Parker)
9. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS** - none
10. **OTHER**
  - a. SLO Committee Faculty Professional Development Events for Spring 2011
    - 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:
    - April 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**  
**April 11, 2011**  
**Room A141, 3:00 – 4:30 PM**

| <b>Members Present</b>                    | <b>Members Absent</b> | <b>Guests in Attendance</b> |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Melanie Parker                            | Michelle Hernandez    |                             |
| Dr. Irit Gat                              | Dr. Rosa Hall         |                             |
| Rick Motawakel                            | Kim Covell            |                             |
| Maggie Drake                              | Ted Younglove         |                             |
| Dr. Fredy Aviles                          | Dr. Bassam Salameh    |                             |
| Stacey Adams                              |                       |                             |
| Aaron Voelcker                            |                       |                             |
| 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 3:07 p.m.

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

– Ms. Parker wished to thank the members for coming to the meetings and for their dedication. Ms. Parker stated that she is in increasing contact with faculty members regarding PLOs. She has not heard from Mr. Tafarella in regard to his contact with the flex committee.

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

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Ms. Parker informed members that the minutes from the last meeting were not yet ready for distribution but will be included in the next meeting.

**5. PRESENTATION** – No presentations.

**6. REPORTS**

**Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)** –Mr. Voelcker informed the members that he had not conducted further WEAVE training but had been contacted by Ms. Kincaid in regard to an issue that he helped her resolve.

**7. ACTION ITEMS –**

**a. Approval of ADN PLO – a motion was made and seconded to move this item to discussion. With no further discussion, the motion was approved.**

**8. DISCUSSION**

- a. SLOs for HD Umbrella Courses - (Melanie Parker)** – Ms. Parker stated that due to time limits, this subject will be postponed to a future meeting date.
- b. Continuing Discussion of GE PLOs (Melanie Parker)** – Ms. Parker stated that due to time limits, this subject will be postponed to a future meeting date.
- c. PLO Rubric - (Melanie Parker)** – Ms. Parker asked members to review the draft PLO rubric to see if it makes sense. It is a good starting point for faculty who are developing PLOs and will help make sure they include what is needed. Committee members will use it to ensure a measure of standardization. Ms. Parker asked the committee to review the ADN PLOs using the rubric as a guideline. This will help point out where revisions should be made to the rubric. In relating this rubric to the ADN program, questions were asked and answered as follows:

**Question #1** – Yes

**Question #2** – Yes

**Question #3** – Yes

**Question #4** – Yes

**# 5 Recommendations** –Grammatical corrections.

**Question #6** – Members had questions for clarification.

**Question #7** – No

**#8 Recommendations** – This is where the committee members would state their concerns and receive more clarification. Once done to their satisfaction, the answers to 5 and 6 would be yes.

**Question #9** – Yes

**Question #10** – A question came up about what happens if a program does not last for three academic cycles? We should change to say “Is the assessment cycle applicable to this specific program?” This was more agreeable to the members.

**Question #11** – Yes

**#12 Recommendations** – This is where we would put our questions if the committee members felt the cycle did not fit the program and ask for clarification.

**Question #13** – A question was brought up by Ms. Drake as it relates of the AJ program. It has 3-4 core courses that must be taken but a different list of supporting courses numbering 15-20 to choose from. She feels that the core courses are the ones that should be assessed and not any of the supportive ones. From Ms. Parker’s perspective, she feels that all the courses should be listed. We should be able to demonstrate that if a student chooses to take one of those supportive courses, it satisfies the requirements of the program where PLOs are being met. She reviewed her own program in CFE and found that it contains two supporting courses that do not meet any of the PLOs. One purpose of curriculum mapping is helping faculty look at the whole program to see if what we require is appropriate and needed. This is an important part of program assessment. There was a question about the courses being classified as elective vs supporting courses. Ms. Drake feels that the committee should not judge on what courses should be included or not. She feels that the core courses are the ones where mastery should be accomplished. Ms. Adams looked over her list of supporting courses and feels that the PLOs for courses would not apply to her program. She does feel that they would help create a well-rounded student versed in a number of areas but would not provide anything applicable to the PLOs of her core courses. She also believes that we should just require the core courses for mapping. Ms. Drake also pointed out that there could very well be a number of supportive courses that only a handful of students are taking. This would not provide a large enough group to receive data from.

Mr. Voelcker stated that within WEAVE there are check boxes asking if this course is required for the program. You would only check the boxes that apply. But if you choose to not include the supportive courses, then you should eliminate it from the template so there is no confusion.

