



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEETING**

April 26, 2010

3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. A141

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
2. **OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SLO COMMITTEE CHAIR**
3. **OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. April 12, 2010
5. **PRESENTATION - None**
6. **REPORTS**
 - a. Office of Institutional Research and Planning (Ted Younglove/Aaron Voelcker)
 - b. SLO Form Signature/Privacy issue(Melanie Parker)
7. **ACTION ITEMS**
 - a. Acknowledgement of revised SLOs for BUS 105, ENGL 111, 112, 113, 211 and 212
8. **DISCUSSION –**
 - a. PLOs for certificates and degrees
 - b. Assessing our needs and next steps – Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness Part III
9. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS - none**
10. **OTHER**
 - a. Remaining SLO Meetings (all in A41) –5/10, 5/24
 - b. Title V sponsored webinar – “The Keys to a Culture of Assessment: Value and Respect”. This webinar will be offered on May 19, 20, 21 and 24 and will last 90 minutes. The window to view it on any computer on the AVC campus is from 12:00 a.m. to 11:59 p.m. each day. It will not be accessible from any home computer or during the interim weekend. A link will be forwarded to the college just before the event. Any faculty member who views this webinar will receive Std. 1 flex credit.
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 26, 2010

Room A141, 3:00 – 4:30 PM

Members Present	Members Absent	Guests in Attendance
Melanie Parker	Michelle Hernandez	Ms. Sharon Lowry
Dr. Bassam Salameh	Kim Covell	Mr. Christos Valiotis
Dr. Irit Gat	Maggie Drake	
Ted Younglove	Dr. Rosa Hall	
Yvette Cruzalegui		
Patricia Marquez		
Dr. Fredy Aviles		
Rick Motawakel		
Aaron Voelcker		

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Ms. Melanie Parker, co-chair of the SLO Committee, called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

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

Ms. Parker gave thanks to the SLO secretary for creating spreadsheets to do inputting of WEAVE facilitators and for inputting PLOs for Tech Ed. She also thanked the volunteers helping with the May 7th Learning Outcomes Update. She thanked Dr. Gat for the amazing door prizes procured for that event.

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – No public comments.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – The minutes of the March 22, 2010 were presented for approval. Corrections were brought forth by Ms. Marquez on Item 8a. On the fourth line, Statewide should be replaced with AVC College. On the fourteenth line, Marques should be replaced with Marquez. On the twentieth line, committee should be replaced with commission. These corrections will be incorporated into the minutes. Ms. Parker requested a motion to approve the minutes. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as corrected. With no further discussion or corrections, the minutes were approved.

5. PRESENTATION – No presentations.

6. REPORTS

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

– Mr. Younglove stated that he has created a one-page handout that will be going out to the Deans today to let them know about WEAVE week and who should be attending.

These attendees need to get their name into Aaron Voelcker by May 13th so he is able to get them into the WEAVE system. Mr. Younglove went to a conference on SLOs and PLOs, which included other colleges, and the consensus is that they all feel they are not in adequate shape to meet the 2012 deadline. Ms. Lowry reminded Ted that the Ed Master Plan needs to be up-to-date by the 2012 deadline. Mr. Younglove is forwarding to all divisions information on updating their respective areas so they are in compliance with the standards. They need to relay that they will be at that particular level when the deadline arrives. Ms. Lowry suggested that a copy of this be included with the next meeting minutes so every member can view it in actual print.

b. SLO Form Signature Privacy Issue (Melanie Parker) – Since this came to our attention at a previous meeting and after discussion with Melissa Jauregui in Academic Affairs, SLOs already posted will have signature electronically whited out. This should be accomplished by the end of the semester. All new SLO documents will have signature removed before posting. The original signature copy will continue to be filed with its respective COR in Academic Affairs.

Once we have a completed full cycle in WEAVE, we should be able to post a time-stamped report that contains all courses and their SLOs. Mr. Valiotis mentioned it would also be a good idea to transfer this report onto the public website for better accessibility.

7. ACTION ITEMS –

a. Acknowledgement of revised SLOs for BUS 105, ENGL 111, 112, 113, 211 and 212 – Ms. Parker requested a motion to acknowledge the listed revised SLOs. A motion was made and seconded to acknowledge them. The motion was approved.

