

DRAFT Meeting Minutes Friday, 11 February 2022
TAP Framework Implementation Review Committee (FIRC)
Co-chairs Heidi Lockwood (SCSU) & Sarah Selke (TRCC)

Members Present: Joseph Berenguel (ACC), Sarah Selke, Co-Chair, (TRCC), Heidi Lockwood, Co-Chair (SCSU), Anita Lee (ECSU), Jennifer “Jen” Wittke (TxCC), Mark Lynch (GCC), Matthew Dunne (HCC), Becky DeVito (CCC), Gail Anne Arroyo (MCC), Maura O’Connor (MCC), Paul Morganti (COSC), Krista Heybruck-Santiago (WCSU), Amy Royal (NVCC), Kaitlyn Hoffman (SCSU)

TAP Manager: Steve Marcelynas

Members Absent: Brian Lynch (QVCC), Jamie Begian (WCSU), Frank Stellabotte Secretary (MxCC), Sharon Cox (CCSU)

Meeting Called to Order at: 9:35

Approval of December 2021 minutes with changes. Approval January 2022 (special meeting) minutes.

Result of Vote: Unanimous with 1 abstention

TAP Manager’s Report (S. Marcelynas)

Safe Courses Task Force update: S.M. explained that he went with a recruitment structure through the regional presidents. There were no criteria for how presidents proceeded. Joseph Berenguel and Sarah Selke are representing their regions. Mark Lynch has submitted his name and is moving forward for his region. Amy Royal nominated herself as FIRC representative. Meetings will be once a month until Fall 2023.

Review of draft SLO feedback (S. Selke & H. Lockwood)

Finalize the WC SLOs from the WC subgroup

J.W. provided feedback from CCET on included the word “evaluate” in the outcomes. CCET members believe the importance of a reading outcome in W.C. Students can show evaluation through little indications, such as explaining author credibility, indication of bias in the chosen sources, why the source was chosen, etc., so that the student is showing they are making appropriate choices for the writing assignment. S.S. agreed the discipline expert input is important in this process and that CCET’s suggestions should be considered.

Motion: Vote to finalize the wording of WC with option 3b as suggested by CCET.

Result of Vote: Unanimous

Finalize the A&H SLOs from the A&H subgroup

The November revisions reflected feedback on the two sets of outcomes. A&H will align with a broad range of courses so the outcomes could be as inclusive as possible for course alignment. Informal feedback has been in favor of the simplicity and broadness of the outcome draft. Question on what “or other artifacts” means: this would include are such as digital arts, or other modes of creation yet to be developed.

Motion: Approve the A&H SLOs.

Result of Vote: Unanimous

Vote to move the final versions of the SLOs forward (S. Selke & H. Lockwood)

Motion: Move the SLOs forward to institutions.

Result of Vote: Unanimous

Discussion of endorsement process (S. Selke & H. Lockwood)

B.D. suggested the colleges move through their usual procedure by starting with department meetings through the college's governance. So that the institution itself, not just a specific committee will vote on it. (B.D. also noted that she distributes major FIRC information—like the call for feedback on SLOs last spring and the TAP Major Pathways to endorse—to all employees directly via email to make sure both faculty and staff have it.)

S.S. emphasized that FIRC members know their governance process and which groups need to review and vote on the SLOs. Each campus can choose to use the language endorse or approve. Simple majority of YES or NO on the package of new SLOs (or individual sets of SLOs, if an institution selects out some but not all categories to decline with rationale) will determine the vote regarding revisions to each set of SLOs. Abstentions will be noted in the official record of the vote, but will not be counted in the tally, and therefore will not contribute toward determining whether the revisions will replace the existing sets of SLOs or not.]

Meeting adjourned: 12:11pm