Ms. Parker and Dr. Aviles still both feel that all supportive courses should be listed. If you have a small number of required courses, that is not showing a complete picture of the program. They feel that the information gained in those courses also lead to development and mastery in of the PLOs. This could help in determining if a course provides sufficient value to a program. Mr. Motawakel stated that he has eight core courses in his program. Does he write a PLO and assessment for each? Ms. Parker explained that you would consolidate information from several overlapping skill, knowledge, or ability areas and develop PLOs on this basis. Some felt that because we are in a time crunch, asking faculty members to do include all of their supportive classes in addition to the core courses will result in a huge time effort. We should just concentrate on the core courses to be done and call it good. If we keep changing back and forth, then everyone will be mixed up about what to do, so we need a consistent process. Through the AP&P process, it is determined what courses will make up a program, so should we not include all courses? Mr. Motawakel feels that it should be left up to the instructor. Dr. Aviles feels that all the courses should be listed to show the whole program. Ms. Adams can see benefit from both sides. You can see how each course inter-relates to the program to make it whole. Yet, time is of the essence so maybe that is too much work to request of faculty. We should keep in mind that it is the faculty of a program who makes the decisions regarding PLOs. The SLO Committee should not be making the decision what courses they include in the PLO process.

Ms. Drake would like to interject with a caveat at this point. If, at any time, whichever way we decide to go, we find “M’s” in an elective course, we have a problem. Mastery should only occur in course that are required. If we want all course listed listed, that will just require more brainpower. But if they are all listed, we as a committee should be focusing on where mastery occurs. If mastery does not occur in a required course, then you cannot assess all students. But again, what does “mastery” really mean? She explained that mastery means the students in that PLO have mastered it. Ms. Parker stated that it is up to the faculty teaching the program to determine at what point mastery occurs and what mastery constitutes in their program.

Mastery level aside, Mr. Voelcker feels that the job of this committee to provide the tools by which faculty can evaluate their programs. We don’t tell faculty how many SLOs are required. We shouldn’t tell them how many courses they have to list beyond the required ones. While he believes that faculty should list more courses beyond the required ones, it should not be a mandate from this committee. All members of this committee now seem to be in consensus that all courses, both supportive and required, be listed. Mr. Voelcker will follow through with updating WEAVE with this information. Ms. Drake also mentioned that she has one course in Technical Education that was developed to address at-risk youth and guide them to a possible career in aviation. The COR and SLOs are kept current but this particular course has no relationship with the current aviation offerings. Thus, it is not included in the list for this program. She stated that there is a fear in believing that if you do not list each and every course, administration will view it as a course that could be deleted from the system. Ms. Parker believes that a more thorough job would present the best picture of a program.

Mr. Briggs asked why the required classes need to be included in the PLOs on the curriculum map. Mr. Voelcker stated it is because they are required and need to be included. He explained that there are some programs that have core courses, supportive courses and a list of suggested electives. We need to be in consensus on what information we give to faculty regarding courses that should be listed and marked as being required.

Ms. Parker redirected the dialogue back to the rubric. The committee has already agreed to take out the assessment cycle covering at least three academic cycles. Going back to the rubric order:

**Question #14** – Check the box

**Question #15** – Check the box

**Question #16**- Give recommendations for questions 13-15 if you feel there is a problem.

Ms. Parker asked the members if we should keep “all program courses” on this rubric and if they saw anything else missing. Ms. Adams suggested we state required elective specifically. (Designation added to Question #13)

**Question #17** – Action taken by committee – to approve or send back for revision

**Question #18** – Approximate date of WEAVE entry that will be expected after approval

A question came up if Accreditation would be looking at the rubric forms if they came for a visit. The answer is no because we are not doing it just for accreditation but to promote value to us as an institution. Since we have to utilize the process, we want it to give us the most value.

Ms. Parker requested a motion to move Discussion Item (c) PLO Review Rubric to an action item to be voted on at this meeting. A motion was made and seconded to move this discussion item. With no further discussion, the vote was unanimous to move this discussion item to an action item. Ms. Parker now requested a motion to approve said Action Item (PLO Review Rubric) with corrections. A motion was made and seconded to approve, with corrections, said Action item. With no further discussion, the vote was unanimous to approve said Action Item with corrections.

**d. ADN PLO – (Melanie Parker)** – Ms. Parker stated that the committee members should approach PLOs with the thought that we cannot be sticklers about what is written because we are not the experts. But we must approach each with the thought that we are looking for a measure of consistency and standardization program to program.

Ms. Parker communicated that the ADN program initially wrote 12 PLOs but realized assessing that many was not practical. She suggested that faculty members reduce the number down to three initially, but with the thought that they can add more if needed. Ms. Parker asked the members to give suggestions if they find anything in they feel is not making sense.

