



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING**

**March 25, 2013
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
L 201**

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 CHAIR**
- 3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
- 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. March 11, 2013 Meeting**
- 5. REPORTS**
 - a. Updates from the Department of Institutional Effectiveness, Research & Planning – Aeron Zentner**
- 6. ACTION ITEMS**
 - a. English Non-Transfer PLOs**
 - b. English Transfer PLOs**
- 7. DISCUSSION ITEMS**
 - a. Division Meeting Presentations - Aeron Zentner**
 - b. SLO Handbook**
 - c. SLO Revision Process**
 - d. Counseling PLOs**
- 8. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**
 - a. SLO-Related Events – FPD: Revising & Reviewing SLOs/PLOS Monday 3/25, 6-9 pm (SSV 151)**
- 9. OTHER**
 - a. Revised SLOs: Ed 140, PSY 101, PSY 230, PSY 232**
 - b. Revised PLOs: Education-Instructional Aid**
 - c. SLO Meeting dates for Spring 2013: April 8, April 22, May 13**
- 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 OUTCOMES MEETING
MINUTES
March 25, 2013
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
L 201

To conform to the open meeting act, the public may attend open sessions

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The March 25, 2013 Student Learning Outcomes meeting was called to order at 3:12 p.m. by Dr. Fredy Aviles, Chair.

2. OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR

Dr. Fredy Aviles reported attending a meeting last Thursday for campus committee leadership. The meeting highlighted the importance of accurate minutes, and Dr. Aviles advised members to look closely at minutes to ensure the accuracy of what is recorded. Dr. Aviles will select Student Learning Outcomes minutes to submit to the committee as an example of the type of minutes should be that used for evidence – with emphasis on accreditation.

Dr. Aviles reported that a call will be made to fill current and upcoming vacancies on the Student Learning Outcomes Committee.

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. March 11, 2013 Meeting

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the March 11, 2013 Student Learning Outcome meeting. Motion carried.

5. REPORTS

a. Updates from the Department of Institutional Effectiveness, Research & Planning – Aeron Zentner

Mr. Aeron Zentner reported that 100% of SLOs have been identified. Out of 526 Action Plans, 524 are complete, resulting in Action Plans at 98%. Four (4) PLOs are missing – two (2) of which are for liberal arts degrees. Mr. Zentner has conducted an assessment to determine the courses taken most frequently by those who earn these degrees, has emailed this to the relevant parties, and is waiting for a response.

6. ACTION ITEMS

a. English Non-Transfer PLOs

A motion was made and seconded to approve the English Non-Transfer PLOs. Motion carried.

b. English Transfer PLOs

Dr. Aviles stated the English Transfer PLOs were approved previously and were erroneously added to the agenda item. No action taken.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Division Meeting Presentations - Aeron Zentner

Mr. Aeron Zentner discussed various approaches to address the problem of delinquent SLOs and PLOs. He encouraged members to address faculty personally, encouraging them to meeting with he or Dr. Aviles to resolve any questions or concerns and move forward. Mr. Zentner explained that since we are now at 100%, sustainability is key.

Mr. Bill Vaughn suggested a portion of division meetings regularly be used for SLO work, rather than orientation meetings where faculty is distracted; or a separate meeting that faculty would not attend. Mr. Zentner reiterated the focus of Integrated Planning should be a conscience continuous exercise, rather than efforts made in reaction to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) requirements.

Mr. Zentner reported that he sent the AVC rubric to the Midwestern Association, and that both the east and west coasts have integrated it into their systems.

b. SLO Handbook

Dr. Aviles distributed the rough draft of the Student Learning Opportunities handbook. The draft was completed in fall 2012. Corrections were made to paragraph structure, spacing and page brakes and a typo on #11 ('continuous'). Dr. Aviles said the handbook will be used as part of training for SLO committee members and faculty. He directed members to talk to speak to division representatives and to report feedback and suggestions. Mr. Willard Howard noted the ACCJC will take notice. Ms. Nancy Masters suggested adding Ms. Tina McDermott's SLOs-to-PLOs map, and to incorporate the term (focus) *Integrated Planning*.

Mr. Bill Vaughan suggested for Question #14 – to add the question *What are PLOs and what is the relation to SLOs?*

Dr. Robert Harris suggested including language for Operational Outcomes (OOs). Dr. Aviles enlisted Mr. Aeron Zentner and committee members to contribute their expertise regarding OOs. Mr. Zentner added he will also provide language to include for Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs).

c. SLO Revision Process

Dr. Aviles recently met with Ms. Linda Harmon, Academic Policies & Procedures (AP&P) Committee Chair, and reported that the SLO Committee cannot speak to course objectives – only to SLOs and PLOs.

Dr. Aviles presented Proposal #1: SLO & PLO Revision Process. He explained that the revision process should be tied to AP&P, but that SLOs can be revised at any time and that it isn't necessary to submit them to AP&P first. The review of SLOs and PLOs should be made at a minimum of every four (4) years, thus tying them to the course and program revision process. He explained that revisions can be made at any time – every semester if necessary. Review of SLOs and PLOs may lead to their revision (i.e. change). Dr. Aviles reiterated the importance of documentation in CurricUNET for revising SLOs and PLOs. He noted the importance of having revisions in AP&P drive SLO and PLO revisions. Substantial revisions of courses and programs in CurricUNET may lead to major SLO and PLO revisions. For instance, when changes are made to the course content or course objectives of a course, it may also be necessary to revise the SLOs as well. These revisions to SLOs (and PLOs) would come to the SLO committee for a full review. It is possible that substantial course and program revisions may not lead to major revisions of SLOs and PLOs, in which case they would not require a full review by the SLO committee. Non-substantial course or program revisions on the other hand would not alter course objectives or content, and hence should not result in major changes to SLOs or PLOs. Such changes would also not require a full review by the SLO committee.

