ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING
May 23, 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. May 9, 2011

5. **PRESENTATION -** None

6. **REPORTS**
   a. Updates from Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)
   b. Report from SLO 5/13 Strategy Session (Melanie Parker)

7. **ACTION ITEMS** –
   a. PLOs for approval: Electronics Technology
   b. New PLOs for approval: Environmental Horticulture; Grounds Maintenance; Landscape Construction; Management; Marketing; Real Estate; Small Business Management; Computer Applications; Computer Networking Core and Multi-Platform

8. **DISCUSSION –**
   a. Fall Welcome Back Proposal and Planning - (Melanie Parker)
   b. Strategic Planning – (Melanie Parker)

9. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS -** none

10. **OTHER**
    a. SLO Committee Faculty Professional Development Events for Spring 2011
    - Learning Outcomes Update – Friday, May 27, 7-9 p.m., SSV151
    - WEAVE Data Days – Wednesday, June 8 and Thursday, June 9, 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. and 1:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m., BE310
    b. 2011-2012 SLO Committee meeting dates: September 12 and 26, October 10 and 24, November14 and 28, February 13 and 27, March 12 and 26, April 9 and 23, May 14 and 28
    c. Pre-Welcome Back Day meeting TBA for summer

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME COMMITTEE MEETING
May 23, 2011
Room A141, 3:00 – 4:30 PM

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
   Ms. Melanie Parker, co-chair of the SLO Committee, called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

2. **OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SLO COMMITTEE CHAIR (MELANIE PARKER)**
   Ms. Parker requested that members check to see what their vacation schedules are so a meeting can be planned during the summer months. She will be contacting the committee by e-mail to set two summer meeting dates. Both Mr. Younglove and Mr. Voelcker have been compiling SLO data to be submitted to ACCJC and we believe that the numbers being submitted accurately reflect our progress. Since ACCJC needs this information before our year end data has been collected, there is reason to believe our rates will improve. To address these issues for next year, she will be working with Mr. Younglove and Mr. Voelcker to establish a different cycle of assessment for 2011-2012.

   Ms. Parker commented that approximately 60% of our PLOs have been written. In a few areas PLOs are already being assessed. Many thanks go to Ms. Adams for pushing through the business and computer PLOs from her division. Ms. Parker also met with Tooraj Gordi on math, Mark Hoffer on English, and has had contact with faculty in physical science. Remaining PLOs need to be submitted to the committee by September 30, 2011. All areas need to begin PLO assessment by the end of fall semester. This will be incorporated into the SLO Guidelines for 2011-2012.

   Ms. Parker commented that on June 15 at 1:00 p.m., Mr. Voelcker and others will begin doing a preliminary review of SLO data from this year. Anyone who wishes to join in will be welcome. She will procure a computer lab to meet in so each person will have access to a computer to look at data, if numbers warrant. Ms. Parker has jury duty that week so hopefully she can attend.

   Ms. Parker has received additional PLOs since the agenda was created and sent out. She asked to add them to today's list of action items. She will go through the mapping and assessment cycles herself to make sure they are correct so there will be no need to do them today. She would like to add the following: Administrative Medical Assistant, Biology, Business Computer Information Science, Computer Software Developer, Fire Academy, and Office Specialist.

She requested a motion be made to add these to the agenda. A motion and a second were forthcoming and with no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously.

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

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   Ms. Parker asked for any corrections to the minutes of May 9, 2011. With none forthcoming, Ms. Parker asked for a motion to approve the minutes. A motion was made and seconded to approve the 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 reported that he is still training people on WEAVE and the volume has increased. He indicated that most are from VAPA and PE. Mr. Younglove mentioned that he is leaning on those deans who do not have any PLOS written and also plans to attend division meetings to let them know the timelines that have been decided. Since we are late in the semester, this information may not be communicated fully until fall semester. In that regard, an e-mail will be crafted from Dr. Fisher, Ms. Parker and himself to the entire campus, operational areas included. This will include the 2011-2012 timeline. He will also be in contact with the divisions once they return in August. From now to 2012, everyone needs to be aware and involved in the process.

