



ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING
November 24, 2008
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 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. November 10, 2008
- 5. REPORT**
 - a. SLO Review Sub-Committee (M. Clinton)
- 6. ACTION ITEMS**
 - a. Acknowledgement of the following SLOs: ANTH 103, ANTH 112, CT 050, CT 100, CT 101, CT 102, CT 112, CT 120, CT 213, CT 242, ELTE 180, FTEC 117, CULA 123, GED 901, GED 902, GED 903, GED 904, GED 905, GED 911, GED 913, GED 914, GED 915, GED 921, GED 922, GED 923, GED 931, GED 932, GED 933, GED 940, GED 942, GED 943, GED 944, LIB 101, LIB 105, PE 170, PE 173, PE 175
 - b. Acknowledgement of Veterans Affairs SLO
- 7. DISCUSSION**
 - a. Web-based reporting demo (Ted Younglove)
 - b. Assessment and reporting news (Ted Younglove)
 - c. Tech Review process for spring (Melanie Parker)
 - d. AP&P/SLO Liaison (Melanie Parker)
 - e. Reformat of the Committee to meet future needs (Melanie Parker)
 - f. Continued discussion on program definition (please read and bring attachment) (Melanie Parker)
 - g. Continued discussion on linking CORs and SLOs (please read and bring attachment) (Melanie Parker)
- 8. SLO COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**
 - a. Possible meeting time change for spring
 - b. Last meeting of the semester – 12/8/08
- 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
November 24, 2008

Members Present	Members Absent	Guests in Attendance
Melanie Parker	Sharon Lowry	
Dr. Rosa Hall	Michael Jacobs	
Dr. Irit Gat	Ted Younglove	
Mary Rose Toll	Yvette Cruzalegui	
Dr. Fredy Aviles	Maria Clinton	
Dr. Robert Harris	Kim Covell	
Michelle Hernandez		

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

- Ms. Melanie Parker, co-chair of the SLO Committee, called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m. No quorum at this time.

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

– Ms. Melanie Parker thanked each participant for the amazing amount of progress the committee has accomplished. Patricia Sandoval, Deborah Charlie, Maria Clinton and Ms. Parker have discussed the future direction of the committee; all have agreed we are “turning a corner” since we have so many of the SLOs approved. New focuses include: continued work on Program Learning Outcomes, streamlining the SLO submittal process, and improving communication on outcomes and assessment campus-wide. All approved SLOs have been put online. We will now ask that all faculty, after notification of approval of their SLOs, submit SLOs to the committee in electronic format. These will be forwarded to Gloria Kastner who will post them online.

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – NONE

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Quorum was accomplished after the arrival of Dr. Harris. Dr. Harris made a motion with a second by Dr. Gat to approve the minutes from the meeting of 11/10/08. With no further discussion, the minutes were approved as written.

5. REPORT – SLO REVIEW SUB-COMMITTEE (M. CLINTON) – NONE – absent from meeting

6. ACTION ITEMS –

- a. Quorum was accomplished after the arrival of Dr. Harris. Dr. Harris made a motion with a second from Dr. Gat to acknowledge the following SLOs: ANTH 103, ANTH 112, CT 050, CT 100, CT 101, CT 102, CT 112, CT 120, CT 213, CT 242, ELTE 180, FTEC 117, CULA 123, GED 901, GED 902, GED 903, GED 904, GED 905, GED 911, GED 913, GED 914, GED 915, GED 921, GED 922, GED 923, GED 931, GED 932, GED 933, GED 940, GED 942, GED 943, GED 944, LIB 101, LIB 105, PE 170, PE 173, PE 175. With no further discussion, the motion passed.
- b. Acknowledgement of Veterans Affairs SLO – there was much discussion among the members of the committee that some of the items listed in the Program Activity column seemed to be SLOs and some seemed to be assessments. It was difficult for the committee members to determine what all of the verbiage was meaning and needed a clarification. Ms. Parker will speak to Ms. Trimble about this and report back at the next meeting.

7. DISCUSSION

- a. **Web-based reporting demo (Ted Younglove)** – absent (reported by Ms. Parker)
Ted expressed dilemmas in terms of reporting information because some faculty indicated they wished their SLO submittals to remain anonymous, believing there might be repercussions in the future. Ted and Aaron are working on some ideas to address this issue.
- b. **Assessment and reporting news (Ted Younglove)** – absent
- c. **Tech Review process for spring (Melanie Parker)** –After discussions with Maria Clinton and Deborah Charlie, and based upon discussions at our last meeting, tech review will follow a different process for spring. SLOs will first be directed to Ms. Parker who will review them and, if needed, pass them to committee members for reading. Since about 93% of existing courses have approved SLOs, we should no longer have large numbers coming through the committee. Ms. Clinton feels very strongly that she needs to be off the committee so she can concentrate on her duties with the AP&P Committee. Since she is the liaison between AP&P and the SLO Committee, another person will need to be designated for this position. Additionally, we hope to develop a matrix, in conjunction with AP&P that will help track SLOs and their dates of assessment. Once SLOs are assessed, that date can be entered on the matrix. The matrix could be updated at the end of each semester. In theory, this information will be handled by WEAVE once it is up and running, so this hopefully is a temporary method of tracking information. Ted Younglove and Aaron Voelcker are hoping to put a WEAVE module together for the committee by the beginning of the spring semester, as a demonstration of what WEAVE can do for us. WEAVE should streamline the sharing of information campus-wide. At least to begin with, WEAVE will be in read-only format. One person per division may be charged with inputting data for their division. We may decide to request that one person from each division be assigned or volunteer to be divisional representative on the SLO Committee. In the future. This person would be responsible for entering data into WEAVE for their division, as well as representing the division's interests on the SLO committee. This procedure has been tentatively discussed by Patricia Sandoval, Deborah Charlie, Maria Clinton and Ms. Parker.
- d. **AP&P/SLO Liaison (Melanie Parker)** –Refer to C above.