8. DISCUSSION

a. Discussion regarding awareness of accreditation standards on SLOs and what evaluators will be considering (Ms. Sharon Lowry) – Ms. Lowry referred the committee members to an excerpt from the “Guide to Evaluating Institutions” by WASC, dated August 2009. This document is given to each of the site evaluators. She is referring to the Standard IIA - “Questions to Use in Institutional Evaluation for Standard IIA”. Under Item 6, she wished to point out to the members that in the last sentence of the paragraph, the word outcomes has been changed from objectives. This again gives emphasis on outcomes. She then relayed to the members that the three bullets listed are going to be questions that the evaluators will ask when they come. Under bullet number 2, it is asking the institution how they verify that students receive a course syllabus that “includes” student learning outcomes. Any other way to relay SLOs to students, either through posting them on a wall or giving them a website link, would not be considered to be “including” them with the course syllabus. Ms. Lowry stated that we must be in compliance with this statement and at this time, we would not be in compliance with this requirement.

It was stated by Ms. Marquez that faculty have been directed to include them with the course syllabus in whatever fashion they would like to do so. But how do we verify that students receive their syllabus and, thusly, the SLOs? ~~The college does a survey to ascertain from the students that they did, indeed, receive their course syllabus within the required time limit (the first week of the course).~~ The college requires that the students receive their course syllabus within the required time limit (the first week of the course). Mr. Valiotis also stated that if you do your assessment, this shows verification that the students have knowledge of the SLOs.

Mr. Valiotis stated to the committee that he does not feel it is a requirement of their duty to establish the rules regarding the way SLOs are imparted to the student at the beginning of the course. The committee should be concentrating their efforts on seeing that SLOs, PLOs, ILOs and assessments are done and entered into WEAVE so we can get to the point of actually running reports. Ms. Marquez and Ms. Lowry stated that it is the obligation of the SLO Committee to ~~dictate~~ recommend the way SLOs are to be given to students. Once this is decided, the decision should be forwarded to the Academic Senate and then ~~to the~~ inform the AP&P Committee. Ms. Lowry states that faculty should not be given choices – they needed more consistency. She does not feel this as an issue of academic freedom. You set out the requirement that the specific SLO should be “included” within the framework of the syllabus. She reminded the committee we must keep in mind that not all students in our courses are on the same academic level. Faculty must remember they need to explain and discuss the SLOs at the level where all students understand.

Ms. Parker will compile the substance of what was discussed by the committee and then forward to all members for review. Once this is finalized and approved by the SLO Committee, we will forward it to the Senate.

b. (Melanie Parker) – PLOs for certificates and degrees (Melanie Parker) – Ms. Parker reminded members that we had determined Counseling should establish the PLOs in all general education areas. Christos Valiotis mentioned that we must be careful that general education PLOs do not conflict with ILOs. He mentioned there may be plans to change the ILOs so they are more measureable. Christos mentioned that we previously decided to divide general education into three programs: the general ed, the transfer program and the vocational program. There are no real guidelines on how to go about this. Ms. Parker thought we could have Counseling take a broad look at the general education requirements and discipline faculty set outcomes and assessment for their majors and certificates.

Christos asked how Counseling might go about this? Ms. Marquez replied that they could do the sections A-F, and possibly create 1-2 PLOs for each. Ms. Marquez indicated that anyone who gets a degree from AVC, would all be operating under the same outcomes in Areas A-F, since they are required to graduate. Christos queried how do you measure the general education PLOs? Ms. Parker replied that at this point we do not know. She has looked at a number of other colleges and some do not have measurements specified, they are just stating what their outcomes are. This is something we need to decide very soon because the people in our divisions are very confused. Once a decision is made on how to establish PLOs, they can move forward. Christos asked the committee if we consider every area that has a degree and certificate a program. And does every program need PLOs? Ms. Parker replied we are using that definition for programs, from the Chancellor’s Office, and that all programs identified by that definition will need to establish PLOs. AVC has accepted this as the course we should follow.

Ms. Parker mentioned Diablo College as an example we may want to look at. They have five outcomes for those students who are getting a transfer degree to a CSU college. They have seven outcomes for IGETC. She read to the committee the outcomes of the section (if interested, please go to their website). Ms. Marquez then stated that if they have met this on the Ed Plan for the IGETC, then they have fulfilled their requirement.

Ms. Parker mentioned a college that is doing a portfolio. They have five general ed learning outcomes. She also pointed out from Golden West College the requirements for their liberal arts degree.