   Mr. Younglove mentioned that he learned of a computer program used by Mt. San Jacinto College whereby you can write a script and it will generate cartoons with characters which tell a story. He wants to create one that involves the researcher talking to the recalcitrant faculty member about SLOs, PLOs and the assessment process. He was going to try to do it in a humorous way. He received an e-mail from Mt. San Jacinto which used a different approach to the same problem. It basically has cartoon characters talking about SLOs and assessment and how it ties into the budget.

   Ms. Parker also wanted to mention to the members that Mr. Valiotis, Ms. Lowry, Mr. Tafarella and herself held an SLO strategy session on May 13. Unfortunately, neither Mr. Younglove nor Mr. Voelcker could attend. Several ideas were discussed that might ensure data is being submitted. One idea was to put a form into each faculty member's mail box for them to fill out with their data and then turn it in. It was apparent that this would require someone (like Mr. Voelcker) to input data. After thinking it over, it was decided that the responsibility needs to reside with the faculty to input their data and not with Institutional Research. It is now time to hold each one accountable and not hold their hands anymore. It would still be acceptable to come to the SLO Data Days with their data and receive help as they input it. We are taking a big chance on this in that we will depend on all faculty to comply. With the crunch coming, it may seem simpler to just do it ourselves but that will not move the process forward in the long run. We need to step back, support incentives to faculty in this process, and encourage personal responsibility for this obligation. Dr. Gat suggested that a flyer be made to let all know who facilitators are, but Mr. Voelcker mentioned that the system isn't that clear cut. He stated that there are many more adjuncts now participating and it could overwhelm just one facilitator. Facilitators may also change from semester to semester as more people participate in the process.

A timeline needs to be instituted so we can accomplish what needs to be done before the report time frame is upon us. Our Accreditation report is due to ACCJC in October 2012. They must have it at least 60 days in advance. Prior to that, it must go to the Board of Directors, first as an information item and then as a communication item. That means it needs to go to the July board meeting at latest. It needs to be approved by the Academic Senate and be available for campus comment before that date. This means we need a revised deadline for faculty to collect and enter data before June 2012. In other words, we need as much of the information entered into WEAVE by the end of Fall 2011 as possible.

Additionally, Mr. Tafarella spoke with a member of ACCJC who stated that we should be ready to provide evidence of where we are in assessment, as well as our analysis of data, etc. We also need to show evidence that our faculty areas are tackling specific issues when they meet, document their discussions, and record what decisions were arrived at. Mr. Tafarella emphasized that we need to demonstrate we are an integrated and effective institution, meaning that loops are closed, we have wide spread participation, the left hand knows what the right is doing, etc. The ACCJC SLO rubric changed slightly and we need to keep an eye open for that new document and to make sure we are following it. Dr. Aviles feels that the assessment will be up to speed but all of the others requirements will not be accomplished by the due date. Ms. Parker and Mr. Youngblood are adamant that we be able to show we are "closing the loop."

Ms. Parker stated that we must be able to demonstrate campus wide discussion, data documented in WEAVE, and how action plans are formulated to continue the process. Faculty must be shown how this is tied to planning and budget, even though money may not be in the picture right at the moment. She hopes all members are in agreement with this and believes it is the right direction to go. Dr. Aviles asked where we stood in regard to percent of assessments done. Mr. Voelcker stated that after he assesses the information in June we should be at approximately 66%; we still need to be 100% by June 2012. Ms. Parker reiterated that it is not just the fact that we have the information in WEAVE but that we are also using it, which means we are closing the loop. Dr. Aviles mentioned that an e-mail should be sent out to faculty that they request their facilitators complete the action plans. Ms. Parker stated there is not enough information by the middle of June to formulate an action plan. This could be incorporated into the timeline at a more appropriate time. A date could be set for both fall and spring semesters. We just need to understand that we can't forget it once summer starts. Ms. Adams had a question regarding who will enter PLO data. Faculty WEAVE Facilitators would be responsible to do this in the same way they enter SLO data.