Dr. Glenn Haller noted that the committee cannot advise to rewrite course objectives, but that the SLO division representative can do so. Dr. Aviles mentioned that as a representative of the committee there may be still be a conflict there.

Dr. Robert Harris noted that SLOs and PLOs should be reviewed at the time of any major revisions. Division representatives can review minor revisions. Dr. Aviles clarified that division representatives should be consulted for minor revision, and that major revisions should be reviewed by the committee. This would entail adding one more checkbox to CurricUNET.

Dr. Haller advised that a section labeled "SLO Rep Consultation" be added to CurricUNET so that SLO division representatives can be consulted prior to approving SLO and PLO revisions.

Discussion was made to incorporate a consultation between the appropriate SLO representative at the time of the revision process. Dr. Aviles stated this need affirms the importance of a representative for every division on the SLO committee. He stated that if a division representative is lacking from the committee, the SLO and PLO revision process may be hindered.

SLO Committee Revision Process – Proposal #1:

SLOs/PLOs will be reviewed on the same cycle as required by AP&P (a minimum of every 3-5 years). Review of the SLOs/PLOs may require that they be revised. When a course is revised through AP&P in CurricUNET, the SLO committee co-chair shall indicate by selecting the appropriate checkbox whether SLO/PLO revision is necessary. The SLO Committee Faculty Co-chair and area representatives shall review SLO and PLO revisions before bringing them to the SLO committee for a more thorough review. In order for SLOs/PLOs to be revised, faculty must use the appropriate SLO/PLO revision form available through the SLO committee website.

Any change considered a minor revision will be approved by the SLO Committee Faculty Co-Chair and forwarded to the Academic affairs Technician for recording. The SLO Committee Co-chair will also indicate approval in CurricUNET by selecting the appropriate checkbox. Notification of approval will be sent to the faculty that submitted the revised SLOs/PLOs so that the relevant changes can be made in WEAVE and assessment can continue.

Any change considered a major revision or one requiring clarification will be brought to the committee for a full review. If such change requires a revision of the course itself, the faculty member submitting the revision will be notified that the course must be revised through AP&P so that those changes can be incorporated into WEAVE.

The SLO Committee defines minor and major revisions in the following way:

Minor Revision:

- A revision that involves a change in the wording of the SLO/PLO but not its basic content.
- A change in the assessment method or achievement target of the SLO/PLO.
- A change in the number of SLOs/PLOs that still assesses the same basic content (e.g. 1 SLO is split into 2).
- Any other change in the SLO/PLO that does not necessitate a change in the course objectives.

Major Revision:

- Any change in basic content necessitated by review of poorly written SLOs/PLOs.
- A change in the basic content of the SLO/PLO such that it no longer incorporates all course objectives or reflects those objectives inaccurately.
- Any change that requires a revision of course objectives or the course itself.

A motion was made and seconded to change the agenda, to move Proposal#1 from a Discussion item, to an Action Item. Motion carried.

A motion and second was made to accept Proposal #1, with changes as follows, and to bring forward to AP&P:

SLO Committee Revision Process – Proposal #1:

SLOs/PLOs will be reviewed on the same cycle as required by AP&P (a minimum of every four (4) years). Review of the SLOs/PLOs may require revision. When a course is revised through AP&P in CurricUNET, the SLO division representative shall indicate by selecting the appropriate checkbox whether the consultation has taken place. The SLO Committee Faculty Co-chair and area representatives shall review SLO and PLO revisions before bringing them to the SLO committee for a more thorough review. In order for SLOs/PLOs to be revised, faculty must use the appropriate SLO/PLO revision form available through the SLO committee website.

Any change considered a minor revision will be approved by the SLO Committee Faculty Co-Chair and forwarded to the Academic Affairs technician for recording. The SLO Committee Co-chair or SLO faculty representative will also indicate approval in CurricUNET by selecting the appropriate

checkbox. Notification of approval will be sent to the faculty that submitted the revised SLOs/PLOs in order for the relevant changes to be made in WEAVE and assessment can continue.

The SLO Committee defines minor and major revisions as follows:

Minor Revision:

- A revision that involves a change in the wording of the SLO/PLO but not its basic content.
- A change in the assessment method or achievement target of the SLO/PLO.
- A change in the number of SLOs/PLOs that still assesses the same basic content (e.g. 1 SLO is split into 2).
- Any other change in the SLO/PLO that does not necessitate a change in the course objectives.

Major Revision:

- Any change in basic content necessitated by review of poorly written SLOs/PLOs.
- Any change required by a revision of course objectives or the course itself.

Motion carried.

- d. Counseling PLOs**
Item tabled.

8. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

- a. SLO-Related Events – FPD: Revising & Reviewing SLOs/PLOS Monday 3/25, 6-8 pm (SSV 151)**

9. OTHER

- a. Revised SLOs: Ed 140, PSY 101, PSY 230, PSY 232**
b. Revised PLOs: Education-Instructional Aid
c. SLO Meeting dates for Spring 2013: April 8, April 22, May 13

10. ADJOURNMENT

The March 25, 2013 Student Learning Outcomes meeting was adjourned at 4:29 p.m. by Dr. Fredy Aviles, Chair.

MEMBERS PRESENT			
Dr. Fredy Aviles, Chair	Dr. Robert Harris	Dr. Tom O’Neil	Aeron Zentner
Stacey Adams	Dr. Glenn Haller	Wendy Stout	
Kim Covell	Willard Howard	William Vaughn	
MEMBERS ABSENT		GUESTS PRESENT/EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS	
Leslie Baker	Yvette Cruzalegui	Scott Lee	
Carolyn Burrell	Dr. Bassam Salameh		

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.

Approved: April 8, 2013 Student Learning Outcomes Committee Meeting

General Information:

See examples posted in the PLO Sample File for additional guidance when completing your program information.

