**From:** Hirsh, Deborah [<mailto:Dhirsh@mail.cccd.edu>]   
**Sent:** Friday, November 22, 2013 3:35 PM  
**To:** Connie Marten  
**Cc:** Andrews, James (DIST); OConnor, Shannon (DIST); Parham, Martha (DIST); Dunn, Andrew (DIST); Andreea Serban; Barron, Cindy  
**Subject:** Re: SLO's

Connie,

Re SLOs - we may not have anything to negotiate. I have spoken to both Dr. Serban and the Board in Closed Session.  While I had indicated a broad District interest to ensure all evaluations for all employees address an understanding by employees of the alignment of their work with the mission of the District to support student learning, classified employees are not directly responsible for SLOs.

For those employees that closely support student learning in the classroom, it is appropriate for managers to make mention on our existing evaluation forms that the employee supports or doesn't support student learning outcomes based on the performance of their support function. For instance, for a lab tech - if the lab tech did a good job in keeping the lab well stocked and in working order for students (or whatever their job duties were in that regard), a manager should comment on how that good work contributes to student learning. If, on the other hand, an employee had habitual, patterned absenteeism or otherwise did not do a good job keeping the lab student ready, the manager should comment on that as well as they currently should be doing.

Based on some of the concerns and areas of confusion on this topic brought up be CFCE in our previous negotiations session, I am not sure CFCE is ready to negotiate language change on evaluations. Board members also indicated some concern to not overcomplicate or over broaden the process unnecessarily.

If you feel we could have meaningful dialogue on SLOs, particularly the idea to change language on the evaluation instrument, we will include SLOs again on a future agenda.

Sincerely,

Deb Hirsh