Christos stated that we offer about 66 degrees/certificates and we must get the information out to faculty on how they should get together and write the specific program outcomes for their area. A few groups, such as TechEd and Health Sciences, are done writing PLOs, but we need to get the rest of campus moving so we can show more progress. Christos brought up the problem that if you have ten students in a particular degree or certificate program, they may only have taken one or two classes in common. Then how do you assess that? Ms. Marquez stated that the students who have done the course work and attained it have satisfied the requirements. SLOs are measuring each specific course so if the students are finished with those same common courses, then you can gather that information for assessment of PLOs. However, Christos indicated that Accreditation required unique assessments for PLOs. How do you go about getting those? You also need to uniquely assess the ILOs. You cannot assume that if students met the SLOs that they have also met the PLOs. Christos feels that we need to create a system for curriculum mapping as soon as possible. This would be a tool that demonstrates what we are working towards. Even if it does not agree with that direction, at least we can show them that we are in the process of figuring out what works for us and beginning to evaluate program learning outcomes. We did this with the SLOs but there are not guidelines anywhere to show how to do the PLOs. We are doing this as best we can to conform to the requirements set forth. We are handicapped because more institutions (in other areas of the country) call their SLOs PLOs, so we do not know how to assess our PLOs since we already assessed our SLOs in conformance with how they did their PLOs. We have no guideline to figure this out. Ms. Parker suggested that we have faculty assess the required courses in a certificate program and take that information as the PLO.

Ms. Parker also mentioned using Capstone courses. Mr. Valiotis stated that when you take the number of degrees that we awarded last year divided by the number of degrees we offer, you end up with about 20 students per degree and when you compare those students, you would probably only end up with maybe one or two common courses. So how do you assess such a small percentage? And then you have to wait for their final grades before you can attempt to do your assessment. Christos feels that if we show a direct correlation between student learning outcomes and program learning outcomes, we have taken a big step towards what Accreditation is looking for. The SLO Committee needs to decide who will write the overarching PLOs and who will write the PLOs for the courses in each program and determine that they meet either the ILO or the PLO requirement. We can try and show that the student learning level is tied into the program learning level. We do not have time to figure out another process to satisfy what Accreditation is looking for.

Ms. Marquez asked if Counseling should do all of the PLOs for the gen ed for the Associates Degree, IGETC and the requirements for CSU/UC? Ms. Parker relayed that we have no decision on that yet. Christos feels that it would be a good idea for that to be presented to counseling faculty. He feels that the committee should direct their attention and time to leading the way for the faculty. As far as the ILOs, six are written for general education programs. If you wrote a PLO for each of those, maybe you are done. For the rest of the degree and certificate courses, we can connect the SLOs to the PLOs. Due to

the fact that we need to show progress, the committee should come up with a time line for establishing PLOs. Ted Younglove will come up with further information on assessment from other colleges and forward it to the committee. The bottom line comes down to interpretation and how the accreditation team will view what we have done.

Finally, Mr. Valiotis encouraged all members to review the Standard II of the Accreditation self-study and recommend any issues or changes. Hopefully, many more of the PLOs will come in as soon as this academic cycle completes. An e-mail has already been sent out to the faculty letting them know that this is the last chance to report before the next visit. Mr. Younglove is working with the ILOs and will forward that information to the committee also.

Ms. Parker reflected on what had been discussed. She stated that all members feel that Counseling should take responsibility for establishing PLOs for Areas A-F. For the areas of option or major (depending on what it is called for that particular degree or certificate), faculty in those areas would be the ones to establish the PLOs. We do still need to think about how PLOs will be assessed but perhaps curriculum mapping will help us do that. We just need to wait and see how mapping will be handled in WEAVE. The question came up about how many PLOs should be done for Areas A-F? It was determined by Ms. Marquez that they would combine the areas and do three PLOs as a minimum for A-F. But would they also do the assessing? Mr. Younglove feels that once we get the process going, there would be a way to figure this out. Ms. Parker raised the possibility of students completing a self-assessment when applying for graduation. A survey could be attached to their application and turned in with their graduation application. This might be a step in the assessment process. Ms. Parker will contact Deans about what is needed for the subject areas and she will review the certificates and degrees to assess our PLO needs.

c. Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness – Part III/Assessment of our needs and next steps (Melanie Parker) – Due to time limitations Ms. Parker decided to place this item on the next agenda (May 10, 2010) for discussion.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS - none

10. OTHER –

a. Remaining SLO Meetings (all in A141) –5/10, 5/24

b. Title V sponsored webinar during WEAVE Week (The Keys to a Culture of Assessment) – Ms. Parker stated that Standard 1 credit will be given for listening to this 90 minute webinar. It will be available on any campus computer starting on May 19 and continuing until 11:59 p.m. on May 21. It will again be available from 12:01 a.m. to 11:59 p.m. on Monday, May 24.

c. WEAVE Week, May 17 through 21, 2010 – put this on your calendars and try to be there to assist as your schedule allows.

d. Ms. Parker read a very negative statement from the Monterey Peninsula college SLO website. It was a statement written on behalf of the English department and put down everything that had to do with SLOs, PLOs, assessment and the whole accreditation process. Ms. Parker used it as an example of what we do not want to happen and stated she feels that our goal is to cultivate ownership in this process. She reminded the committee we are all learning as we work through the issues.

11. ADJOURNMENT – the meeting was adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

pag