

Minutes of the TAP Framework Implementation Review Committee (FIRC)

Friday, March 24, 2017--10:00 a.m.--Noon

61 Woodland Street, Room 207

Hartford, CT

Present: D. Weiss (co-chair, SCSU), L. Doninger (co-chair, GCC), G. Adamek (NCC), M. Coach (ACC), F. Coan (TXCC), N. Esposito (MCC), P. Raymond (MXCC), E. Steeves (HCC), B. Tedesco (NVCC), A. Hawkins (WCSU), R. McDonald (COSC), B. Lynch (QVCC)

By Conference call: S. Selke (TRCC),

Present Non-Voting: M. Buccilli (GCC), S. Marcelynas (SCSU), C. Barrington (TAP Co-manager)

Guest: B. DeVito (CCC) for S. Fagbemi

Absent – G Gelbrund ECSU, B. Merenstein (CSCU), S. Fagbemi (CCC)

NCCC – no representative

D. Weiss called the meeting to order at 10:10. This was a rescheduled meeting due to snow, so some members were unable to attend.

A plea for a secretary was made. People jockeyed and vied, desperately trying to volunteer for the task. Doninger was the lucky winner.

Campus Reports

NCC – no report

TCC – Art pathway was endorsed, ECTC and Theater will be endorsed. Computer Science continues to be in limbo. The assessment schedule is being hammered out.

CCC - Becky DeVito – sitting in for Fagbemi. The committee was reminded that in 2015 it was decided that there would not be alternates to FIRC, but because of the difficulty surrounding the rescheduled meeting and because DeVito is preparing to take the FIRC position, an exception was made. CCC continues to have strong opposition to the MAT 137 pre-req to QR. They are working on their assessment cycle and preparing to deliver a final report on QR. They are conducting focus groups with writing instructors and business communication, collecting data, for SR assessment.

COSC — no report

MxCC – MxCC has begun the assessment cycle. Teams have been established and the deliverables have been set.

MCC – endorsed Art, abstained from Theater, ECTC goes to Senate next month

SCSU – everything has been endorsed. The LEP foreign language requirement has changed for transfer student. Transfer students with 60+ credits will be fully exempted for FL, this will, of course, include TAP students.

WCSU – Alba Hawkins was welcomed; she is a temporary appointment to FIRC for this semester. The Computer Science pathway was ready for a vote but the Senate lost quorum so did not make final vote, it is expected to pass in May. The Art pathway is moving forward and looks like it will pass but it may not be before the end of the semester. No report on Theater, but movement is anticipated. The FIRC proposed assessment cycle is being considered as WCSU has a new gen ed and they have not started assessment.

QVCC – Assessment report at QVCC has been mailed to members. The French pathway was not affirmed. The Spanish, Art, and ECTC pathways were affirmed, though there are still some questions. Gen Ed I and II are in progress. QVCC has questions about what is on website at college and what is on BOR website. Where/how do corrections get made?

HCC – ECTC chair still thinks pathway is not finished. The Art pathway made it through the department, will go before Senate, and endorsement is anticipated. The Theater pathway is still in department. Gen Ed I and II have not yet been addressed.

GCC – all endorsed except Computer Science, which is looking more promising. Gen Ed I and II are in development.

ACC – Art and ECTC were endorsed. They talked about the contact hours for Art but decided not to make changes unless mandated. ACC abstained from Theater and Exercise Science.

TRCC – Exercise Science, ECTC, and Art pathways were endorsed. TRCC abstained on Theater.

NVCC – Computer Science and Business are going to final votes, only done at beginning and end of semester. Will likely abstain on Exercise Science. There is a lot of work to do on Theater and Art, but they will likely move forward. Italian – seemed to be supported but it was halted because they do not think there are enough courses. Working on Gen Ed I and II.

NCCC – does not send a representative to FIRC

Introduction

Arthur Poole, BOR Director of Educational Opportunity, acts as director of academic affairs for the Provost, joined the meeting for introductions. For the past three years, Poole has been working with the Provost monitoring academic program review. Poole has also been system coordinator for the Multi-State Collaborative. Poole expressed concern that the FIRC assessment calendar will interfere with individual institutional efforts at assessment.

TAP Co-Chair Report (attached)

This is not a typical report, but in anticipation of their three-year term ending, the co-chairs thought it appropriate to give a report to tie up loose ends and begin discussing new leadership.