Once completed, post the entire file in the WEAVE Document Repository for your program and submit a signed hard copy of the PLO and Assessment page to the SLO Committee mailbox. When the SLO Committee has reviewed the completed file and verified appropriate completion of each page, email acknowledgement will be sent to the area dean. At this point, PLOs and assessments should be entered in WEAVEonline under the appropriate program degree and/or certificate entity.

For assistance, please contact Melanie Parker, SLO Committee Faculty Co-Chair, at mparker@avc.edu should you need assistance.

Instructions:**PLOs and Assessment:**

Use this page to document the PLOs and assessment strategies developed for your program. Once the file is complete, submit a hard copy with the area dean's signature to the SLO Committee mailbox. See Sample PLO and Assessment page if you need additional guidance.

Program Assessment Cycle:

Document the expected assessment cycle for your program. See Assessment Cycle Samples #1 and 2 if you need additional guidance.

Curriculum Map:

List each course that is part of your program. Indicate which courses are required. Use I, D, and M designations to indicate the level at which each PLO is addressed and assessed in each course. See Curriculum Map Samples #1 and 2 if you need additional guidance.

PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES



ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

English Program Learning Outcomes for English AA (Non-Transfer)

Institutional Learning Outcomes

1. Analyze diverse perspectives from a variety of disciplines and experiences that contribute to the development of self-awareness.
2. Value and apply lifelong learning skills required for employment, basic skills, transfer education, and personal development.
3. Demonstrate a breadth of knowledge and experiences from the Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Arts, Natural Sciences, and Mathematics.
4. Solve problems using oral and written communication, critical thinking and listening skills, planning and decision-making skills, information literacy, and variety of technologies.
5. Demonstrate good citizenship and teamwork through respect, tolerance, cultural awareness, and the role of diversity in modern society.
6. Identify career opportunities that contribute to the economic well being of the community.

Indicate, by number, the Institutional Learning Outcome(s) each Program Learning Outcome will support.

Submit a signed copy of this form to the SLO committee mailbox.

Specifically describe the assessment method(s) used to measure each outcome and specify the achievement target that will determine successful completion of the outcome.

if this is an instructional program, a curriculum map must be completed. All programs must attach a proposed cycle of assessment.

ILO	PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES	ASSESSMENT METHODS and ACHIEVEMENT TARGETS
1, 2, 4	PLO #1 - Students in program courses will enter and participate in the academic community by first understanding the impact of professional discourse, the role of rhetoric, and the function of research.	Data from SLO #1 will be collected from program courses. The achievement target is that 70% of students will meet PLO #1.
1, 2, 4, 5	PLO #2 - Students in program courses will demonstrate the ability to access, read, interpret, analyze, and evaluate textual materials across traditions, genres, and media, with critical attention to both diversity and complexity.	Data from SLO #2 will be collected from program courses. The achievement target is that 70% of students will meet PLO #2.
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	PLO #3 - Students in program courses will develop both an awareness of different audiences and the persuasive skills needed to deliver effective arguments and verbal presentations.	Data from SLO #3 will be collected from program courses. The achievement target is that 70% of students will meet PLO #3.

Area Dean Approval: _____ Date: _____ SLO Committee Approval: _____ Date: _____

General Information:

See examples posted in the PLO Sample File for additional guidance when completing your program information.

Once completed, post the entire file in the WEAVE Document Repository for your program and submit a signed hard copy of the PLO and Assessment page to the SLO Committee mailbox. When the SLO Committee has reviewed the completed file and verified appropriate completion of each page, email acknowledgement will be sent to the area dean. At this point, PLOs and assessments should be entered in WEAVEonline under the appropriate program degree and/or certificate entity.

Please contact Melanie Parker, SLO Committee Faculty Co-Chair, at mparker@avc.edu should you need assistance.

Instructions:**PLOs and Assessment:**

Use this page to document the PLOs and assessment strategies developed for your program. Once the file is complete, submit a hard copy with the area dean's signature to the SLO Committee mailbox.

See Sample PLO and Assessment page if you need additional guidance.

Program Assessment Cycle:

Document the expected assessment cycle for your program. **See Assessment Cycle Samples #1 and 2 if you need additional guidance.**

Curriculum Map:

List each course that is part of your program. Indicate which courses are required. Use I, D, and M designations to indicate the level at which each PLO is addressed and assessed in each course. **See Curriculum Map Samples #1 and 2 if you need additional guidance.**

PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES



English Program Learning Outcomes for English AA (Transfer)

<p>Institutional Learning Outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analyze diverse perspectives from a variety of disciplines and experiences that contribute to the development of self-awareness. 2. Value and apply lifelong learning skills required for employment, basic skills, transfer education, and personal development. 3. Demonstrate a breadth of knowledge and experiences from the Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Arts, Natural Sciences, and Mathematics. 4. Solve problems using oral and written communication, critical thinking and listening skills, planning and decision-making skills, information literacy, and variety of technologies. 5. Demonstrate good citizenship and teamwork through respect, tolerance, cultural awareness, and the role of diversity in modern society. 6. Identify career opportunities that contribute to the economic well being of the community. 	
---	--

Indicate, by number, the Institutional Learning Outcome(s) each Program Learning Outcome will support.

Submit a signed copy of this form to the SLO committee mailbox.

Specifically describe the assessment method(s) used to measure each outcome and specify the achievement target that will determine successful completion of the outcome.

If this is an instructional program, a curriculum map must be completed. All programs must attach a proposed cycle of assessment.

