



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING**

April 25, 2011

3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. , A141 Conference Room

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
2. **OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SLO COMMITTEE CHAIR**
3. **OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. March 28, 2011
 - b. April 11, 2011
5. **PRESENTATION - None**
6. **REPORTS**
 - a. Updates from Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)
7. **ACTION ITEMS –**
 - a. PLOs for approval: Associate Degree Nursing; Aerospace (attached); Clothing and Textiles – Fashion Design (attached); Electrical (Attached); Interior Design (Attached)
 - b. SLOs for approval: AUTO 198A, 198C, 198D, 198E, 198F, 198H, 198N; DM 103L, 105L, 113L, 115L, 128L, 133L, 203L, 205L, 213L, 215L, 233L, 246L; ENG 185; FTV 155, 215, 251, PHTC 213L, 215L
8. **DISCUSSION –**
 - a. Fall Welcome Back Proposal and Planning - (Melanie Parker)
 - b. Learning Outcomes Updates (May 12 and 27 Planning) – (Melanie Parker)
 - c. Accreditation Concerns-Strategic Planning - (Melanie Parker)
9. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS - none**
10. **OTHER**
 - a. SLO Committee Faculty Professional Development Events for Spring 2011
 - Learning Outcomes Analysis and Evaluation - Friday, April 29, 1-4 p.m., SSV151
 - Learning Outcomes Update - Thursday, May 12, 4-6 p.m., SSV151
 - Learning Outcomes Update – Friday, May 27, 7-9 p.m., SSV151
 - b. Spring 2011 SLO Committee meeting dates:
 - May 9 and 23
11. **ADJOURNMENT**

NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY

Antelope Valley College prohibits discrimination and harassment based on sex, gender, race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, cancer-related medical condition, or genetic predisposition. Upon request, we will consider reasonable accommodation to permit individuals with protected disabilities to (1) complete the employment or admission process, (b) perform essential job functions, (c) enjoy benefits and privileges of similarly-situated individuals without disabilities, and (d) participate in instruction, programs, services, activities, or events.



ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME COMMITTEE MEETING
April 25, 2011
Room A141, 3:00 – 4:30 PM

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

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Ms. Melanie Parker, co-chair of the SLO Committee, called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.

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

Ms. Parker announced that WEAVE Data Days have been scheduled for Wednesday June 8 and Thursday June 9. The hours for each day will be 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. and 1:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. Aaron and Melanie will be available in room BE 310 for any faculty needing refreshers or help entering their data into WEAVE. Informational emails will be sent to faculty and deans and the information will also be posted in the local news section of WEAVE.

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – None

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Ms. Parker asked for any corrections to the minutes of March 28, 2011. One typo correction in 8c was mentioned. Ms. Parker asked for a motion to approve the corrected minutes. A motion was made and seconded to approve the corrected minutes and with no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Parker asked for any corrections to the minutes of April 11, 2011. Two typo corrections, both in 8c were mentioned. Ms. Parker asked for a motion to approve the corrected minutes. A motion was made and seconded to approve the corrected minutes and with no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

5. PRESENTATION – No presentations.

6. REPORTS

Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker) –Mr.

Voelcker informed the committee that both Ms. Parker and he met with Mr. Tafarella about his accreditation concerns and that after preliminary WEAVE training he expressed more confidence about how we are gathering and documenting data.

Also, Ms. Parker relayed information from Mesa College (AZ) forwarded by Mr. Younglove. At first glance, it appears that campus spends an entire week in the spring dedicated to assessment issues. This has been recognized as an exemplary program and Mr. Younglove feels it would be a good idea for us to investigate how we can apply a similar idea at AVC next spring. Mr. Younglove will provide further information at a later date.