- 1) In reviewing the Implementation Plan, it was noted that the TAP Coordinating Council (CC) is supposed to be playing a significant role in the entire TAP process. The co-chairs regret this oversight and apologize for the error in process. CC is comprised of six faculty and six

administrators. It is designed to be a balanced committee to oversee TAP. Instead of moving business to the CC, it has gone to the Academic Council – all administrators – for review and approval. It has gone smoothly, but it is not the way it was designed. Members question the wisdom of another layer of bureaucracy when it appears that the process of going to the ACA has been working. Nevertheless, the Plan calls for going through the CC. The co-chairs will investigate the status of the CC and request a meeting. It is unknown if they have met or have a chair or who the members are. The co-chairs will make this a priority for the remainder of the year.

- 2) The co-chairs commend the Foreign Language faculty from the four CSUs for making such a careful review of the mandate for FL policy among CSUs. In their report, the FL faculty commented on the unreasonable timeframe that was expected in the policy request that came down from Provost Gates. It was not a proposal just about making the language uniform. The language could not be uniform if the requirements were not uniform and the requirements could not be uniform if the curriculum was not uniform. Consideration of FL by TAP is seen as being outside of the purview of the TAP mission since FL was never part of the Framework30.
- 3) The co-chairs have received reports of concern re: turnaround time for campus endorsement. Because some of the pathways that came to FIRC were sent back to the workgroups, by the time they came back to FIRC the window for campus endorsement had become quite narrow. Consequently, it looked like some pathways were going to ASA and BOR before campuses really had time to review them. Some members commented that the rush was not a problem because the pathways are going to be reviewed every year. We may need to adjust the timeframe for future pathways. We want them to be expeditious but do not want it to be a sham process.

Co-Manager update – Barrington

On 4/13/17 at 1 pm, there will be an official launch of the Transfer Tickets. They are hoping for the Capitol but do not have space yet. The Co-managers visited most CCs during the break, but were thwarted by weather. Brochures are available; they were left on campuses and more are available. There is a 2-page document for external use and a 2-page internal use document that can be edited on campuses as needed (they will be re-sent to FIRC).

The Co-managers have been going to visit high school counselors and attending college expo/convention events. Counselors have had a very positive response to TAP.

The Co-managers are working with registrars to archive program sheets, they need a straight, clear archive, but not one that can be easily accessed by the public as students may follow an outdated curriculum.

Gen Ed I and II – pretty much in place for CC to start vetting courses – it is ONLY for pathways that have room for Gen Ed I and II. Whether or not the CSUs will accept the Gen Ed I and II to meet requirements for non-TAP students is unknown – it is not what was negotiated. Members commented that Gen Ed I and II are a very good thing as they build that pool of courses that students can take at a CC and that are designed by CC faculty. The vetting form can be edited to meet the curriculum process at each CC.

Student Services Report –

Cataloging and archiving may be an issue. Need to revise the course of study sheets. Need to clarify what happens with old articulations. There was a discussion about whether the Dual Admission Program still exists (or should still exist). The co-chairs will confirm that TAP students have the same perks of early registration (with rising juniors) as is offered by Dual Enrollment. This led to a discussion about TAP students accessing high-demand classes, like Organic Chemistry, via the Consortium Agreement. Because the Agreement only allows CC students to enroll based on seats-available and the classes always close, there is no real way for students to get the courses done.

Unfinished business of assessment

- 1) Follow up on 6-year assessment schedule – CCs need to report on their intended schedule by 4/21. A discussion ensued about whether or not the four-year schools are required to be part of assessment process and to assess the Framework30 competencies. The sentiment and decision by this committee and the original 2012 Steering Committee, has always been that the 4 years are part of the Framework group and have the same learning outcomes and are responsible for assessing them. WCSU and SCSU are moving forward. Some of the four years think they are exempt from TAP assessment. Co-chairs will review documents and minutes to verify the expectations of the 4-year schools around Framework30 assessment.
- 2) Assessment
 - a. The recommended assessment schedule was clarified. In each semester that a competency is assessed, data will be gathered. The following semester will be used for data review. The report will be due at the third FIRC meeting of the next semester. For example, the first assessment cycle will be fall 2017 when artifacts are gathered. In spring 2018 the artifacts will be reviewed and analyzed. The report will be due at the November 2018 FIRC meeting.
 - b. Parameters for Assessment Questionnaire document was reviewed. There was lively, wide-ranging debate. An edit to item three was recommended: Provide assessment method/design such as a rubric or other assessment tools that clearly specifies the standard for the competency. DeVito suggested that the mode of reporting, change from a paper only format to a conference to get people in the same room talking to each other and to allow for peer review and transparency. A conference would allow presentations that each campus would tailor to their needs. Ultimately, reports do have to come back to FIRC so we can work on revisions of competencies.

The meeting adjourned at 12:07 with many members volunteering to take minutes at the next meeting and many discussing how much they would like to assume the chair role next year.

Respectfully submitted,
L. Doninger