ILO	PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES	ASSESSMENT METHODS and ACHIEVEMENT TARGETS
1, 2, 4	PLO #1 - Students in program courses will enter and participate in the academic community by first understanding the impact of professional discourse, the role of rhetoric, and the function of research.	Data from SLO #1 will be collected from program courses. The achievement target is that 70% of students will meet PLO #1.
1, 2, 4, 5	PLO #2 - Students in program courses will demonstrate the ability to access, read, interpret, analyze, and evaluate textual materials across traditions, genres, and media, with critical attention to both diversity and complexity.	Data from SLO #2 will be collected from program courses. The achievement target is that 70% of students will meet PLO #2.
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	PLO #3 - Students in program courses will develop both an awareness of different audiences and the persuasive skills needed to deliver effective arguments and verbal presentations.	Data from SLO #3 will be collected from program courses. The achievement target is that 70% of students will meet PLO #3.

Area Dean Approval: _____ Date: _____ SLO Committee Approval: _____ Date: _____

Introduction

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) requires associate degree granting institutions to meet four standards that ensure that the public receives a valuable education. In other words, the standards ensure that “the education earned at the institutions is of value to the student who earned it; and employers, trade or profession-related licensing agencies, and other colleges and universities can accept a student’s credential as legitimate.” (ACCJC.org website). The four standards are designed to foster discussion about the institutions effectiveness and ways to enhance it. The four standards are as follows:

The institution provides the means for students to learn, assess how well learning is occurring, and strives to improve that learning through ongoing, systematic, and integrated planning (Standard I).

Instructional programs, student support services, and library and learning support services facilitate the achievement of the institution’s stated student learning outcomes (Standard II).

Human, physical, technology, and financial resources enable these programs and services to function and improve (Standard III).

Ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization guides the accomplishment of the mission and supports institutional effectiveness and improvement (Standard IV).

The guidance provided in this document is specifically designed to help the institution meet Standard II as it pertains to Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). For guidance on how to meet the other three standards, please refer to the ACCJC website.

1) What are Student Learning Outcomes or SLOs and how do they differ from course objectives?

According to the ACCJC, Student Learning Outcomes are the “knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitudes that a student has attained at the end (or as a result) of his or her engagement in a particular set of collegiate experiences” (ACCJC Standards Adopted 2002, Standards Glossary, p.6). In other words they are the “specific observable or measurable results that are expected subsequent to a learning experience.” The SLO Glossary produced by ASCCC in 2010 further clarifies by stating that “SLO s describe a student’s ability to synthesize many discreet skills using higher level thinking skills and to produce something that asks them to apply what they’ve learned. SLO s usually encompass gathering together of smaller discrete objectives through analysis, evaluation and synthesis into more sophisticated skills and abilities (ASCCC, 2010, p. 13).” SLOs differ from course objectives in that the latter are specific teaching objectives that drive course content and activities (ASCC.org). Objectives are small steps that lead toward a goal, for instance the discrete course content that faculty cover within a discipline. Objectives are usually more numerous and create a framework for the overarching student learning outcomes which address synthesizing, evaluating and analyzing many of the objectives (ASCCC, 2010, p. 10).

2) Why should I participate in this?

The Academic Senate views outcomes assessment as a productive activity that can improve teaching practices and thus enhance student learning. For this reason, effective

assessment practices are important not only to meet accreditation demands but also to benefit the college, the faculty, and the students.

According to the “Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment,” Principle Eleven: “Faculty should engage in SLO development and assessment not because it is a requirement for accreditation but rather because it is good professional practice that can benefit programs and students (page 25).”

Faculty’s chief responsibility is to provide students with an effective and rewarding learning experience. The responsibility involves participation in development of curriculum at the course, program and college level, and not just the responsibility for one’s own classes. Furthermore, “decisions regarding curriculum development should be based on collegial and authentic analysis of data...and for this reason SLO assessment can provide informative and beneficial input for making curricular evaluation and discussion at all levels more valuable and purposeful (Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, 2010, page 25).

The Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, 2010, also states that “Outcomes and their assessments therefore must remain under the purview of those responsible for teaching the courses and those who are most qualified to make decisions regarding curricular practices. Faculty should have control of assessment processes and take the lead in analysis and use of the data. Collection of data should be led by the faculty members in the courses they teach. In all aspects of SLO development and assessment, faculty should assume primary responsibility (26).”In other words, because faculty have the necessary expertise, curricular decisions need to remain under their control. For this reason faculty need to be the ones that engage in assessment of student learning outcomes and the curricular decisions that follow.

“When designed and implemented appropriately, SLO assessment can provide significant benefits as a tool for evaluating and revising curriculum and for improving student learning, and these benefits should be the primary reason for faculty to participate in assessment work (Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, 2010, page 26).”

“If faculty do not accept these responsibilities and fail to see SLO assessment as a beneficial professional practice, both faculty and students may suffer. If assessment becomes a task done only to satisfy the ACCJC, faculty will be less likely to engage in authentic discussions of valid data, and indeed the data collected itself may well be less informative. Curricular development and decision making will be less effective, thereby depriving students of the maximum educational experience. In addition, faculty who do not engage in assessment activities may find that decisions regarding curriculum are made for them, either by smaller groups of individuals who have chosen to become involved or, worse yet, by non-faculty who have taken on the responsibilities rightly due to the instructional experts (Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, 2010, page 26).”

3) But we already assign grades, so why do we have to do this other thing?

According to the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment. Principle 8, Principle Eight: SLO Assessment processes and grading are different but mutually compatible activities and should complement rather than conflict with each other (page 21). Grades and student learning outcomes are not the same thing because they have different approaches and have different purposes. Grading usually involves assigning a letter to some assignment or class the student participated in. The grade tells you very little or nothing about what skills the student can perform. Grades also tell you nothing about how the student can improve.

