

TAP Framework Implementation Review Committee (FIRC)
Friday, March 11, 2016: 10:00 a.m. – Noon
Conference Room 123
39 Woodland Street
Hartford, CT

Present: D. Weiss (co-chair, SCSU), L. Doninger (co-chair, GCC), M. Coach (ACC), F. Coan (TXCC), N. Esposito (MCC), S. Fagbemi (CCC), G. Gelburd (ECSU), S. Gusky (NWCC), R. Gustafson (WCSU), B. Donohue-Lynch (QVCC), B. Merenstein (CCSU), G. Montez (NCC), P. Raymond (MXCC), S. Selke (TRCC), E. Steeves (HCC), B. Tedesco (NVCC)

Present Non-Voting: N. Kullberg (WCSU), K. Pittman (TXCC)

Absent: R. Benfield (COSC)

Call to Order: D. Weiss called the meeting to order at 10:01a.m.

Announcements: The Faculty Advisory Committee conference will take place at HCC on April 8. Those present observed a moment of silence for former FIRC member S. Montez, who passed away recently.

Minutes of 2/19/16: Approved

TAP Co-Managers' Report (K. Klucznik and C. Barrington)

The co-managers displayed the TAP website, which will be available to the public on April 4, 2016. The history pathway is posted, to be followed by the other dozen pathways FIRC has reviewed. Regarding the history pathway, the co-managers asked the FIRC representatives to make sure the list of TAP vetted courses is complete and accurate for their respective campuses. In addition, they distributed a list of courses that may fit TAP but have not been vetted for it and asked the appropriate FIRC representatives to let them know if any of said courses should be added to Template 4. If and when courses are added to or removed from Template 4 or mapped to a different competency, FIRC representatives should so notify the TAP co-managers. Also, FIRC representatives should, ASAP, let the co-managers know who will be responsible for overseeing each pathway on each campus. All pathway groups will meet again in the fall, date(s) to be announced.

A brief discussion ensued about TAP marketing and advising logistics and challenges. To what extent should and will the BOR, as opposed to each individual campus, spearhead these efforts? The co-managers distributed copies of a TAP postcard that will be mailed out to students. On March 31, each campus will dispatch a team of student services personnel to GCC for a TAP advisor training session. The BOR has not yet decided if the TAP website will be linked to each college and university catalog. Since few students access the BOR website, it is imperative that each institution include TAP information on its website. It will be too cumbersome and technologically challenging to place advising sheets for each pathway and

from all institutions on the TAP website. There will be a centralized process, e.g., training for key people, information dissemination, however some institutions may choose to create their own 'advising sheets.'

Campus Updates

President Ojakian stopped in to thank FIRC members for their hard work on an important initiative. He also praised the TAP co-managers for their role in implementing TAP.

ACC: Has approved its Template 4 courses and will vote on the Physics and Computer Science pathways in three weeks.

CCC: The Communications pathway is being considered at the curriculum level, while the Mathematics pathway was not endorsed. The Physics and Computer Science pathways have not yet been reviewed.

CCSU: Has endorsed the Sociology, Criminology, Social Work, and Communications pathways. The Psychology and Mathematics pathways are progressing through governance.

COSC: No report

ECSU: Has moved the History, Psychology, Sociology, and Social Work pathways to the Senate for a vote. The English and Political Science pathways are making their way through governance. "Some issues" have been raised about the Communications pathway.

GCC: The English and Communications pathways are being revisited, while the Physics pathway is moving forward.

HCC: Has almost completed revising its General Education core to align with TAP. No action has been taken on the Computer Science and Physics pathways.

MCC: Is slowly moving ahead with assessment and is relieved to know that the TAP competency rubrics are optional, not mandatory.

MXCC: The Physics and Computer Science pathways are proceeding through governance.

NVCC: Will vote on the Criminology and Social Work pathways by the end of the semester. Will probably also vote on the Physics and Computer Science pathways. The Mathematics pathways is meeting some resistance.

NWCC: Is revisiting the History pathway, did not endorse the English pathway, and will vote on the Computer Science and Physics pathways in May.

NCC: Did not endorse the Computer Science pathway. Chief concerns were the Calculus II requirement, the absence of Data Structures, and the conclusion that students will not be able to complete the pathway requirements in two years.

QVCC: Will vote on the Computer Science and Physics pathways next month and is revisiting the English pathway.

SCSU: The Undergraduate Curriculum Forum endorsed the Physics and Computer Science pathways (CS with qualifications).

TRCC: Will vote on the Physics and Computer Science pathways by the end of the semester.

TXCC: Will probably vote on the Physics and Computer Science pathways next month.

WCSU: Has modified its General Education curriculum, with modifications to go into effect in Fall 2016. The Senate will vote on the Chemistry, Communications, and Psychology pathways this month.

New Business

Summative Assessment of TAP Learning Outcomes: At the behest of the TAP co-chairs, FIRC representatives offered brief summaries of how and to what extent (if at all) their respective schools are assessing the TAP competencies. Several institutions have established a cycle for assessing General Education competencies, and most of these have begun to do the same with the TAP competencies. Some have mapped or linked their General Education requirements to TAP requirements in some fashion, while several have adopted TAP in large measure or entirely as the General Education core. Several institutions capture and store assessment data electronically, some using Digication, at least one, Elumen, and others locally-created products. A few institutions either ask or mandate some instructors or students to upload student artifacts to an electronic database of some sort. Regarding the TAP rubrics, several institutions are making no use of them, several others are employing them, and others still used them as a guide for the creation of their own rubrics.

A brief discussion took place regarding communication about TAP on each campus. It is clear that each school has a unique bureaucracy, academic and governance structure, history, and culture, all of which influence how communication occurs (or does not, as the case may be). It is equally clear that each FIRC representative has a vital role to play in disseminating information about TAP. Many FIRC members serve on, or even chair, key campus committees that review and make decisions on TAP matters.

Role of TAP FIRC in Assessment: Those present briefly discussed the role of the FIRC in assessment. Should the committee create a set of assessment guidelines? Should it collect and analyze assessment data? What role should it have in deciding the role of electronic technology in assessment, or in providing professional development to faculty who will be doing the assessing? Is the proper role of the committee to act as a resource and clearing house for those

who have questions about TAP in general and the assessment of the TAP competencies in particular? When, how, and on what basis will the TAP framework, competencies, learning outcomes, and rubrics be revised?

Next TAP FIRC Meeting: April 15, 10:00 a.m.—Noon (unless otherwise noted), location to be announced.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 12:01 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francis M. Coan