7. **ACTION ITEMS –**
   a. **PLOs for Approval:**
      - **Electronics Technology –** Ms. Parker stated that all corrections requested by the committee had been done by Mr. Motawakel. All of the "ands" had been changed to "ors" and one was removed due to duplication. Ms. Parker requested a motion from the committee to approve this PLO. A motion and a second were forthcoming and with no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously.

   b. **New PLOs for approval:** Ms. Parker stated that she goes over each of the curriculum maps to make sure they have been done correctly according to the requirements in the catalog but has found some difficulties in regard to revisions that have been posted since the time it was produced. She also looks at the assessment cycles to make sure they look appropriate. A blanket approval of those being accepted will be made after the last PLO. A list of those needing to be returned will also be enumerated.
      - **Administrative Medical Assistant –** one clarification stated by Ms. Adams in PLO#4 is that "writing", as opposed to typing, is the correct terminology.

- **Biology –** Dr. Gat questioned the last line in the assessment method of PLO#5. Dr. Salameh explained of the dangerous infectious organisms that can be present in the lab. Each student must pass line-for-line each section of the safety methods and laboratory equipment test. If they do not pass the first time, they will be required to study again and take the test a second time. The question was posed if this data was going to be included in the PLO. Dr. Salameh stated that this was going to be the first time it would be. Dr. Gat felt that you would then be acquiring two sets of data which would then make it inaccurate. Ms. Adams felt that the last sentence in the assessment method should be eliminated as students do not meet PLOs, programs do. It was agreed that this was correct and the last sentence would be taken out. Also, it was determined that the "100%" should also be taken out of the first line as it is redundant. Dr. Salameh will make these corrections, have Dr. Uhazy sign and return to Ms. Parker.
- **Business Computer Information Science –** Dr. Gat had questions about the various courses listed in the assessment method and if it was assumed that an "or" was between each on. Also, that all adjuncts knew what the particular assignments were for each course. It was pointed out that the first "and" should be taken out of PLO#2 and a "period" at the end of PLO#1.
- **Computer Applications –** Dr. Aviles had a question on PLO#1 of how you would apply multiple choice questions to identification of computer components. It was explained that they have an established tool to do this. Another question came up about explaining their purpose. It would also be solved with an established tool. Dr. Gat had questions about the projects and if they would be following the same rubric. Ms. Adams stated that the full-time faculty would be getting the adjunct onboard as to this rubric.
- **Computer Networking Core & Multi-Platform –** Dr. Aviles questioned about the two assessment methods in PLO#1 referring to a written exam and a hands-on demo. How is each weighed? It was explained that the percentage would be taken from each and then blended together for one score. The next query was about the "and/or" in assessment method #2. Clarification will be asked of Dr. Beyer on this one.
- **Computer Software Developer –** First, Ms. Parker pointed out that there is no faculty name on this one. Ms. Adams felt that is was probably Ron Mummaw. It was pointed out the he used the extra "and" in PLOs #1 and 2. It was decided to go ahead and make the correction.
- **Environmental Horticulture (Certificate and Degree) –** it was agreed by all that there were too many PLOs and many could be consolidated. Ms. Adams pointed out that each of these PLOs was assessed in different classes. Dr. Gat felt that they seemed more like SLOs. Mr. Voelcker and Dr. Aviles felt that if you just changed the wording that a number of these could be combined. Ms. Parker pointed out that there are 16 agriculture courses listed for the program plus one biology, one business, and one management. She pointed out that they are looking at many different things. But are they over-arching enough? Most felt that it was an unusual case and perhaps let the faculty member try his hand at it. Dr. Aviles did point out on PLO#1 on how you would identify, install and maintain fruit trees. There needed to be a process explained with the words "how to" installed. It was decided to ask for more clarification.
- **Fire Academy –** Ms. Parker noted a spelling correction in PLO#2. Dr. Aviles had questions about PLO#3 then received explanation. There were no other concerns.
- **Grounds Maintenance (Certificate) –** A question arose on the same word, "propagate," in PLO#1. Once read again, all seemed to agree that it was OK.
- **Landscape Construction –** This program contains 13 PLOs. The question arose again on consolidation. Since this is a very specific and hands-on program, it appears to need this many. Ms. Parker pointed out that one program has 51 units and the other has 69.

