

FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee
Tuesday, January 19, 2016
MEETING MINUTES

LOCATION: Administration Building / President's Conference Room (1901)
TIME: 12:30PM – 2:00PM

ITEM	TOPIC
1	Discussion of Committee Charge
2	Proposed Membership + Committee Chairs
3	Moving Forward + Future Discussions

PRESENT: Barbara Shewfelt, Katherine Schaefer, Elaine Kuo, Jennifer Sinclair, Isaac Escoto, Andrew LaManque, Stephanie Tran, Bernie Day, Carolyn Holcroft, Justin Schultz

(1) DISCUSSION OF COMMITTEE CHARGE

Jennifer Sinclair noted that she would like the SLO process to be more about reflective improvement. As of right now, many in the PSME division feel it is just extra work and does not help the faculty impact student success. She likes the idea of having SLO representation at the division-level and welcomes feedback and thoughts from other folks. Barbara Shewfelt echoed Jennifer's statement – faculty in Kinesiology & Athletics want the process to be more outcome-oriented and less task-oriented. She also requested additional TracDat training, specifically with 4-column reports.

Elaine Kuo requested clarification if the focus of the committee is on the curricular SLOs, as the current membership of the committee is very faculty/instruction heavy – she noted that the other piece to consider is the classified staff representation (if the traditional Tri-Chair structure were to be used). Carolyn Holcroft noted that the goal of the committee should be to provide campus leadership regarding Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). She suggested that the proposed membership should be any interested faculty, staff and administrators. It was also noted that there is less impact for classified staff than faculty, as the SLOs are in the classroom, on the C.O.R., etc. Right now, there is not a vehicle at the campus-level to provide an opportunity for institutional dialogue regarding SLOs.

The current (proposed) charge of the SLO Committee is as follows:

- Make recommendations to the Academic Senate and the Office of Instruction in regard to Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) practices, timelines, technologies, and accreditation.
- Plan and facilitate training for faculty on SLOs.
- Make recommendations to the Academic Senate and Office of Instruction about SLO coordination structures.
- Make recommendations to the Academic Senate and Office of Instruction on the use of SLOs in Program Review.

Katherine Schaefer added that having the SLO structure/practices in the form of a handbook would be a helpful resource – she suggested looking at Skyline College as a reference point. In relation to the charge, Carolyn Holcroft noted that the Academic Senate has a role in the SLO instructional area, but that body does not necessarily have the experience to start the discussion – the SLO Committee can instead make recommendations to bring to the Academic Senate.

The timeline for SLO reflections was also clarified – everything should be considered within a 3-year cycle. If an individual department would like to assess their SLOs more frequently, that is fine, but by the time a comprehensive program review comes around, that department should have reflections for every SLO for every course that is taught (within that 3 year cycle).

(2) PROPOSED MEMBERSHIP + COMMITTEE CHAIRS

The logistics of running and chairing the committee were discussed. A reminder was given to those present of the traditional tri-chair leadership structure used by many of committees, specifically that the tri-chairs lead the discussions and track key information to present back to the Senates and PaRC; these tri-chairs must also present the concerns of the constituent groups they represent.

A desire was expressed to have additional classified staff representation on the committee, even though this committee is a formation of the Academic Senate. (the committee charge came out of Academic Senate). It was also noted that there is a lack of representation from the Fine Arts & Communication instructional division. It was suggested that the committee reach out to Classified Senate to see if classified staff involvement is a key issue. As such, a co-chair (faculty + admin) structure was also proposed.

An addition to the proposed charge was also suggested, specifically “*act as a liaison to classified staff and administrators regarding their SLO processes*”. This would address the fact that SA-SLOs and AU-SLOs must also be considered, not only instructional CL-SLOs and PL-SLOs.

(3) MOVING FORWARD + FUTURE DISCUSSIONS

Jennifer Sinclair noted that planning and training must first take place within the committee before going out and making recommendations (or training) others – train the trainers first!

Several suggestions were made for future discussions / considerations:

- How do we get some training / professional development first?
- What are our colleagues at De Anza College doing?
- It might be valuable to bring in someone from the outside (or consider external reference sources).
- Development of a training or reference manual.
- Development / revision of a TracDat user guide (especially with V5.0 coming ...)

It was noted that departments/divisions are currently having a tough time with the program-level student learning outcomes (PL-SLOs) – this is a potential area for further training. The disaggregated data piece is another discussion item – how do we approach this at the campus-level? It was noted that there is currently no official approval process for SLOs, but the ACCJC standards suggest that there should be higher-level discussions of SLOs (possibly at the division-level?) – do they support a reflective practice approach?

Planning items for the next meeting:

- February 2016 meeting calendaring; meetings 1x per month (1 hour, 30 min)
- Brief the Classified Senate; request input.
- Co-Chair discussion / nominations.
- Discussion of the IL-SLOs (institutional-level student learning outcomes)