



ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING
April 27, 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. April 13, 2009 minutes.
5. **PRESENTATION**
 - a. “Where Should Course SLOs Live”? – Christos Valiotis
6. **REPORTS**
 - a. Ted Younglove, Institutional Research
7. **ACTION ITEMS**
 - a. Acknowledgement of the following SLOs: PE 104, Math 102; acknowledgement of the following revised SLOs: COMM 101, COMM 103, PHYS 120
8. **DISCUSSION**
 - a. Revision and Assessment of SLOs (Melanie Parker)
 - b. Outcome and Assessment Goals for 2009/2010 (Melanie Parker)
 - c. Guidelines for PLO Development (Melanie Parker)
 - d. Communicating the Process-Designing “the Box” (Melanie Parker)
8. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**
 - a. Committee Re-organization
 - b. Last meeting of the semester – May 11, 3:00 p.m. in Room BE207
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
April 27, 2009

Members Present	Members Absent	Guests in Attendance
Melanie Parker	Sharon Lowry	Christos Valiotis
Michael Jacobs	Yvette Cruzalegui	Curtis Smith
Dr. Irit Gat	Michelle Hernandez	
Rick Motawakel	Ted Younglove	
Dr. Fredy Aviles	Kim Covell	
Dr. Rosa Hall		
Dr. Bob Harris		

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 thanked the members who were in attendance, but reiterated that we still have a lot of work to do. She asked if members had read the forwarded article from the Rostrum. Ms. Parker felt that it gave her a great picture of the issues we face when working with faculty who hold differing perspectives of the SLO process. Ms. Parker reminded members that we will be talking about designing “the box” (how to communicate SLO issues) per our discussion with Ed Beyer in the previous meeting and she would like us to keep these different faculty perspectives in mind. Questions regarding discussion items from the last meeting are welcome.

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – None

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – A motion was made (Dr. Harris) and seconded (Dr. Gat) to approve the April 13, 2009 meeting minutes. With no further discussion, the minutes were approved as submitted.

5. PRESENTATION

a. **“Where Should Course SLOs Live” (Christos Valiotis)** – Professor Valiotis recently attended the statewide Academic Senate meeting in San Francisco and came to discuss this current issue with the committee. The ACCJC recently stated that SLOs should be placed on the course syllabus and also on the Course Outline of Record. Prof. Valiotis related that this issue came up about a week before the state Academic Senate

Plenary meeting. It raised a tremendous uproar around the state and generated numerous e-mails. Mr. Valiotis related that both the State Academic Senate and State Union leadership took a position regarding this issue; the Chancellor's Office is also considering taking a position on the subject. While Mr. Valiotis stated that ACCJC should not dictate where we are required to put the SLOs, he does believe including them on the syllabus is a good idea. There seems to be confusion regarding ACCJC's current standards and positions. The recent ACCJC newsletter indicating that SLOs be stated on both course syllabi and the COR, supersedes any prior interpretation of standards according to the ACCJC. As the committee has already discussed, putting SLOs on the COR creates a great difficulty due to the regular revision cycle of the CORs. This is a very intensive process and if we were to do this for the over 1000 courses we offer, the process would be time intensive and exhausting. If a faculty member wished to change SLOs, they would also have to go through the major changes to the COR and approval by AP&P. This conflicts with the flexible nature and intention of SLOs. Both the State Academic Senate and the Chancellor's Office are concerned about these issues and intent in working towards resolution. Title V regulations dictate that faculty have absolute authority over what goes into a particular COR. Mr. Valiotis stated that no accrediting agency has the authority on the state level to dictate to an institution what you are going to do with your COR. There currently seem to be two different approaches. The first is regarding an institution under sanction. In these cases, there needs to be clarification between the accrediting agency, the Chancellor's Office, the State Academic Senate, and the faculty union as to the actual policy and standards. The second approach, if the institution is not under sanction and ACCJC has responded that the institution is doing well (as they have in AVC's case), is to continue the current process but house the SLOs in a conspicuous place. Mr. Valiotis believes the best choice would be stating SLOs directly on the syllabus or including them as an attachment. This would reduce our exposure to warnings and so far as we are concerned, we currently have no other guidelines from the state level. ACCJC knows that we house our SLOs alongside the COR and approved of that practice in their most recent visit. Mr. Valiotis's interpretation of the recent newsletter is that we are doing what we need to do. Dr. Harris commented that in discussion with Dr. Ed Beyer at the previous meeting, Dr. Beyer suggested we place a link to SLOs posted online. Dr. Harris believes this may not be sufficient communication of SLOs to students. Dr. Harris asked who on campus would make the decision regarding placement of SLOs. Mr. Valiotis stated that it would be the Senate or AP&P and that they would determine if they plan to follow the guidelines of ACCJC as related in the newsletter. On the other hand, the Senate is the entity that has the guidelines for syllabi. Ms. Parker recently checked Title V to review the way course objectives are to be stated on the syllabus and the language used indicates they are to be "in accordance" with what is on the COR, leaving that matter open to some interpretation, possibly in a similar way that the issue of SLOs may be open to interpretation. Mr. Valiotis suggested the argument among community college authorities is that this requirement is an intrusion into how we do things and that the accrediting agency is interfering with the laws of the State of California. ACCJC will need to resolve this issue with community colleges. Ms. Parker is concerned about what we tell faculty and who has the power to decide how we are going to do this. Dr. Hall brought up the issue that the AP&P Committee has approved all CORs and if she should hire someone new as a faculty member, they are informed they must implement the COR and course objectives already approved; they do not have the right to change them as they wish. Ms.

