Student Learning Committee (SLC)
Minutes from Meeting on February 3, 2020

Attendees: Paul Overvoorde (Chair)

Nancy Bostrom

Terri Fishel

Adam Johnson

Dylan Larsen

Donna Maeda

Joan Ostrove

Patrick Schmidt

Claire Sislo

Andrew Wells

I)   Recapping SLC: A presidential committee with 4 responsibilities
II)   HLC Criteria for Accreditation
   a. Pertaining to the HLC needs, the burden is on document collection. Patrick is looking to revisit those criteria we discussed last spring.
   b. Question: Would it be helpful to put together a matrix of uploaded documents, a short description about them, and the ways in which information was used to close the loop?   Yes--Add to action items list.
   c. Question: What is the SLC committee's role in helping out with this four year review?
       i.   Answer: We'd like to have a higher fluency at the college so that not one person has the wealth of this knowledge to themselves.
       ii. The connection between the HLC and accreditation and statement of student learning- this gives us some internal ways to start reflecting on the work that is or isn't happening. Example prompt: how are we connecting admissions, student life, curricular and co-curricular learning?
       iii. Question: At what point do we think about when is it time to reconsider these six outcomes? How they're framed, and what the language is? It's been a number of years since these were written. This committee essentially oversees those 6 statements. Does anyone have thoughts on this?
           1. Terri- we spent so much time wordsmithing to get to this point. But it makes sense that now, after 10 years, this should be looked at again.
           2. Nancy- we should look again how some of these outcomes differ from or overlap with General education requirement outcomes.

3. Terri- I don't think there is anything that directly addresses digital literacies; we didn't have anything focused on student learning expectations. Having something more explicit regarding inclusion would be pertinent.

4. Paul- does it make sense to start with one of these and use it as a pilot, or look at all of them at once, with the understanding of how interconnected they are.

5. Andrew: thinking about Terri's comment on digital literacy; if there is a review of the statement of student learning; if we piecemeal, and go one bullet at a time, do we miss the idea of including entirely new categories? I don't want to miss the opportunity of going from 6 to 8 learning statements, or from 6 to 3, by looking at all of these at the same time.

6. Patrick: We've revised GE requirements holistically long ago, and now almost 10 years ago with the statement of learning. Just thinking about where we are in this life cycle. Do we wait a year of settling with the new president, or do we just get started?

7. Joan: If we say the statement of student learning is this example of the college values, given to drive curriculum- do we have an opportunity to be more mission focused and holistic, beyond student learning? How does the tenure and evaluation process of faculty connect back to this statement of learning? It seems like there are really big opportunities to talk about rethinking curriculum, or big ideas like "do we need departments anymore?" It seems silly not to include all the players and processes when analyzing something as large as our statement of student learning.

8. Andrew: I would add – why is this called "statement of student learning" and not "student development." Most students don't experience the binary of curricular and co-curricular, but instead, a more holistic experience. If we were thinking about this in terms of learning AND development, it would make more sense to connect back to more areas of campus.

9. Joan- What does it mean to say we have a statement of student learning? Are we offloading certain statements to certain areas of campus? What does it mean to collaborate with more areas on campus to connect more of these?

10. Nancy- I wonder if using the logic models or some other tool, we could start the conversation and not lose momentum.

11. Terri- I worry about doing an analysis of one by one. It makes sense to take on a multiple pronged approach to this revision.

12. Nancy- I feel that this is why the logic models are helpful because they help define exactly what work is connected and where. It makes sense that we would have underlying principles that inform our statement of

student learning. Equity and Inclusion should be foundational to everything we do here. In the original statement of student learning, I also think we weren't being clear enough in recognizing student success more broadly.

13. Paul- The threads through this conversation exemplifies the challenge of student experience versus curricular and co-curricular organization. What is considered curricular vs co-curricular seems to be a barrier. This is one of those things that seems to stifle change in higher education; what the faculty role is or isn't. The underlying question for me: How do we think about these statements of what the student experience will or won't be given those constraints? This committee feels like a generative spot to start listening to both the curricular and co-curricular experience.

14. Terri- Is that the possible starting point? Conversations with the community? A town hall might make sense- "we're listening to what your thoughts are regarding this statement. What do you think?" I was thinking about whether or not this statement of learning is even included in the end of course survey?

15. Donna- For example- if we were to choose to start with "engaged community," what would be a lesser version of that and a deeper one for students? Where do students learn deeper and deeper in these 6? For the critical thinking student affairs teaches critical thinking differently than the faculty. If we could figure out some sort of way to define thinking critically and show examples of how that comes from the academic and other areas of the college. If we reviewed one that we know won't be going away- it would be easy to generate conversations, and have that be an opening about the overall statement of student learning.

16. Nancy- Related to the "Demonstrate Depth and Breadth," I have data on baseline surveys on questions like liberal arts and major selection. The most recent sophomore survey data shows what kind of information students want when choosing a major--some of it is an introduction to the liberal arts. It's another one of those examples that shows these conversations are happening in different pockets in the college.

17. Paul- It sounds like going forward we want to develop some kind of process here. If there is a way to pry open these statements for review without undoing so much of the work that has been done previously.

III) Assessment as embedded within courses as opposed to happening outside of a learning experience
   a. One example is the writing assessment (WA) that Nancy has been working on. The embedded assessment approach is being piloted this spring and includes a workshop

geared towards assignment design and pedagogy connected to this WA requirement. This will be followed by collection of student papers and a scoring panel where faculty get together to evaluate samples of student work.

    b. A similar plan is in the works for USID, and if success continues, this idea would roll into internationalism and QT as well.

IV) Learning Outcomes and Dimensions

    a. If we are rethinking the statement of student learning; how do we align general education outcomes with the student learning statements? This is another factor to take into consideration in the context of all of this large change.

ACTION ITEMS:

Next meeting: Demonstrate Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Logic model discussion and brain storming.

Meeting minutes retrieval from Spring 2019 for Patrick.

Nancy will be create a matrix ofHLC assessment documents for Patrick.