7. ACTION ITEMS –

a. PLOs for Approval:

- **ADN PLO** – Ms. Parker had a discussion with Ms. Sundberg, the faculty writer of the ADN PLOs. In regard to PLO #1, faculty wish to keep the two forms of assessment that are tied to this PLO. She understands how it might seem confusing with both the clinical aspect as well as the student survey, but faculty agree they want to try it to see how it works. The other PLO that was a concern to the committee members was #3. Ms. Sundberg agreed to clarify the assessment per the committee's request. Ms. Parker asked that if members were in agreement that all concerns had been addressed, a motion be made to approve the ADN PLOs. A motion was made and seconded and with no further discussion, the PLOs were approved unanimously.
- **Aerospace** – Ms. Parker asked Ms. Drake, Tech Ed Dean, to explain why two courses were listed in each PLO, and who is deciding which course is used for the assessment. Ms. Drake explained that one course is the air frame course and the other is power plant. One course is taught in the daytime and one in the evening. The following year, the schedule is flipped. Students only take one course at a time and follow it up the next year for their second half. A student must choose to be either a daytime student or an evening student, so you cannot change in mid-program. The program itself is 60 units and it feeds three different degrees. For the license, it is a 75 unit commitment. Dr. Hall felt that the PLO was very straightforward and down to earth and Ms. Drake was glad to hear that comment. She explained that her faculty had gathered into common clusters when writing so that wordings would show up consistently throughout the PLOs. Dr. Hall pointed out that utilizing standard shop practices and safety procedures made it a good model for PE and VAPA to use in their PLOs. Ms. Drake mentioned that all students are involved in completing a major project. Dr. Aviles brought up a question of why ILO #6 had been chosen for all three PLOs. Ms. Drake stated that #6 is the best one we have for now and made the comment that they should be revisited in the future to better assess them. Dr. Hall also felt the same way but stated that we need to wait on this or our faculty will really get confused. Ms. Parker asked that if all members were in agreement that all concerns had been addressed, a motion be made to approve the PLOs. A motion was made and seconded and with no further discussion, the PLO was approved unanimously.
- **Clothing and Textiles – Fashion Design** – The first question Ms. Parker had is that the course numbers are not matching those on the in current AVC catalog. Ms. Drake stated that the program and courses had recently been revised. She gave accolades to Ms. Melissa Ramiro, adjunct faculty, who took on this job from a previous faculty member and brought the program up to date. She spent hours with Ms. Drake working on restructuring each course outline of record, restructuring the entire program to sequence all courses so that they are, in fact, a career technical program and not a hobby

class and placed a one-time-only limit on each course so people do not use the course labs as their private sewing room. She began assessing all of the SLOs with other faculty members and wrote the PLOs. Ms. Drake knew that a few things were still incorrect, but stated that overall, you could not expect a better effort by an adjunct doing this for the first time. Ms. Parker and others had questions about the confusing use of 70% on the final project and the statement that 85% will meet the PLO. Ms. Drake explained that perhaps some errors had occurred during cutting and pasting. The statement should read something like: “Students will have achieved this PLO if they score 70% or higher on their project. The achievement target is that 85% of all students assessed will meet the PLO.” On each one of the PLOs, it appears that the extra 70% should be deleted. Also, in the listing of the classes for each PLO, “and” should be changed to “or” to indicate that this will only have to be assessed in one of the courses listed. Ms. Parker will forward to Maureen Rethwisch and Ms. Drake the corrections that need to be made. This PLO will be brought back for approval at another meeting.

- **Electrical** – Ms. Parker had questions about PLO #1 in regard to talking about questions on specific exams. She asked if they referred to different courses. Ms. Drake relayed that she was unsure but that they were all probably very elementary and found in every course. For the PLOs, the word “and” in the first sentence in relation to the course classes should be changed to “or”. A question also came up about the 70% and 80%. Ms. Drake explained that it was a grade of 70% for an achievement target of 80%. Ms. Parker asked if assessment by industry standards (as stated in PLO #4), related to the projects in all courses. Ms. Drake indicated it depended on where that PLO is being assessed. According to the curriculum map, mastery is expected in the 220 course. There were also several typos pointed out. Dr. Salameh mentioned that in their science courses, students must pass a safety exam before continuing in the class. If they cannot do so, they will be instructed to drop the class. Ms. Drake stated that this also holds true for the entire tech ed courses. Ms. Parker will forward to Maureen Rethwisch and Ms. Drake the corrections that need to be made. This set of PLOs will be brought back for approval at another meeting.
- **Interior Design** – The course numbering for this program has also been revised and therefore does not follow the current AVC catalog. Ms. Parker pointed out that wording for PLO #4 and 5 needs to be changed from the word “and” to “or”. Ms. Parker will forward to Maureen Rethwisch and Ms. Drake the corrections that need to be made. This PLO will be brought back for approval at another meeting. Ms. Parker gave praise to Ms. Drake and her division for doing such an outstanding job and believes they will serve as wonderful models for other program areas. Ms. Drake will pass this acknowledgement onto her faculty