Parker feels that we need to communicate the SLOs to students in the same way the course objectives are communicated; as part of the syllabus. Informal discussions indicate some faculty on campus object to doing this and question why they have to communicate the SLOs to their students. How do we balance ACCJC expectations and faculty control over their syllabus? Mr. Valiotis feels that we are abiding by the newsletter directive in that we have the SLOs housed in the same file as the CORs. As far as how they are communicated with the syllabus, Mr. Valiotis believes the SLO Committee could make a recommendation to the Senate who would then pass it on to the AP&P Committee for final determination. Dr. Gat reiterated that in order for us to get accredited, whether this is law or not, "we could get screwed". How can the accrediting agency come up with a standard that goes against California law and not seem to care? Mr. Valiotis stated that ACCJC is run by people who may be unclear as to what they are doing. Dr. Gat stated that in order for us to get accredited, we have no choice but to follow their dictates, whether or not it is lawful under California rules. Dr. Hall believes that the leadership at AVC has taken a very pro-active stance with the Academic Senate's "Guidelines for Creating an Effective Syllabus". Dr. Hall feels that the SLO Committee should make a recommendation to AP&P regarding the relationship of SLOs to the syllabus. If a recommendation was put in place, it would at least give ACCJC the indication that we have taken a position on this issue as opposed to doing nothing at all. Dr. Harris again asked if putting a link to SLOs was a valid option, but as Mr. Valiotis pointed out that "if the accrediting members are having a bad day when they arrive, they may feel it is just not good enough and say we are not in compliance." Ms. Parker asked our guest ASO Representative, Curtis Smith, if he knew the SLOs for the courses in which he is enrolled. While initially stating they appeared on the syllabi, more discussion lead him to explain it was probably the course objectives he saw stated and not the SLOs. Mr. Valiotis feels that we could give faculty a choice of either incorporating their SLOs into syllabi or attaching the SLOs to the syllabi. If there is a revised SLO, Dr. Gat requested that faculty know where to find them. Ms. Parker believes that getting WEAVE up and running as quickly as possible will help address this problem and reiterated that faculty had been asked to submit written SLO revisions to the committee so that the most recent revisions can be posted online. Dr. Hall would like to request that Academic Senate update syllabus guidelines and also give direction to faculty and staff to check the website for most up-to-date SLOs. Doing this would move us in a positive direction and also show the accreditation committee that we are following their standards. Ms. Parker asked if committee members agreed with this recommendation and the committee overwhelmingly answered yes. Mr. Valiotis related that there has been much dissatisfaction in the state as far as how accreditation has been going. The Chancellor was quite upset that 22 of the 110 community colleges in California are on sanction, which has never happened before. Most colleges do not know exactly why. Compton College lost their accreditation and their visiting team did not include a faculty member. Cuesta College has recently been put under sanction. Mr. Valiotis reported that ACCJC went to Cuesta's board and made the statement that the faculty does not have the right to speak to them; that communication to the board must go through the president. This makes it very apparent their grasp of Title 5 is not accurate or incomplete. The opinion was expressed that you can do the best job you are capable of doing and receive an excellent grade from the exit team and then you could receive sanctions for no apparent reason; what is happening does not seem to make sense. Mr. Valiotis queried other colleges regarding PLOs for their general education degrees. In each of the degree areas