According to the publication “Grades vs. SLOs” by Joan Sholars (2009), “It is very difficult to trace back the learning of specific skills from a general grade. For example, if a student earns a “B” in the course, it is not possible to determine which skills or topics within the course were grasped well by the student simply by looking at the grade the student earned. Different faculty members teaching the same course could vary in the way they measure the combination of the different skills to produce the grade. For instance, Professor A might count the research paper for that course as 20% of the student’s overall grade, while Professor B might count the research paper for that course as 15% of the student’s overall grade. If that same research paper was used to assess an SLO, the faculty would score the skills that the faculty determined important on a faculty-developed rubric. The faculty would have been normed on the rubric. Consequently, a student could earn an “A” in the course, but have scored only a 3 out of 4 on a faculty-developed rubric. (Mt. San Antonio College SLO Coordinator December 2009 Whitepaper).”

It is not just faculty that should be aware of the skills attained by a student after an assignment, but also the student. Students should be assigned a grade on an assignment and also a score that pertains to the SLO. If the student is familiar with the rating scale on the rubric, and what skills each score represents for a particular SLO, the student would be aware of what skills he or she has attained and which have not yet been mastered. Therefore, “formative SLO assessment involves evaluating student performance with the aim of providing feedback that will enhance student learning through improved instruction. Formative assessment helps the student and the instructor to ascertain what has been learned and what still needs to be learned and thereby can improve both teaching and learning.” (Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, 2010, page 26).”

Thus, student learning outcomes are more useful for helping students understand how to improve their performance in a class and in future classes. Data from SLO assessment also provides feedback to faculty about how to improve instructional practices in a current class and in subsequent classes.

Grading and outcomes assessment need not conflict with each as both serve necessary functions. “Faculty who employ only grades or only outcomes assessment may be depriving their students of important feedback. For example, a composition instructor who reads a student essay and simply assigns a letter grade or score, or even one who offers brief, general written comments to the student, has done little to improve the student’s writing. More productive comments would target specific expectations or

outcomes for the paper and explain to the student where and how those expectations have or have not been satisfied. Through such feedback students can advance their skills and enhance their understanding of the course material. Thus, grading and outcomes assessment both serve important though separate roles and, rather than conflicting, should work in concert to provide the different levels of input necessary for complete and effective student evaluation.”

4) Okay so I have to do this. How do I do I begin?

According to the SLO Glossary produced by ASCCC in 2010, SLO s describe a student’s ability to synthesize many discreet skills using higher level thinking skills and to produce something that asks them to apply what they’ve learned. SLO s usually encompass gathering together of smaller discrete objectives through analysis, evaluation and synthesis into more sophisticated skills and abilities. (ASCCC, 2010, p. 13). An SLO refers to an overarching outcome for a course, program, degree or certificate, or student services area (such as the library)..

Therefore, you should begin by examining at the specific course objectives listed in the Course Outline of Record (COR) for the particular course. You should then try combine 2 or 3 or more of them into one logical cohesive outcome that can be assessed.

For example, at AVC PSY 101 course has the following course objectives:

Explain the historical context of the field of psychology.

Identify, describe, and compare different research methodologies used in the scientific study of psychology.

Recognize, inspect, question, and evaluate various theories and concepts that presently influence the field of psychology

Examine and analyze various topics and concepts in psychology.

Assemble and critically analyze recent information on topics in General Psychology through the use of current literature and scientific journals.

Assess the complexity and diversity of behavior including the impact of culture on human behavior.

Inspect and describe the interaction of nature (genes) and nurture (culture) on human behavior.

Recognize and appraise scientific journals in the field of psychology.

Identify and demonstrate APA writing style.

Objectives 5, 8, and 9 could be combined and rewritten as: Students will be able to recognize scientific journals in the field of psychology, critically evaluate their content, and synthesize the information into APA format.

The other objectivess can be combined similarly to yield other student learning outcomes.

Bloom’s taxonomy is a well-known description of levels of educational objectives. It may be useful to consider this taxonomy when defining you SLOs.

5) Ok. I have written SLOs for my courses, now what do I do with them?

SLOs are specific measurable outcomes that are expected subsequent to a learning experience. Therefore, an **assessment tool** must be found or developed that can yield data that determines whether that outcome has taken place. In other words, the assessment tool should be able to tell you whether students can really do what the SLO states. According to the Guiding Principles for SLO Assessment, principle one: “Faculty have the primary responsibility for developing assessment tools and determining the uses of data that are collected, and therefore faculty engagement and active involvement in SLO assessment is essential (page #9).”

As mentioned previously, only faculty have the necessary expertise, training, background, and experience necessary to develop effective methods of SLO assessment for their courses and programs. According to the Guiding Principles for SLO Assessment, principle one:

“This same principle applies not only to classroom instruction, but also to student support services, library services, and all other areas of a student’s academic experience (page 9).”

6) But I don’t know much about assessment. What are the different types of assessments that I can use?

In “The Concept of Formative Assessment” (2002), Carol Boston offers the following explanation and definition of the concept of assessment:

Black and William (1998b) define assessment broadly to include all activities that teachers and students undertake to get information that can be used diagnostically to alter teaching and learning (Guiding Principles of SLO assessment, page 8).

There are many different assessments: The following, though by no means exhaustive, is a list of some of the most common ones:

Portfolios: a compilation of an individual’s work over time. Faculty decide what and how much evidence will be presented in the portfolio to allow assessment of **program** goals.

Multiple choice questions

Essays

Standardized tests

Licensure exams

Projects

Quizzes

Short answer questions

Research papers

Lab assignment

Performance

Recital

Simulation

Interview

Survey

According to the Guiding Principles for SLO Assessment: If the term “assessment” refers to the process of collecting data, then “assessment results” are the data or evidence produced by this process. Such data need not always be quantifiable or measurable in numerical terms. Assessment results may take various forms, including not only quantitative data such as numerical or statistical scores but also qualitative evidence such as portfolios, narratives, performances, or other data that may be more dependent on observation than computation. Any information produced by assessment processes that can be used for analysis and improvement of student achievement and learning would fall under the category of assessment results (page 8).”