Ms. Drake had also spoken with Mr. Tafarella about the concerns he had regarding the college accreditation progress. After discussion, he now sees that there are areas where we are farther ahead than he realized and some areas that continue to need quite a bit of help. She was pleased that he is so enthused about taking on this job and that he is trying to pass this information onto the faculty. He was very impressed with the achievements and progress of Tech Ed and hopes that this will lead the way across other divisions.

b. SLOs for approval: Ms. Lowry recently communicated that courses listed in the present catalog that do not have currently approved SLOs on file would not be included in the 2011-2012 schedule. The committee has now received SLOs for all of those courses with the exception of PE 237 and Math 099. Since MATH 099 is an umbrella course there was confusion about how the SLOs were to be written and assessed. Ms. Lowry asked what would appear on a student’s transcript and indicated that she believed specific SLOs should be written

and assessed for each unit of MATH 099 credit. Dr. Hall gave an explanation of how the system works in BANNER. A student would need to complete, for example, MATH 50 or 60 and that is what would appear on their transcript. The transcript would not say MATH 099 as this works only as a service configuration. MATH 099 is a self-paced study of math courses chosen from a list that goes from MATH 050 all the way to MATH 140. Students can only choose from one course at a time and must complete at least one unit of credit in a semester. Each unit must be completed before moving on to the next. Ms. Drake explained that in her AUTO tech class, the main umbrella course is AUTO 198, but all of the sub-courses refer back to it. The main issue was to make sure that all of the sub-courses under these areas had SLOs. There are still questions in regard to how this will work for math courses associated with MATH 099. Ms. Parker believes that since SLOs already exist each of the actual math courses, perhaps stating that each unit must be completed successfully before moving ahead to the next, might provide the needed evidence of success. Dr. Hall feels that it does not make sense to demand more SLOs just because MATH 099 divides the math course into separate units; it still adds up to the same thing as for the original. Ms. Parker will keep everyone updated on this issue.

Ms. Parker requested a motion to approve all the SLOs listed on the agenda. A motion and second was forthcoming and with no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

8. DISCUSSION

a. Fall Welcome Back Proposal and Planning - (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker mentioned that we have received conditional approval from the Faculty Professional Development Committee to give a 90 minute afternoon workshop on Fall Welcome Back Day. All faculty would be required to attend their division or department level session for the purpose of analyzing data from the 2011-2012 cycle and begin writing action plans to go into WEAVE. Each SLO Committee member would be assigned to facilitate the session for a specific division. We would have a very concise and specific set of instructions and materials that we would take to each department or subject area. We also hope to identify faculty members from each division who have been actively working with SLOs and could help facilitate the process. Those people, in combination with the assigned SLO committee member, would lead the charge and give a brief overview of the session's purpose. With the very specific instructions given, we hope faculty can accomplish what is required. Each group would also receive a progress report page that would be turned back in at the end of the 90 minute workshop. All of this would accomplish the following: 1-It would give us a captive audience with our best shot at gathering as many subject area faculty together as possible. 2-It gives us the opportunity to document the group instruction that is being given. The reporting page will act as further documentation. Ms. Parker is hopeful this opportunity could also be offered at the Spring Welcome Back Day. These events, in combination with a possible assessment week scheduled for spring, should help us get up and running on analysis of SLO assessment and development of related action plans.

Ms. Parker feels that we need to move quickly to prepare for this event. She believes we will have to break out the data, department by department, and put it in some type of easily usable form. We already have a good set of analysis questions to use, but we also need more specific information for handouts and the report form. And finally, we need all SLO Committee members to commit to be actively involved. Mr. Younglove commented that VAPA and PE are urgently in need of help. They may not have as much data entered as other areas on campus, and we may need to customize the process especially for them. We only have 90 minutes to work but it will be the only workshop choice during that time period. It would be a good idea for each group to meet in a computer lab so that what data they come up with is

immediately documented in WEAVE. WEAVE can also work on the Macintosh platform so it would be a good idea to make available a multi-media lab for those people who only know that system. Each area may need some customization, depending upon the data entered by the end of the current cycle. Dr. Gat asked about areas that already have their SLOs done? Ms. Parker stated that they will have to go through their SLO results, figure out how to analyze their data, and then formulate that data into an action plan. There may be some groups with very individualized needs but other groups who have commonalities and can cluster together to work.