(A-F), we will need to write outcomes and measure them. He spoke with Janet Fulks of Bakersfield College, (SLO/Accreditation Committee Chair for State Academic Senate) and asked about the process they followed. She explained that they have faculty in each area copy the test that they will use to assess their SLOs and they put all into a box. From here, they take out a random sampling for grading. General education areas will need to develop unique outcomes for each area; math, humanities, social and behavioral sciences, etc. AVC's LAS degree has three different options. The question is, how will we assess all three areas for our GE? The three areas are math/science, arts/humanities and social/behavioral sciences. Would not courses from these three areas cover the six areas of the GE since that is what they are built from? (The answer is probably yes but we would also have to add an outcome from Diversity Studies which is included separately.) Mr. Valiotis feels then that you just have three SLOs. He stated all course SLOs could be put into a matrix and representative samples pulled from those SLOs. This method, if acceptable, may help eliminate some of the work that would be required. The committee asked if more information would be available from Ms. Fulks and Mr. Valiotis indicated he would follow up on this information. If you evaluate each area, you are, in essence, evaluating each of the General Education Requirements. Bakersfield College does not have the three options our LAS degree contains. They measure each and every area. This may work for us or it may not. Installing these different matrices into WEAVE would seem to provide the ability for comparison, however before you can put them into WEAVE, you have to do the measurements. WEAVE will show the specific SLOs and how they are related to the PLOs. You have to have separate PLOs to measure them separately. The matrix will show the correlation but that is outside of the SLOs and PLOs themselves. To take psychology as an example, you would measure the SLOs for each course but that does not mean you have measured the PLO. You would still need to write "unique" PLOs and measure them separately. So, it did not make sense for WASC to tell us that we needed to do the SLOs on the course level; Mr. Valiotis believes we only really needed to do the PLOs. Ms. Parker asked if some of the assessments of PLOs will come from the course SLOs. Mr. Valiotis answered that will be very possible in many cases, some will be fairly generic and overarching. It would only make sense that information you have gleaned from the SLOs could become part of the PLOs. Dr. Harris questioned again if we wrote the PLOs for the three areas of the LAS degree, would it satisfy the requirement for the GE? This would help us streamline the process and get us further to the point of being able to do planning. The question was also brought up of how many students are in the LAS program? The answer is it may only be one but you would still need to complete the process, even for only one student. You must indicate SLOs for each course you have listed in your catalog and PLOs for every degree or certificate. The question was asked, "If you have a number of students who only take a few courses with the rest being optional, how can you create any statistics that would help you?" Mr. Valiotis stated that the PLOs must have a unique assessment outside of the SLO. Whatever we decide to do, the final decision rests with the accreditation team and whether we can produce what they are looking for. At this point we are hoping they will not look too closely at what we did, just that we did something and are moving in the right direction... Dr. Hall feels that we must still have a connection from the SLOs to the PLOs. Ms. Parker stated that we will wait for the information that Christos brings back from Janet Fulks and then proceed from there...we do not need to re-invent the wheel. Mr. Valiotis also mentioned that there are some colleges who took their objectives from each COR and with changes, made them their

SLOs. The legality of this is questionable but it does bring them to a level similar to that of the rest of the country, because they are graded (with unique assessment) and you create your PLOs from there and are done. Dr. Aviles made mention that if we are going to do separate assessment for the PLOs, it looks to him like an exit exam. Will this be a requirement with the accreditation committee? The answer is unknown. Dr. Hall mentioned she is planning a meeting next Tuesday with all of her deans and directors who have been involved in SLOs and PLOs for Student Services. They have given themselves a June 30 deadline and she feels even less knowledgeable about PLOs than she previously realized. She believes Mr. Valiotis could provide them with help on creating unique assessments. Mr. Valiotis is upset that this whole process is being turned into a burden where if it had been handled right, it could have been an enlightened situation. Dr. Hall requested that members of the committee attend her upcoming meeting but most have scheduling conflicts. She is considering changing the time of her meeting. Dr. Hall expressed that Student Services needs help in straightening out their SLOs and PLOs; some SLOs may actually be PLOs.