7) How do I know I have good assessment tool for my SLOs?

This question is best answered by the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment (page 16), Principle Five: SLO assessment should be as authentic as possible and should be minimally intrusive to the educational experience of students and the instructional planning and performance of faculty.

Good assessment needs to simulate real world experiences and involve the application of critical thinking to tasks that approximate real world conditions like the workplace and other situations outside the classroom (Grant Wiggins, 1990). Appropriate SLO assessment should not be simply a reproduction of information without context to anchor it. Authentic assessment is meaningful and involves application of knowledge and skills, not just simply memorization of information. The ACCJC’s 2012 SLO Rubric notes the importance of authentic assessment as an aspect of SLO proficiency: “Student learning outcomes and authentic assessment are in place for courses, programs, and degrees” (p. 5).

Faculty also need to consider providing assessments at certain intervals of a course rather than just at the end. Such assessments are more useful because they can track student progress and provide more useful feedback to improve student learning. In other words, ongoing authentic assessment can improve the input that faculty provide to students as an aspect of instruction throughout their classes. As Arthur Chickering and Zelda Gamson’s (1987) “Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education” states, “In classes, students need frequent opportunities to perform and receive suggestions for improvement” (Appendix C, para. 15).

Assessments should also be integrated into courses so they non-obtrusive and as least disruptive as possible. “Other, more formal assessment practices also might be developed as a part of the standard instructional program for a course. Assessment data can be collected from work students do as required course activities, projects, or assignments, requiring minimal additional course preparation or student performance documentation Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, Principle 5, page 16).” Faculty can plan for such standards assessments in advance by incorporating them into their classes as part of the

normal expectations for students in the course. This insures that SLO assessment will be as efficient and practical as possible

Furthermore, according to the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, Principle Six, page 18: Rather than relying on one assessment method for all situations, effective assessment may benefit from a variety of methods, even within a single course, that can respond to different learning outcomes, teaching styles, and student learning needs.

8) Where do we collect the data?

For a particular set of SLOs developed for a particular course, data should be collected from all sections of that course. This is would be ideal, however, it is also acceptable to randomly sample from certain sections if many are available.

At Antelope Valley College, each area or discipline has an **assessment facilitator** who collects SLO data from the various individuals who teach the course. Usually those teaching the course record the number of students that took the course and the number of students that met the assessment criteria (i.e. passed). This data is reported in **WEAVE**, an online course data management system that tracks SLO data and related matters.

Assessment criteria must be established for each SLO prior to collecting data.

Assessment criteria refers to the percentage or ratio of questions answered correctly. For example, a multiple-choice test may require that 75% of the questions be answered correctly for the SLO to be met. Therefore the assessment criteria would be 75%.

Assessment criteria can also be set for more complicated assignments like papers, projects, etc. by following a rubric.

An **achievement target** must also be set for each SLO before data is collected. The achievement target refers to the overall percentage of students that successfully meet the assessment criteria for the SLO. For example, a particular course might require that 80% of the students be successful when assessed for a particular SLO. Thus, for this particular SLO, 80% would be the achievement target.

9) What do we do with the data once it is collected?

Faculty need to take part in a discussion of the SLO results for their courses. All faculty who teach a particular course need to discuss the SLO results in order to decided whether they need to modify the SLO, the assessment tool, the assessment criteria, or the achievement target. More importantly, faculty need to decide what the results mean for that particular course in order to modify it or improve it. AVC has developed an **action plan** form that should be filled out after such a discussion. It is the job of the assessment facilitator to enter this information into WEAVE (i.e., AVC's online course data management system).

According to the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, principle one, page 9: Faculty are in direct contact with students, have the greatest knowledge and deepest understanding of the students' needs and abilities, and have the responsibility for developing and delivering the curriculum and course content, and therefore faculty can better understand the context of the data. "By accepting and embracing their responsibility for SLO design and assessment, faculty will be in the best position to

examine assessment data, ask questions about what the data suggest, and make appropriate changes to classroom and institutional practices in order to improve student learning (Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, **Principle one, page 9**).”

10) Who should be involved in this process?

According to the Guiding principles of SLO Assessment, Principle Two (page 10): Outcomes assessment is a process that should involve all appropriate participants at each level of the college, not just select groups or individuals. SLO assessment must involve full-time faculty, part-time faculty, staff, administrators, and anyone else directly or indirectly serving students. Faculty need to take primary responsibility for developing SLOs, the assessments, analyzing data, coordinating discussions. Part-time faculty need to be involved as well as they are a majority of the faculty at most colleges. Faculty should be the ones making curricular decisions, especially those concerning how it can be changed and improved by using SLO data. Staff also need to be involved. Staff need to be involved in preserving data, maintaining and recording it, as well developing software tools and systems. Staff are thus needed to support the entire SLO assessment process. Discussion should also be held at the college level by faculty under the leadership the academic senate. Instructional and student support service faculty should also be involved. According to the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, principle two: “A comprehensive system of support services exists, and is characterized by a high degree of integration among academic and student support services”. Instructional and student support services faculty should not work in isolation from each other, but rather should collaborate and share information at all levels in order to more fully inform and strengthen the delivery of all aspects of a student’s educational experience. (page 11?). There must also be assistance from college researchers to aid in the design and implementation of SLO instruments as well as evaluating their validity and applicability. Administrators also play an important role in the SLO process. Administrators need to support and facilitate the process. They need to make available sufficient staffing, technology, resources, compensation and other needs. Not only this, administrators must also must also support the SLO process through organization, scheduling, facilitating, coordinating, and encouraging, and approval of other necessary efforts to make the process more effective. According to the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, principle two: “If the entire college is involved in assessment efforts, with each area or constituent group fulfilling its appropriate role while understanding and respecting the faculty’s primacy in SLO processes, all areas will be able to work cooperatively toward the common goal of serving students in the most effective ways possible (page 11?).”

