Meeting Minutes

TAP Framework Implementation Review Committee (FIRC)

Co-chairs Heidi Lockwood (SCSU) & Sarah Selke (TRCC)
Friday, 11 December, 20

The meeting was held via WebEx.

**Members Present**: Elle Van Dermark (ACC), Sarah Selke, (TRCC) Heidi Lockwood (SCSU), Jamie Begian (WCSU), Amy Lenoce (NVCC), Meghan Finley(MCC), Anita Lee (ECSU), Donna Bontatibus (MxCC), Gail Anne Arroyo (Registrar-MCC), Jennifer Wittke (TxCC), Mark Lynch (GCC), Martha Kruy (CCSU), Matthew Dunne (HCC), Susan Steiz (NCC), Becky DeVito (CCC).

TAP Manager: Steve Marcelynas

Meeting was called to order by Heidi Lockwood at 10:06

November minutes were unanimously approved with one edit: wo = without

Spring 2021 meeting dates confirmed *3/12*, 4/9 and 5/14, with the Feb meeting to be determined.

**TAP Manager Report - S. Marcelynas**

Editing of SLOs includes Aesthetic Dimensions and Social Phenomenon; it won’t be feasible to wait for consolidation – alignment must be addressed: Arts & Humanities and Social & Behavioral Sciences.

Will FIRC take on the work for these two Gen Ed categories? FIRC members polled.

Steve – These are not easy decisions. There are three options in a poll that will need a response by Thursday, end of day:

* + FIRC will do the work
	+ FIRC will unofficially do the work through an ad-hoc committee of FIRC members who can do this work. Those who cannot do this work can abstain from voting.
	+ FIRC will not do the work and will cede responsibility to a SO work.

Steve will ask for assurances from SO that the work will be respected. He is concerned that if FIRC doesn’t produce something by Spring, it will be produced by someone else; alignment is happening and if SO doesn’t have the work they need, they will undertake it.

* + Original rationale was we will wait for Consolidation – but it is happening much sooner than anticipated. We anticipated that the work needed to be done, but we delayed as long as we could.
	+ Those who need to, should check with their campuses.
	+ FIRC is the obvious place for this work to be done; the realities of colleges positions will influence what we can do. The middle option provides a path to doing the work (ad hoc committee) to get SLOs crafted; FIRC will review what another group does.

**Draft Framework30 SLOs: HK, SKU, SR, QR, OC**

Discussion of draft Framework30 SLOs from March were edited for clarity, cohesion, and voice. The expectation is the rubrics can incorporate more detailed information for assessment as needed. Once we have a set of approved SLO’s we will send these to the campuses for college level review and feedback.

* Review the HK Outcomes: Something that wasn’t captured in the results we received is the level of consensus that came from the Feb workshop. The statewide history faculty developed these outcomes so the workshop was pro-forma:
1. Define and interpret primary and secondary historical sources.
2. Explain and evaluate the influence of historical agency (race, class, gender, region/location and/or belief system) in the context of defined periods.
* Review the SKU: Three were proposed; edited.
	1. Communicate scientific knowledge using appropriate terminology via representations, models, or analysis.
	2. Describe how scientific explanations and theories are refined or replaced.
* Scientific Reasoning (lab course).
1. Apply scientific methods to investigate phenomena of the physical or natural world through prediction, observation or experimentation, data acquisition, and evaluation.
2. Represent and report scientific data symbolically, graphically, or numerically.
3. Interpret scientific data, and draw reasonable and logical conclusions.
* Quantitative Reasoning:\* The SLO Revision Workshop worked from the AAC&U outcomes, but the group did not write outcomes, come to consensus related to the intent of the SLOs or definition of QR, nor did they work on these outcomes afterward to revise or refine.

Feb 2020

1. Analyze/Represent - (include verbiage about representing information in, or interpreting information from, a visual, possibly including graphs, equations, charts, etc. and/or numeracy and number sense)
2. Apply - (include verbiage about methodology, calculation, inference, and/or drawing conclusions)
3. Interpret - (include verbiage about applications, communication and/or interpretation of the aspects of an answer, including significance, reasonableness, and/or implications)

Nov 2020

1. Demonstrate numeracy by representing or analyzing mathematical information in the form of a visual (e.g., graph, chart, formula).
2. Use arithmetic, algebraic, geometric, or statistical methods to solve problems.
3. Interpret the significance, reasonableness and/or implications of calculated results.

Dec 2020

1. Communicate quantitative information using multiple forms of representation.
2. Create and apply mathematical models to solve problems.
3. Interpret the significance, reasonableness and/or implications of calculated results.

Significant discussion ensued related to how QR is defined, applied, and understood, as well as courses that will be populate this category. Next, the (Dec 2020) outcomes will be reviewed by systemwide Math folks and we will review again with their feedback.

\*Evolution of the Outcomes: the FIRC workgroup attempted to write these Outcomes from the notes we had from the workshop group (which disbanded after the workshop). However, review by Three Rivers faculty adamantly rejected the FIRC written outcomes.

Progress thus far, we have reviewed HK, WC, SK, SR, with significant progress on QR and OC; AD and SP are close, but significant work remains with CLIL. Next meeting, we will finalize the Outcomes (except CLIL).

Goal is for mid next semester, send to colleges; will have feedback back to FIRC by first Fall 2021 meeting of FIRC.

Adjourn 12:12

Respectfully Submitted,

Elle Van Dermark