6. REPORTS

a. Ted Younglove, Institutional Research – Mr. Younglove is presenting at a conference; no report available.

7. ACTION ITEMS – a motion was made (Dr. Gat) and seconded (Dr. Hall) to acknowledge the listed SLOs: PE 104, MATH 102; and revised SLOs: COMM 101, COMM 103, PHYS 120. With no further discussion, these SLOs were acknowledged. The motion carried without any further discussion.

8. DISCUSSION

a. Revision and Assessment of SLOs (Melanie Parker) – Ted Younglove indicated he plans to develop a form for faculty to submit SLO and PLO data in format easily transferable to WEAVE. Many of the courses that have established SLOs do not have any success criteria for their assessment. As Ms. Parker works with individual faculty on revisions of SLOs, those who have not yet set criteria are being asked to do so. This will be required for everyone when information is entered into WEAVE and is an additional goal for the coming year.

b. Outcome and Assessment Goals for 2009-2010 (Melanie Parker) – Our goals are SLOs written for 100% of our courses, PLOs written for 100% of our programs plus establishing the curriculum maps that go along with them, and setting criterion for success for each SLO/PLO. Dr. Harris inquired if there are curriculum maps for Student Services. Ms. Parker will look for sample matrices. We do need to do one round of assessment before the semester is over.

c. Guidelines for PLO Development (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker gave committee members a draft titled “Questions and Answers on Developing Program Learning Outcomes”. She requested that members read through it and come back to the next meeting with suggestions. Mr. Jacobs asked a question regarding how and in what format PLOs should be written (reference first bullet on second page). Ms. Parker replied that while we cannot force a certain format (and different discipline areas may need to approach PLOs differently), we can give suggestions and provide samples. Once WEAVE is up and running, there will be a format to follow when entering information into the system. Ms. Parker is collecting samples and has found useful

information from several sources, including College of the Canyons, Bakersfield College, and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo. Our intent is to provide specific formats for people to follow regarding the information PLOs must include, some examples of PLOs, plus common questions and answers. Dr. Harris stated that perhaps we are focusing too much on SLOs and should be concentrating on the PLOs.

- d. Communicating the Process – Designing “the box” (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker liked Ed Beyer’s idea about designing “the box”. He said we should not worry what’s in the box, simply design the box. Ms. Parker expressed her own difficulty in designing the box because it will need to look different for different audiences. She also has had a conversation with Ted Younglove and Christos Valiotis about making themselves available to meet any faculty on Thursdays and Fridays during the month of May. This would give the faculty one-on-one help with SLOs, assessment and PLOs. She will also request that Sharon Lowry impress upon her deans the importance of speaking to their respective faculty about the SLO/Assessment/PLO process and to support their continued efforts. We need Deans to inform their faculty that the process is not done. Some faculty seem to feel that since they have completed the initial process of writing SLOs, they do not need to do anything else and do not have any worries about the college being sanctioned or losing its accreditation. Faculty and staff need to continue their conversations on SLO issues. Dr. Harris feels that we should have faculty talk to faculty. Ms. Parker feels that we should designate people within each division to be their “go to” people. The question asked was, “Could faculty receive flex credit for this?” The answer is they probably cannot as informally identified liaisons. However, if they were members of the SLO Committee, they would receive credit for committee membership. Committee members expressed support for committee re-organization. Changing/re-organizing membership would have to be approved by the Academic Senate. Campus reorganization may also play a role in “who goes where”. Ms. Parker asked members for other ideas on ways we can communicate to faculty, staff and students. Suggestions included: committee reorganization along divisional/discipline lines, update/develop our website more completely (like Bakersfield), put tips for assessment and analysis into our planned newsletter, planning workshops that would encourage new participants (meaning more diverse dates, times and methods of delivery since we seem to see the same people with the same questions), presentations on Welcome Back Day, making attendance at an SLO workshop mandatory and requesting that Dr. Fisher encourage and support faculty in the SLO training and development process.

9. SLO Committee Administrative Business

- The final Spring 2009 meeting of the SLO Committee will be held on Monday, May 11, 2009 at 3:00 p.m. in Room BE 207.

10. OTHER – None

11. ADJOURNMENT – the meeting was adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

pag