First under PLO#1 for assessment, members asked about the meaning of a “final summative evaluation.” Ms. Drake says it sounds like their final exam for the clinical portion of the program. This program has two components, one classroom and one clinical, and both portions must be passed to be successful in the program. The second score would come from a student evaluation. Ms. Drake asked about putting two different assessments into WEAVE. Mr. Voelcker stated that you would enter two different assessments for that particular PLO. The same thing happens in Student Services where you may have a survey and a student evaluation. He further relayed that you may have circumstances where one assessment for a PLO does not meet the determined guidelines but the other assessment does. WEAVE will ask if each particular measure has met, partially met or did not meet the guidelines, so that is what is reported. Further, in WEAVE there is not a section where you reconcile that. Ms. Drake asked what would happen if there is have a 90% pass rate for the clinical but only a 40% pass rate on the student evaluation? Where would you go from there? Mr. Voelcker stated that you would go to the Action Plan and indicate that related discussion occurred. Showing discussion for this

indicates to the Accreditation Team that we see a problem and are making group decisions on how to correct it.

Ms. Adams asked a question in regard to her accounting PLOs. Does incorporating data from three courses into just one PLO make sense? Dr. Aviles felt it was a little bit different in that you are creating a composite and applying your passing score to it such as 70%. He also stated that on the ADN PLO he would recommend just the first measure and eliminate the second as it does not give measurable data. Ms. Drake agrees with this. This first measure is the one that counts. But Ms. Parker asked just how picky should we get. Should it be sent back to the faculty member and ask for changes/clarification or do we just accept it as is? Ms. Drake feels that we should not get picky but as the SLO Committee with the knowledge to determine the correctness of each PLO, our members should look at it to determine if an outcome is workable. The committee shouldn't demand a change but could suggest assistance in creating a better and more measurable PLO. If a defense of the PLO is given by the faculty member and it now makes sense, then the committee members would then defer to them as they are the ones most knowledgeable in the program. The committee should still keep in mind as they review PLOs, whether assessments are feasible, can be accomplished and are realistic.

In regard to the first PLO, second measure, the faculty member can come back to the committee with the explanation on how assured and confident does each class member feel about their abilities as they relate to the clinical portion. Then this all makes sense. Mr. Briggs asked how do you aggregate the two together if there was a wide gap in percentages? Ms. Parker relayed that it would be the final summative measure that would count because we want to send students out in the working world who have that confidence in their abilities as they handle patients who are counting on knowledgeable and confident nurses to take care of them. The Accreditation Team would be looking at how much we are discussing the measures and not concentrating on just the hard numbers. Mr. Voelcker feels that is correct and would be the information put in the action plan section. This would show we are at sustainable continuous quality improvement level for each of our programs even if we just put that we are waiting for more data in the action plan. What we need to show is that we are completing the process from SLOs to the action plans on each of our programs. Mr. Briggs asked if we will be required to do SLOs/PLOs from here on out? The answer is "until someone determines that we don't have to do it anymore". Dr. Aviles feels that since AND has established two assessments in PLO#1, we should ask them to specify that if these two disagree, we recommend that the first assessment be rated more heavily than the second. The second one could be for more discussions purposes but the first one is the one that really counts. They will need to make a determination if the PLO met, partially met or did not meet based on the compilation of the two assessments.

Going onto the second PLO and assessment, Mr. Briggs asked if it would have been better to make them separate PLOs? Ms. Parker stated that there may be times when this is feasible if you have more than one course where one is measured in the first semester and the other in the second semester. They would then have two assessments. Dr. Aviles brought forth a grammar issue that the "s" should be taken off reports as well as documents. This now makes more sense. Since the assessment is for clinical achievement, the 90% is an appropriate goal.

Moving onto the third PLO and assessment, Dr. Gat queried about the definition of "average probability?" Ms. Adams stated that the score from the exit exam will give them an average of how well they did and if they passed or not. Ms. Parker explained that the NCLEX is the exam for the nursing board credential and the exit exam is associated with the program. Dr. Aviles needed further explanation of the assessment regarding how the exit exam relates to the exam

for the NCLEX. Ms. Drake stated that if a student scored below 70% on the exit exam which would place it below the average, then it would be assumed that they would not pass the board exam. Members felt that a little further clarification should be given. The NCLEX exam is an external one and we do not have control over whether students take it or not. The only thing we can determine is if a student does pass the exit exam with a score of 70% or better, the faculty member teaching the program could assume the student would pass the NCLEX once it was taken.

The next section to review is the curriculum map. Each column shows a cycle of program assessment but Ms. Parker explained to the members that you will only see assessments done in the spring because that is the ending timeframe for graduating from the nursing program.

AND PLOs were sent back to faculty for minor corrections and clarification.

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

**10. OTHER** –

**a. SLO Meeting Dates for Spring** – 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 - 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 4:29 p.m.

pg