

DRAFT Meeting Minutes, 10 May 2024
TAP Framework Implementation & Review Committee (FIRC)
Co-Chairs Kauther Badr (SCSU) & Becky DeVito (CCC)

Members Present: Kauther Badr (SCSU), Joseph Berenguel (ACC), Becky DeVito (CCC), Matthew Dunne (HCC), Kaitlyn Hoffman (SCSU), Michael Pence (MCC), Amy Royal (NVCC), Sarah Selke (TRCC), Frank Stellabotte (MxCC), Jennifer “Jen” Wittke (TxCC).

TAP Manager: Absent

Members Absent: Brian Lynch (QVCC), Mark Lynch (GCC), Paul Morganti (COSC),

Open Seats: CCSU, Northwestern, Norwalk, ECSU, WCSU

Meeting called to order at 11:04 (B DeVito)

Approval of 12 April 2024 Minutes

TAP Manager’s Report:

- Transfer Council Report (Kauther)
 - o Gen. Ed. Transfer Credit Alignment Policy from System’s office: the proposal came to all the 4 year institutions, including Charter Oak. It asked for the universities to align courses and accept the shared general education curriculum.
 - Even if students don’t earn a TAP degree, the Framework30 will transfer as a block, which is a real advance for students.
 - ECSU did not provide feedback on the proposal, but they are already accepting a block of credits when students complete the Framework30.
 - o In his TAP Manager Report, Steve asked the committee for feedback on adding language for the CT State Course Substitution Form. He has drafted: *I have discussed with the student that any substitution will nullify any transfer guarantee to include, but not limited to, general education alignment and TAP.*
 - B DeVito noted “general education alignment” refers to the Gen Ed Transfer Credit Policy guarantee discussed in the Transfer Council Report. It will assist students who don’t earn a full TAP degree but will qualify to have their Framework30 Gen Ed transferred as a block for any Bachelor degree they plan to pursue at one of the CSCU 4-year institutions. She asked should the language be more specific or more general? Should this

sort of statement be included in the course substitution form? From correspondence with M Stefanowicz, should the language also address other transfer guarantees such as UConn GAP?

- J Berenguel noted concerns raised about who communicates the information to students and who has the authorization for signing off on this because each campus has a different process for advising and substitutions. Could the general education representative be the point person because they would have the most updated information? B DeVito cautioned that the Gen Ed Rep for each campus may be fully occupied with responsibilities already defined for the role, so if there are a lot of course substitution requests it would be untenable. Ensuring all faculty and staff who are authorized to sign the form fully understand how the block transfers work could help the statement achieve its intended impact.
 - M Pence suggested adding a note to clarify that transfer will happen on a course-by-course basis instead of as a block when course substitutions are made.
 - S Selke reminded that the purpose of the language is to emphasize that with substitutions the contract is broken and that hopefully this will help lessen the number requests being made.
 - K Hoffman asked if there is a time stamp regarding the acceptance approval to the transfer institution and if that would be considered when substitutions are made?
- Co-chairs Report
- Aynsley has responded in favor to our communication regarding FIRC's continued work for AY 24-25.
 - Course modifications at CT State, advising to maintain alignment with Framework30 (Becky)
 - SOC 1001 course modification: do the revision of the SLOs for the course still align to the Framework30? See [letter from Brian Lynch](#) and [proposal for course modification](#). These docs also reside in a new folder called "SDC Proposals" within our Current Year folder in Teams.
 - B DeVito gave an overview of the letter from Brian Lynch. She expressed appreciation for how it identifies the complexities of ensuring alignment of SLOs at the various levels for any new course proposal or course modification proposal. She drew attention to the following sentence in item 3: "The outcomes in the TAP framework were initially intended for the TAP process

and are related but not identical to the general education outcomes or the specific course outcomes defined in each course's official state-level record (see SOC 1001 official course outline)." She clarified that the CT State 21-credit Gen Ed Core is a direct subset of the TAP Framework30, so the individual Gen Ed SLOs actually are identical to the Framework30 SLOs, verbatim. It is important to communicate this at every turn. Course outcomes will tend to be more specific in wording but need to align with the Framework30/Gen Ed SLOs in terms of content and skill level.

- J Berenguel asked if there will be concerns about the skill level difference between "use" in the course SLO and the verbs used in Bloom's Taxonomy, and whether "analyze" is too high of a level. B DeVito noted while "analyze" demonstrates a higher level of understanding than "explain," understanding (indicated by "explain") is a prerequisite for the ability to analyze, so the minimum requirements for "explain" in the corresponding F30 SBS SLO are met with "analyze."
- B DeVito and K Badr agreed that there can be a level difference between programmatic or course outcomes and F30 / Gen Ed outcomes, as long as the course or program outcome is at a higher level than the F30/Gen Ed SLO it is being mapped to, and the skill level in the F30/Gen Ed SLO is necessarily addressed on the way to achieving the higher level skill. Even introductory level courses can achieve higher levels of knowledge and skill in content that is prioritized. It is the purview of the faculty in the discipline to decide which content might be given that level of priority.
- Approved feedback to be shared: FIRC agreed that the course revisions are appropriately aligned with the SBS Framework 30/General Education SLOs and the modified SLOs for the course meet or exceed the knowledge and skill level of the Framework30.
- Planning for advisement on SLO revision and alignment with TAP Framework30 after FIRC is sunset (which committee(s) should we direct SDCs to consult (only Gen Ed, or are there cases that should also be reviewed directly by the Transfer Council?), begin developing guidelines).
 - K Badr asked to consider including a matrix of mapping course outcomes to general education outcomes on the proposal. B

DeVito noted that not every course aligns with general education so the alignment would be conditional.

- Gen Ed Committee Update: [Election Results](#) and *Congratulations to Mike Pence*, rep for core area SK/SR
- Update tally of FIRC members planning to serve on CT State Gen Ed Committee and CSCU Transfer Council AY 2024-25.
 - J Wittke will represent Tunxis as the Assessment Rep on the Gen Ed Committee.
 - K Badr will create an Excel file to keep track of general education committee members, for FIRC members to update.
- New business
 - Elections for FIRC Co-chair positions. Only one nominee per position, votes were unanimous.
 - K Badr will co-chair as representative of the 4-year institutions.
 - B DeVito will co-chair as representative of the 2-year institutions.
 - Nominees to serve on Transfer Council working group to create standing Oversight Committee charge and guiding docs.
 - The Oversight Committee will pick up some of FIRC's work regarding transfer. There will be a limited working group that will put together the charge for the committee. The working group is asking for a call for membership so that the work can begin in the fall. Membership on the Transfer Council Oversight Committee can include representatives outside of the Transfer Council.
 - S Selke understands that the Oversight Committee will just look at the Framework30 component of TAP Degrees because the TAP Major Pathway groups are still getting together to review the program courses.
 - B DeVito wonders if there should be a separate working group to oversee the program courses because Joe Cullen needs someone to work with for program review on the TAP degrees. K Badr thinks that it this should be considered in the Oversight Committee and that the 4 years should have input in the outcomes for program courses that transfer.
 - J Berenguel, M Pence, M Dunne, S Selke, and B DeVito volunteered to participate.
 - Other new business
 - FIRC will meet on the 2nd Friday of the month 11-1:00 next year. The schedule will be revisited if the CT State governance meeting schedule changes.

Meeting adjourned at 12:45pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Jen Wittke