RESOLUTION 1: Support for Faculty Primacy in the Use of SLOs to Improve Student Learning

Whereas, the members of the Foothill College community are dedicated to the achievement of learning and to the success of our students;

Whereas, the cycle of SLO assessment empowers faculty to try new pedagogical approaches to explore both what works and what does not work, and encourages meaningful collegial dialogue about improvement of student learning;

Whereas, SLOs are intended to target deep learning beyond content alone and as such have the potential to stimulate both faculty and students to consider beneficial lifelong skills, values and behaviors that may be gained from a college education; and,

Whereas, The 2002 ACCJC accreditation standards require that colleges incorporate measurable student learning outcomes at the course, program and institutional level;

Resolved, the Foothill College Academic Senate supports the development and utilization of processes that honor faculty primacy in the identification and assessment of SLOs and that seek to utilize SLOs to their greatest potential in fostering student success.

RESOLUTION 2: SLOs on Course Syllabi

Whereas, when placed on the course syllabus, SLOs are made transparent to students and can prompt students to consider their own learning; and

Whereas, course-level SLOs are aligned with program and institutional-level learning outcomes and as such articulate a clear vision for student learning to the students;

Whereas, many students experience an increased motivation to learn when they have a clear understanding of how a course is going to benefit them in the long term;

Whereas, the 2002 ACCJC accreditation standards require that "in every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning outcomes consistent with those in the institution's officially approved course outline,"

Resolved, the Foothill College Academic Senate strongly encourages faculty to place SLOs on their course syllabus.

RESOLUTION 3: Opposition to Using SLOs in Faculty Evaluation

Whereas, Campus visiting teams for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) have offered conflicting interpretations of Accreditation

Standard III.A.1.c, leading to some team recommendations that the attainment of student learning outcomes should be included in individual faculty evaluations;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in its 2004 paper, The 2002 Accreditation Standards: Implementation, has stated its opposition to the use of SLOs as a basis for faculty evaluation, noting the potentially negative impact on evaluation as a collegial peer process, on academic freedom, and on local bargaining authority;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges noted in the same paper that "in the event that SLOs data is collected and aggregated, it must be without reference to specific classes, students and its instructors"; and

Whereas, The differing interpretations of Standard III.A.1.c by visiting teams have caused confusion, uncertainty, and anxiety on the part of faculty at colleges that have received team recommendations that appear to conflict with stated positions of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, with previous understanding of the standard, and with the ACCJC's stated respect for academic freedom;

Resolved, That the Foothill College Academic Senate work with the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges to clarify the intent of standard III.A.1.c in order to resolve the conflicting messages being delivered by various visiting teams;

Resolved, That the Foothill College Academic Senate affirms its resistance to including the attainment of student learning outcomes as an aspect of individual faculty evaluations; and

Resolved, That the Foothill College Academic Senate work with the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges and with other concerned statewide faculty organizations to ensure that accreditation recommendations do not encourage the use of student learning outcomes in any manner that would undermine either local bargaining authority or the academic freedom of individual faculty members.