11) Ok. SLOs have been defined, assessment tools have been developed, data and action plans have been collected. Am I done?

No. The process is supposed to be ongoing and lead to “**continues quality improvement**” of the courses, programs and services offered by the college. According to principle one of the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, page 9: “The purposes of student learning outcomes include assessing student achievement, evaluating the strength of courses and programs, and identifying instances in which instruction and student

learning can be improved.” Furthermore, According to the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, “Principle Three (page 10): SLOs and SLO assessment should be connected to the overall culture of the college through the college vision or values statement, program review processes, and college curriculum, planning, and budgeting processes.”

SLO assessment is not an end to itself but a vehicle for program and educational improvement. It needs to be an ongoing activity which uses current data to inform instructional practices. It should not a periodic exercise that uses outdated assessments and data to inform current practices and decisions. The Academic Senate’s *SLO Terminology Glossary* (ASCCC, 2010, p. 4) defines “**closing the loop**,” as “the use of assessment results to improve student learning through collegial dialogue informed by the results of student service or instructional learning outcome assessment. It is part of a continuous cycle of collecting assessment results, evaluating them, and using the evaluations to identify actions that will improve student learning, implementing those actions, and then cycling back to collecting assessment results, etc.”

This requires a commitment by all people across all levels of the college. Faculty are more likely to believe in the process and devote their effort if they feel it will lead to budgetary decisions that will enhance students’ educational experience. The college needs to make budget decisions that will support the projects and innovation that will lead to curriculum improvement. ACCJC emphasizes the importance of using assessment data as a basis for decision making throughout the college: “Results of assessment are being used for improvement and further alignment of institution-wide practices (p. 5).” Colleges must therefore integrate SLO assessment into its program review. In other words, data from SLO assessment needs to inform the decision making reflected in program review. Programs need to be analyzed based on concrete information, thus making the program review process more data driven. This allows SLO assessment to connect logically and meaningfully to both short-term and long-term college planning. SLO data can inform decisions for improvement of programs, the setting of goals and implementation of strategies, as well as allocation of resources to address these needs. Programs can use concrete data to support their budgetary requests thereby making budget discussions more meaningful and better informed. The decision making process will tie resource allocation directly to the SLO process.

“Perhaps the highest level at which SLO s and SLO assessment can be incorporated into the culture of a college is by connecting general education outcomes directly to the college vision, values, or mission (Guiding principles of SLO Assessment, page 10). Colleges might want to revise their mission statement, if necessary, to make an obvious connection with its institutional learning outcomes. Institutional learning outcomes should also have an explicit connection with the general education outcomes.

12) Do SLOs remain the same once established or can we change them?

SLOs can be revised as needed. According to the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, Principle 3, page 10: “The process and the SLO s themselves must remain open to revision and adjustment. Student needs and curricular practices change, and colleges must continuously reflect on their practices and expectations in order to serve students as fully as possible. The job of SLO development and assessment is never finished, and

SLO s should not be seen as fixed or unchangeable. For SLO data to be effective in informing decision making at all levels of the college, the SLO assessment process should be revised as necessary to reflect changes in the college's curriculum, needs, and culture."

13) Okay, we are continuously assessing student learning outcomes, revising them as needed, and using them to inform program review. Now are we done?

No. Program learning outcomes, general education outcomes, and institutional outcomes must also be developed. Program learning outcomes must be developed for any sequence of courses that leads to a certificate or degree. The college catalog for Antelope Valley College lists the specific programs and their objectives. Objectives at this level can be used to develop program learning outcomes.

According to the Guiding Principles of SLO assessment, Principle Four, page 15: "SLO s should be clearly mapped and aligned throughout a course sequence and among various levels (course, program, institution) to achieve the most efficient and effective assessment." The mapping of these outcomes needs to be thoughtful and involve dialogue among all necessary parties. This includes not only faculty, but also staff and administration.

"When dealing with outcomes and assessment, it is important to determine that course outcomes align or match up with program outcomes; that institutional outcomes align with the college mission and vision" (ASCCC, 2010 p.1). Doing this makes the assessment process more practical and efficient.

"For example, if program outcomes are designed and mapped to reflect direct connections to the SLO s of the courses that comprise the program, then assessment of the program outcomes may be conducted using data provided through the process of course SLO assessment (Guiding principles of SLO Assessment, principle 4, page 15). This means that means that SLO assessments, if appropriately designed and assessed, can double as program learning outcomes. Furthermore, program learning outcomes assessment need not incorporate data from every course that comprises the program. Certain programs that have mastery courses, where students master a skill that was introduced in previous courses, might choose to focus assessment at the courses where mastery occurs.

Assessment of general education and institutional outcomes requires a broader dialogue. The *SLO Terminology Glossary* (ASCCC, 2010, p.9), states that institutional learning reflect "the knowledge, skills, and abilities a student is expected to leave an institution with as a result of a student's total experience." Thus, they combine expertise found in several areas or a combination of areas and not a single discipline. Institutional learning outcomes include those related to institutional effectiveness (degrees, transfers, productivity) as well as learning outcomes.

"Successful attainment of general education and institutional outcomes depends on the overall educational experience that is founded on the course and program level. If students do not achieve the expected outcomes at the course and program level, then they are also unlikely to attain the college-level outcomes. For this reason, colleges should work to establish explicit alignment between program outcomes and those at the general education and institutional level. If students are successful in achieving course and

program level outcomes, and if those outcomes provide direct and clear connection to the general education outcomes, then assessment will once again be simplified and the overall educational experience of students will have greater coherence and will therefore be enhanced (Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, principle 4, page 16).

14) Can results of SLO, PLO assessment be used against me?