- e. **Reformat of the Committee to meet future needs (Melanie Parker)** – As already discussed and as the committee evolves, it seems possible that the committee included campus-wide divisional representation, similar to AP&P. This is a topic for further discussion in the future.
- f. **Continued discussion on program definition (Melanie Parker)** – After discussions at the previous meeting, Ms. Parker added a statement to the previous definition. (See attachment.) Committee members felt the definition was well stated and also appropriately open-ended. Dr. Harris mentioned that if there were any questions, faculty and staff could come to the committee for further explanation. Ms. Parker would like to take this statement to the Academic Senate at the start of spring semester for confirmation. Dr. Harris commented that in the second paragraph regarding campus areas of service an indication could be made that other campus entities may establish student learning outcomes and program learning outcomes if it is appropriate for their area. Dr. Hall also said that many of the student services SLOs have been done but some areas may not require a PLO.
- g. **Continued discussion on linking CORs and SLOs (Melanie Parker)** – at the previous meeting, Dr. Harris made the statement that SLOs need to be linked to their appropriate CORs. Ms. Parker stated she agrees but we need to keep in mind what the SLOs and CORs represent. By definition SLOs are meant to be more flexible than the CORs. Over time, in the majority of cases, the COR stays very consistent. Sometimes, there is tweaking to course objectives and content of the course, updating textbooks, changes in assignment, etc. But for the most part, the COR stays fairly similar over time, even if there are minor changes made. The SLO needs to be more flexible and have the ability to respond in like manner. We are assessing students each semester and then making changes to what we are doing, changing what we are looking for and methods of assessment because this information is what we should be continually utilizing. Ms. Parker gave an example from her own division where assessment tools might need to be change to reflect changing standards in the field. By nature, SLOs should be open to more frequent revision than CORs, so we want to be certain any decision we support in linking the SLOs to their CORs keeps things flexible. We want to keep communicating with faculty so they see the linkage, but also doing what we can to keep things as fluid as possible. As of last week, all SLOs were posted on the campus website. In the Academic Affairs Office, the original approved SLO has been copied onto colored paper and then attached to its respective current COR and filed. If an SLO is revised, it will also be put into the file. At some point this is information that will also be entered into and managed by WEAVE. Our paper copies and files are a stop gap measure until WEAVE is up and running. Dr. Hall asked if the Student Services SLOs have been posted. It appears they are not so she will get the information to the SLO secretary to get them posted. A question was brought up about linking AP&P and SLO websites. The committee believes this link should be reciprocal and go both ways. Faculty should be able to access one site from the other. Dr. Hall stated that many of the Student Services SLOs have been through program review and are linked to the Educational Master Plan which is the centerpiece of our planning. The accreditation team noticed our efforts in doing this and it is very important we demonstrate this in the program review so that it becomes an active part of the budget process. Dr. Harris stated another concern: a large portion of our courses are taught by adjunct faculty (over

400 faculty members are adjuncts), but the information we are creating is known best to full-time faculty. The information adjuncts receive may come from a Dean or another full-time faculty. How do you get this information to them so they know how to find it and utilize it? It comes down to the question of the training for adjuncts because so many of them are teaching our classes and they are the ones needing access to the SLOs and CORs. Deans should be communicating information SLOs and assessment, and the committee hopes there is consistency to this process. One problem seems to be the resistance of adjunct faculty to involve themselves in learning more about the SLO, assessment, and accreditation processes. This should likely be addressed as part of the faculty evaluation process but there may be many differences in how divisions do this. Since we have over 400 adjuncts, they will have a major impact on our accreditation if they are not in the loop and they must be involved in this process. Some faculty feel adjuncts do not show enough interest in these issues. Dr. Harris had several suggestions, including the development of short five question quizzes that adjuncts could administer to their students. This might help streamline course assessments and Dr. Hall expressed this might help adjuncts become more involved in the SLO process. Ms. Parker suggested that we take our “show on the road” to division meetings to encourage our faculty to take on this responsibility, yet many adjuncts do not attend division meetings. The more Deans we can get involved, the better. We will try to improve our communication methods this at the beginning in spring semester. Dr. Hall suggested we work with the Institutional Flex Committee as this would encourage adjuncts to participate in the SLO process since they are required to do flex time. Perhaps we can schedule a variety of training sessions to accommodate various schedules or put training online. Ms. Parker hopes to attend a Dean’s meeting in order to encourage consistency in communicating the SLO process within each division.

8. SLO COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

- **Possible meeting time change for spring meetings** – Ms. Parker suggested changing the meeting start time to 3:00 p.m. next semester in order to accommodate classified work schedules. Meetings would run from 3 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. instead of 3:30 p.m. to 5 p.m. Pat Gordon will send out an e-mail to get a consensus from committee members regarding this possible change.
- **Last meeting of the semester** – Reminder that the location of the meeting will be BE207.

9. OTHER

- Dr. Fredy Aviles reported that he is still trying to put together a hands-on training for the SLO process. He has heard comments from others who have attended the flex presentations that the information had been a waste of time. Maybe we should send out an e-mail asking for suggestions regarding information faculty members believe they need?

- 10. ADJOURNMENT** – A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the SLO meeting at 4:50 p.m. Motion carried.