The action plan only needs to be very basic and if they do not believe they have enough data yet to state a specific plan, it can simply be stated that more data needs to be collected in the 2011-2012 cycle. Dr. Gat still feels that faculty will need to be given some type of brief overview before being turned loose to figure it out on their own, but we recognize this may take more valuable time away from what must actually be accomplished. Ms. Parker stated that the SLO committee member needs to be very succinct in the overview that they do give. Dr. Hall suggested that since all would be in computer labs, we utilize CCC Confer with one person giving the same overview to all groups. It was also suggested that it be projected on the screen in each lab or that perhaps a podcast could be created. Once direction was given, the faculty would break up into their respective area groups and the SLO committee member would go around the area making themselves available for any questions or help. Dr. Hall suggested that all the small groups (one person programs, for example), work in the same room. The idea is to get faculty to accomplish at least one course from start to finish. This should give them the tools to go back and complete any others needed. Some areas may be able to complete several courses the same day. Mr. Younglove also suggested that the members be assigned to divisions right away so they can start pre-preparing that division ahead. Once summer begins, contact with faculty will become more complicated. Ms. Adams feels that the more you can get done, the better. She would like her whole area to complete theirs in one sitting.

Dr. Gat also had a concern about the faculty point person. Do they all need to be trained during the summer? Ms. Parker feels that what we will require of them is something many have already been doing. The sooner we can assign responsibilities, the more we can get done before semester's end. She stated this will take a lot of work to pull all of this together so that is why we need to start now. Ms. Drake commented that all of this needs to be put in place before the end of the semester since the building shutdowns will be very disruptive this summer. Ms. Parker mentioned that the Flex committee is meeting on April 27 and should have a final answer for us. Dr. Hall just wishes we could have 2 hours instead of 90 minutes. Others requested that the session be done in the morning when people are fresh and there are concerns this meeting will "bleed" into the division meetings in the afternoon. Dr. Hall suggested that we have three levels of completion and competency and tailor our program for each group so we don't start with going directly into what the third group already knows and leave the first group totally lost. Ms. Parker stated that we will not know where all groups stand until the reporting has been done at the end of this semester. This summer she, Mr. Younglove and Mr. Voelcker will need to work together to put many of those pieces together. The committee will need to meet at least once before Welcome Back Day to make sure everyone is on the same page with the program. We just need to make sure that we have the OK from the Flex committee before proceeding with anything. Also we will need to be certain we have the technical bugs worked out and that all computers are turned on and ready for log-in before the faculty arrives. Ms. Parker reminded all SLO committee members that faculty planning and facilitating the process will receive flex credit for presenting.

Ms. Adams also feels that we need to dispel the rumors and false information floating around out there about SLOs. Many of the adjuncts are being led astray with improper information in regard to SLOs and when they do attempt to do an SLO, it can be something completely out in left field. Ms. Drake feels that a number of the SLOs that were initially written during the big push were not realistic and those people are now finding themselves dealing with unrealistic SLOs and assessments. She inform faculty that they will need to revise and improve them in the future but try to work with what they initially wrote for now. Dr. Aviles and Dr. Hall agree that faculty should just “do it” and give us some data for now and we will fix it next time with better and more consistent assessment tools. Mr. Younglove and Mr. Voelcker are both of the opinion that there are some who just keep changing their assessment tool and will go year after year not coming up with any data that is consistent. If we can just get faculty to do the assessments, even if they are not well-written, we can improve them later.

We will concentrate the remaining two meetings of this year on further formulation for this project.

b. Learning Outcomes Updates (May 12 and 27 Planning) - (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker will e-mail members for suggestions.

c. Accreditation Concerns – Strategic Planning - (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker relayed that we have already addressed a lot of these concerns and will continue to do so as we go along.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS – none at this time

10. OTHER –

a. SLO Meeting Dates for Spring – May 9 and 23 – all meetings to be held in A141 unless otherwise notified.

b. FPD events for Spring 2011:

- Learning Outcomes Analysis and Evaluation - Friday, April 29, 1-4 p.m., SSV151
- Learning Outcomes Update - Thursday, May 12, 4-6 p.m., SSV151
- Learning Outcomes Update – Friday, May 27, 7-9 p.m., SSV151

11. ADJOURNMENT – the meeting was adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

pg