Mr. Younglove pointed out that the Chancellor's Office is considering an 80 unit maximum and installing penalties such as registering late, so if you added just a few courses outside of the program you would be over this limit. There is one grammatical error on PLO#13 to take out the second "and." It was deemed to again let the faculty member try his hand at this one.

- **Management** – Dr. Salameh asked if they needed to state whether assessment would be objective or subjective. Dr. Aviles stated that essays and projects can always be a little subjective, just so long as they stay consistent across instructors. There were no other concerns expressed.
- **Marketing** – There were no concerns expressed.
- **Office Specialist** – Dr. Aviles stated that PLO#2 seems to be a little vague. Ms. Adams stated that the word "writing" or "keyboarding" is what needs to be inserted but it was agreed that it be returned to the faculty member for clarification.
- **Real Estate** – Dr. Aviles felt that the word "explain" should possibly be replaced with "identify." It will be returned to the faculty member for clarification.
- **Small Business Management** – There were no concerns expressed.

Ms. Parker asked for a motion to approve the following PLOs: Administrative Medical Assistant, Business Computer Information Science, Computer Application, Computer Software Developer, Fire Academy, Grounds Maintenance, Landscape Construction Certificate and Degree, Management, Marketing, and Small Business Management. A motion was made and seconded to approve the listed PLOs and with no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously.

As a point of issue, the following are the PLOs that are being returned for clarification and correction: Biology, Computer Networking Core and Multi-Platform, Environmental Horticulture Certificate and Degree, Office Specialist, and Real Estate. Ms. Parker will communicate this with the respective faculty members.

8. **DISCUSSION**
   a. **Fall Welcome Back Proposal and Planning – (Melanie Parker)**
   Ms. Parker shared a set of sample questions that can be used when discussing SLOs and writing Action plans. Faculty who are going to be analyzing data may need to keep in mind that we are not only looking for statistical data. We may want to provide such a handout at Welcome Back Day. Ms. Parker will be communicating with committee members before the semester is over in order to set meeting dates for this summer.

   Dr. Salameh asked how to be "polite" to faculty members who don't seem to care about this process. Ms. Parker explained some of the things he missed at the beginning of the meeting. Those are: Mr. Younglove will be reminding deans what needs to be accomplished in the coming year and also that Mr. Younglove will be crafting an e-mail that will come from Dr. Fisher and the SLO Committee stating what are the things that need to be done and in what time frame. Ms. Parker knows that we cannot get 100% of faculty onboard but, hopefully, this will encourage more people to join in. Once they know the deadlines and what it means for accreditation for the college, we hope they will see the merit in joining in. We have to understand that all we can do is tell them what needs to be done in the process, but we cannot force them nor be the PLO/Assessment police force. Mr. Younglove made a comment that he believes some faculty will still fake the data. Ms. Adams asked if she found some data that she knew to be wrong, what she should do. He stated that if you feel that it is so far out of the realm of being believable, then you could drop it. Mr. Younglove stated that if it is only one person doing a course and this is what they put down, then you

are stuck. But if it is a group of people who are assessing several sections of one course and one is totally out of line, then you could feel free to drop that one.

b. **Strategic Planning - (Melanie Parker) – The meeting ended without any further discussion on this subject.** 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 Fall 2011 –** September 12 and 26, October 10 and 24, November 14 and 28. All meetings to be held in A141 unless otherwise notified. The meetings will be from 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.

   b. **SLO Meeting Dates for Spring 2012 –** February 13 and 27, March 12 and 26, April 9 and 23, May 14. The second meeting of May lands on Memorial Day. Ms. Parker will probably schedule a different day to meet to finish the year. Room and meeting times remain the same.

11. ADJOURNMENT – the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

pg