

TAP Framework Implementation Review Committee (FIRC)

Friday, February 9, 2018--10:00 a.m. to Noon

61 Woodland Street, Room 207

Hartford, CT

Present: G. Gelburd (co-chair, ECSU), E. Steeves (co-chair, HCC), G. Adamek (NCC), F. Coan (TXCC), B. DeVito (CCC), L. Doninger (GCC), N. Esposito (MCC), R. MacDonald (COSC), P. Raymond (MXCC), J. Seabury (NVCC), S. Selke (TRCC), E. VanDermark (ACC), D. Weiss (SCSU)

Present Non-Voting: M. Buccilli (GCC), S. Marcelynas (SCSU)

Teleconferencing: B. Donohue-Lynch (QVCC)

Absent: P. Boily (WCSU), M. Jackson (CCSU), (NWCC)

Guests: P. Bouffard (SO/NWCC), M. Stefanowicz (SO/ACC), H. Zeine (TRCC)

Call to Order: G. Gelburd called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

Minutes of 12/8/17: Approved

Relationship Between TAP and Curriculum/General Education Consolidation: M. Stefanowicz provided an overview of the One Community College Consolidation Plan, complete with a schematic of proposed committee structures and lines of reporting and communication, the agenda from the initial Academic and Student Affairs Consolidation Committee (ASACC) meeting (including a list of committee members), and a copy of the Gateway CC General Education core. The ASACC will serve as a steering committee and create a set of guiding principles and provide direction to a number of subcommittees. Tentatively, the subcommittees will include the following: General Education, Governance, Discipline Review Groups (multiple), Assessment, Developmental Education, Placement, Special and Accredited Programs, and Student Affairs Policies (multiple). The plan is to follow the TAP model and convene faculty groups to work on each program and discipline. As much as possible, existing system committees and groups will be used to collaborate with and help shape the work of the new subcommittees. For example, TAP FIRC members could possibly play a role in the work of the General Education subcommittee.

TAP FIRC representatives voiced the following concerns about the proposed plan and structures:

- Some people will end up serving on multiple committees, subcommittees, and work groups, which will make it difficult for them to attend all the meetings that will have to be scheduled.
- The list of subcommittees should include a Curriculum and Standards group. If such a subcommittee is created, somebody will have to determine what role it will play in the work the various Discipline Review Groups will be engaged in.
- The Faculty Advisory Committee does not include a representative from every community college
- Only a fairly small minority of ASACC members are faculty members, and it appears that faculty had little to no input on who was chosen to serve on this group.
- COSC has a representative on the ASACC, and faculty at several of the community colleges have raised objections to this.

- The goal of creating, reviewing, debating, and approving a logical, workable, and sound common General Education core for all non-TAP degrees in approximately three and a half months is unrealistic.
- It makes little sense to create a common General Education core for non-TAP degrees and retain a different General Education core for TAP degrees. They should be related.

TAP Co-Managers' Report (K. Klucznik): Several new TAP pathways may be in the works, including Geography, Economics, Cybersecurity, and Music. The co-managers continue to mobilize the various TAP work groups, which will create program outcomes, review the curriculum in each pathway and perhaps make changes to some, some in anticipation of the system consolidation. **They would appreciate it if each FIRC representative will encourage the work group members on his respective campus to participate in this work.** Many faculty members have asked the co-managers to re-sequence courses on the various TAP program sheets. The co-managers are seeking to devise ways of making it easier and simpler for students who plan to transfer to a CSU to find information on the process for doing so, deadlines, and the like. Finally, when submitting TAP changes, each campus should be guided by its own catalog update deadline as the co-managers have not yet established hard-and-fast deadlines for updates.

Biochemistry Pathway: Campus endorsement votes are due by March 1. Please forward to Ken or Candace. Not enough have sent in their endorsement or comments.

Campus Assessment Updates and Discussion

ACC: Every discipline is assessing two outcomes per year. The focus this year is on AD and SPU.

CCC: Currently reporting WC findings to the entire college to elicit suggestions for how to address student needs and improve skills, analyzing SR and QR data and creating rubrics for CALT (finishing it soon) and AD (beginning the work soon).

CCSU: No report

COSC: Have completed assessing WC and OC and hope to look at AD and SPU this semester.

ECSU: The LAPC (which is the General Education Program) at ECSU organizes its assessment around four core principles: Written Communication, Critical Thinking, Ethics, and Information Literacy. The current pattern is that Written Communication and Critical Thinking are being assessed every other year using the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) exam. The exam is administered to a sampling of first-year students in English 100 and/or ENG 100P in the Fall semester, and to a sampling of students completing their Tier III LAC requirement in the Spring semester. We are administering the CLA this year (2017-18), and will administer it again in 2019-20. Information Literacy is assessed in a similar manner, using the Information Literacy Test (ILT), developed by James Madison University. As with the CLA, the exam is administered to a sampling of first-year students in the Fall (in sections of FYI 100), and to a sampling of Tier III students in the Spring. That test is being administered this year, and will be administered again in 2019-20. The LAPC is now seeking to find a different method of assessment for Ethics. (which it did 2016-17). It found that the AAC&U Ethics rubric was not well-suited for our needs.

GCC: Assessed SPU and now assessing AD. Still figuring out process.

HCC: Focusing on SPU and QR

MCC: Has two assessment managers. Gathering artifacts for SPU and AD. [MCC endorsed the Biochemistry pathway](#)

MXCC: Has an assessment manager. Developing processes, gathering artifacts, and will be examining data.

NVCC: Have a report for WC and gathering artifacts for SR, AD, and CALT.

NWCC: No report

NCC: Hope to be assessing AD and HKU this term. The Biochemistry Pathway has been endorsed by the Science Department and by the Curriculum Committee, and it is hoped it will sail through the Senate in time for the deadline.

QVCC: No report

SCSU: Assessing SKU, SR, and WC this year and using CLA to measure CALT. Southern had 5 TAP students transfer in during spring 2017. All 5 students switched their majors when they arrived on campus so did not utilize the Pathways that they had completed.

TRCC: Assessed SKU and SR and will be assessing AD and SPU this term.

TXCC: Assessed WC in the fall and currently measuring HKU.

WCSU: No report

Discussion centered around the following matters:

- Faculty resistance to assessment and reluctance to submit assignments
- Inconsistency in assessment methodology, approach, and expectations
- Uncertainty about the roles and responsibilities of TAP FIRC and the Assessment Committee in assessment across the community college system.

New Business: None

Next Meeting: March 2, 2018 from 10:00 a.m. until noon, Room 207.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 12:03 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francis M. Coan