

# SLO Committee Minutes

10/24/2016 12:30 – 2:00, Room 4402

In attendance: Jennifer Sinclair, Stan Baldwin, Enjoli Flynn, Isaac Escoto, Fatima Jinnah, Katherine Schaefer, Ruby Sodhi, Carolyn Holcroft.

Minutes were reviewed, including one submitted change and were approved by consensus.

Enjoli brought up a question about deadlines. Currently, for assessments done during one quarter, the “deadline” for entering into TracDat is the end of Week 3 of the next quarter. This provides a little structure for faculty and gives the Office of Instruction some parameters to consider when running reports and updating software. Oftentimes, there is no one beyond the department and the SLO coordinator who would “see” that the deadline was met. So some consider this a “soft” deadline. What’s the “hard deadline?” Program Review is the hard deadline. SLOs and their assessment and reflection must be printed out for Program Review during each fall quarter. The report that is run is called the 4-Column Report. If any SLO Coordinator has trouble running this report, they can get help from either another coordinator or from Justin Schultz.

SLO Coordinators and each division/department have the freedom to do what “makes sense” for them with regards to schedule. For example, math has chosen 3 themes to be considered over 3 years in all classes. English has chosen a different block of classes to consider each year. This customization became possible when the Academic Senate advocated for more faculty freedom in an attempt to reestablish the usefulness of the SLO Assessment Cycle as a tool for reflective improvement. Prior to Spring 2014, there was only one “Plan” for assessment: Assess EVERY SLO in EVERY section of EVERY class at least one quarter out of the year. This treadmill proved to be the opposite of helpful. Faculty felt like they were wearing themselves out doing busy work. Some departments may still be using that model—either because it works for them or because they haven’t realized that the Academic Senate fought for their right to do what makes sense.

1. Jennifer gave a presentation, “A New Beginning.” Coordinators reflected on their knowledge and feelings related to SLOs. Jennifer pointed to some resources pertaining to 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning and connected this notion of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning to our ILOs. She also pointed to a few related take-aways gleaned from Professional Development offerings this last year.
  - a. Committee member agreed that SLOs provide a certain standard for learning. “What do we want students to learn/do?”
  - b. Some members expressed liking focused conversation about assessment. Others felt that SLOs provide structure and possibly consistency. Others thought SLO work sometimes feels like a bothersome, bureaucratic process that takes time.
  - c. **Suggestions for improvement:**
    - i. **Introduce the SLO process to all new faculty as a regular thing that’s part of our work.**

- ii. Find a way to incorporate student voice into assessment. We would like more information about Assessment Design. What makes for good assessment?
- 2. There is much work that we are asked to consider: ILO assessment, **PLO assessment (start here)**, Moving beyond compliancy, GELOs, and Equity-minded SLOs. Committee members shared barriers to this work and resources needed before further progress could be made.
  - a. The notion of “Reframing” was identified as an important step. How can we reframe what we’re doing to focus less on the bureaucratic process and more on dialogue surrounding teaching and learning. Such a reframing likely needs to be accompanied by time and professional development.
  - b. Time was a big barrier, related to the reframing, above. Serious, important work requires serious time. How can we carve out time?
  - c. One resource request that was identified immediately was research staff. Coordinators shared that getting data and help with surveys was a really big deal. Requests are often deflected, presumably due to inadequate staffing.
- 3. **ACTION ITEM:** Committee members will read the “SLO Handbook Section 1<sup>st</sup> Read” (in meeting invite...click on event in calendar) to provide feedback and ideas for additional Chapters next meeting. The Table of Contents and Big Picture writing was a result of Katherine and Jennifer’s collaborative work last year. All aspects of this work are wide-open for suggestions and improvements...what we have so far is just a starting point. NOTE: ENJOLI’s question, above is good material for the Chapter on Rules and Dates. We especially need the newest SLO Coordinators to bring their fresh eyes to this work...if they need to learn it, then it should probably be in the handbook.
  - a. **Immediate Feedback:** Include a section on Service Area Outcomes. Use Ruby’s presentation as a starting point and perhaps through personal reflection, articulate the important parts in a Chapter and include a link to the presentation.
- 4. The committee talked about whether we should ask programs to submit a written description of their of 3 year plans
  - a. We believe that they are currently required to share/comment on it during a comprehensive review.
  - b. Our concern is that when that comprehensive review comes along, there might be some program that finds itself unprepared. But on the flip side, faculty have little tolerance

for change, especially related to the bureaucracy of SLOs. Those coordinators who have served for at least 1 year agree that asking programs to submit something at this point is probably not worth it.

- c. Once we get infrastructure in place for PD/Genuine dialogue, articulation of 3 year plan could be more meaningful.

Request was made to meet in smaller conference room, 4409 next time, as the air conditioning blew uncomfortably in 4402.