No. According to the “Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment”: “SLO assessment of student learning outcomes is a process that is separate from faculty evaluation.” (Principle Ten, page 24).

ACCJC Standard III.A.1.c “Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.” Though some believe this means that SLO assessment data can be used to evaluate faculty, the Academic Senate strongly disagrees. The 2004 paper entitled “The 2002 Accreditation Standards: Implementation” justifies strongly warns that:

“[U]sing SLO s as a basis for faculty evaluations (III.A.1.c) demonstrates an egregious disregard for local bargaining authority and interjects a threatening tone into what the ACCJC claims is a collegial peer process. Moreover, III.A.1.c is particularly coercive to non-tenured and adjunct faculty; and is viewed by the Senate as nothing less than an attack on our profession (p. 12).”

A 2007 Senate Rostrum article titled “Accreditation and Faculty Evaluations?” stated: “Placing student learning outcomes data within a faculty member’s evaluation would create a downward pressure on the rigor of the outcomes and a strong motivation to create assessments that validate or justify the content, pedagogy, and assignments” (Alancraig & Fulks, p. 2). Thus SLO assessment results would not be a true indicator of whether learning has taken place or whether the results should be used to improve the courses, programs, or services the college offers.

The Rostrum article “Accreditation and Faculty Evaluations?” and the “Guiding Principle of SLO Assessment” make it clear that ACCJC Standard III.A.1.c. should mean that faculty “evaluation involves the faculty member’s participation in assessment activities, not the results of assessment data used to judge some faculty as less fit.”

SLO Committee Revision Process

Proposal 1:

SLOs/PLOs will be reviewed on the same cycle as required by AP&P (a minimum of every 3-5 years). Review of the SLOs/PLOs may require that they be revised. When a course is revised through AP&P in Curricunet, the SLO committee co-chair shall indicate by selecting the appropriate checkbox whether SLO/PLO revision is necessary. The SLO Committee Faculty Co-chair and area representatives shall review SLO and PLO revisions before bringing them to the SLO committee for a more thorough review. In order for SLOs/PLOs to be revised, faculty must use the appropriate SLO/PLO revision form available through the SLO committee website.

Any change considered a minor revision will be approved by the SLO Committee Faculty Co-Chair and forwarded to the Academic affairs Technician for recording. The SLO Committee Co-chair will also indicate approval in Curricunet by selecting the appropriate checkbox. Notification of approval will be sent to the faculty that submitted the revised SLOs/PLOs so that the relevant changes can be made in WEAVE and assessment can continue.

Any change considered a major revision or one requiring clarification will be brought to the committee for a full review. If such change requires a revision of the course itself, the faculty member submitting the revision will be notified that the course must be revised through AP&P so that those changes can be incorporated into WEAVE.

The SLO Committee defines minor and major revisions in the following way:

Minor Revision:

- A revision that involves a change in the wording of the SLO/PLO but not its basic content.
- A change in the assessment method or achievement target of the SLO/PLO.
- A change in the number of SLOs/PLOs that still assesses the same basic content (e.g. 1 SLO is split into 2).
- Any other change in the SLO/PLO that does not necessitate a change in the course objectives.

Major Revision:

- Any change in basic content necessitated by review of poorly written SLOs/PLOs.
- A change in the basic content of the SLO/PLO such that it no longer incorporates all course objectives or reflects those objectives inaccurately.
- Any change that requires a revision of course objectives or the course itself.

SLO Committee Revision Process

Proposal 2:

SLOs/PLOs will be reviewed on the same cycle as required by AP&P (a minimum of every 3-5 years). Review of the SLOs/PLOs may require that they be revised. SLOs will be listed immediately after the course objectives in the course outline of record COR. When a course is revised through AP&P in Curricunet, the SLO committee co-chair will have a checkbox to indicate if SLO/PLO revision is necessary. The SLO Committee Faculty Co-chair and area representatives shall review SLO and PLO revisions before bringing them to the SLO committee for a more thorough review.

Any change considered a minor revision will be approved by the faculty co-chair and forwarded to the Academic Affairs Technician for recording. The SLO co-chair will also indicate approval in Curricunet by selecting the appropriate checkbox. Notification of approval will be sent to the faculty that submitted the revised SLOs/PLOs so that the relevant changes can be made in WEAVE and assessment can continue.

Any change considered a major revision or one requiring clarification will be brought to the committee for a full review. If such change requires a revision of the course itself, the faculty member submitting the revision will be notified that the course must be revised through AP&P so that those changes can be incorporated into WEAVE.

The SLO Committee defines minor and major revisions in the following way:

Minor Revision:

- A revision that involves a change in the wording of the SLO/PLO but not its basic content.
- A change in the assessment method or achievement target of the SLO/PLO.
- A change in the number of SLOs/PLOs that still assesses the same basic content (e.g. 1 SLO is split into 2).
- Any other change in the SLO/PLO that does not necessitate a change in the course objectives.

Major Revision:

- Any change in basic content necessitated by review of poorly written SLOs/PLOs.
- A change in the basic content of the SLO/PLO such that it no longer incorporates all course objectives or reflects those objectives inaccurately.
- Any change that requires a revision of course objectives or the course itself.

Response from Melissa Jauregui concerning Proposal 2:

Please note, in order for the SLO's to appear after the objectives on the COR as stated below, that data would need to be entered into CurricUNET since the COR is generated from CurricUNET. We do not have a way to add the SLOs on the COR if they are not entered into CurricUNET.

Once the data is entered, and if edits are needed as described below, those revisions could be done directly in CurricUNET and the SLO Committee could then have a paperless approval process. If the intention of AP&P and the SLO committee is to have this information entered into CurricUNET so it appears on the COR, I believe this would need to be approved or supported by the Academic Senate since in the past this was a point of contention.

Please advise.

Sincerely,

Melissa Jauregui
Academic Affairs Technician
P: 661-722-6317