Long Form Meeting Notes - Elle

TAP Framework Implementation Review Committee (FIRC)  
Co-chairs Heidi Lockwood (SCSU) & Sarah Selke (TRCC)

Friday, 13 November, 2020

10:00am – 12:00pm

This meeting was held on 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 Marcelyans

**Meeting began at 10:05am**

Appreciation expressed for the work on Outcomes Revision: Sarah, Heidi, Becky, Susan, and Elle worked on editing the Draft Outcomes.

**Approval of Minutes**

Motion to approve Minutes from 9.11.2020

Edits: FYE and CLIL and intersections related to F30 and One College Gen Ed; NWC CC is also vacant.

Motion approved.

Motion to approve Minutes from 10.9.20

Edits: Extra Comma after Meghan Finley; ~~NWC CC and QVCC remain vacant.~~

Minutes approved.

**TAP Manager Report - S. Marcelynas**

Please share how students are being advised for Transfer Tickets. Students within the TT are being sent to the departments OR they are being referred to the FIRC Rep.

Work Group Meetings continue. Some are moving better than others. Biggest concern is communication from the CC to the 4 years.

Social Work program is raising concerns. It is the only TT that requires applying to that particular program at the transfer institution. With limited slots available at transfer institutions, students need to know where they are transferring and that there are additional requirements which can delay their transfer.

Part of the problem rests with the title of the program. Students think once they graduate, they can work in the field. Also the TT gpa requirement is misleading; depending upon the transfer institution it could be a 2.5-2.75.

Proposals: increase gpa and change the name.

Proposal: the SW TT will need permission from the Human Services Dept/Coord; the CC advising will provide that information; survey being sent to students to get a better understanding of what students expect;

We know students are skipping formal advising and self-selecting this major without realizing the implications. If recommendations are approved students will not be able to self-select into the Social Work program.

The Census Report does not capture student intent well:

Ex if students are planning to go to UConn or work after graduating, the TT are not their best option. This highlights the need for proper advising. Currently 762 students in the TT, far fewer slots available and we know many of these students do not want to transfer to a CSU.

No action required from FIRC at this time. Proposal is going to the SW Work Group for permission to opt into the TT.

Steve reiterated: This is the only TAP pathway that prepares students for a 4 year degree that also has an additional component.

Note: Chat demonstrates FIRC reps believe students who are opting into other TT reveals significant advising concerns: arts, business, nursing, English, etc also problematic.

Suggestion: F30 needed to align better with the LAS degree so students who change their minds or do not meet a gpa requirement do not suffer significant setbacks. If aligned, impact of changes could be minimized.

*As we move forward with SLOs development and vetting courses in new categories –* Universities need to become more involved to ensure maximum flexibility for credit transfer.

Normalization of 60 credits for transfer and 60 to completion for graduation at the transfer institution.

Cross Functional Teams are critical to see what we know based on the evidence related to TT.

**Discussion of draft Framework30 SLOs**

Vibrant discussion around the Review of the Draft Outcomes (from Feb): how we edit, suggested changes, to whom?

Important questions raised:

*Are the Outcomes supposed to apply to the discipline or across the campus disciplines?*

Communication Outcomes -

From the perspective of a Comm course – the outcome leans for a public speaking course and we are leaning toward specific types of speeches, but we are trying to respect the types of rhetorical products that might meet the outcome. We are not trying to limit it.

Through the outcomes we are forcing any discipline to create a particular assignment that responds to these outcomes if the course is going to satisfy it.

* 1. Employ communication theories and concepts.
  2. Critically analyze messages.
  3. Create and deliver oral messages 🡪 Create oral messages.

Importantly, ethics can be embedded. It is critical but it was eliminated when we submitted 5 outcomes.

Additional Comments/Considerations

The groups of people who participated in the workshop in Feb to draft new outcomes may have been limited by various constraints: availability, conflicts, etc. They should not be excluded.

We need to include a broader group; include the TAP Working Group, Discipline Working Group, Other?

**FIRC Conversation: Outcome goal revisions process**

In trying to come up with a set of SLOs, we began with the drafts from the Feb meeting, there are some categories we are comfortable doing that revision work with.

FIRC cannot do the revision/refinement necessary from the products produced at the Feb workshop for all the outcomes, but maybe some?

Important we don’t undermine the work done in February; some groups may have had limited participation due to other constraints.

Does the entire FIRC group want or need to provide feedback and or suggestions on the Outcomes?

Oral Communication and CLIL are still under development.

Written Communications – removing the 1,500 word requirement and adding it to the rubric;

Previously there was the implication that *some outcomes would be limited to specific courses* while with other outcomes the expectation seemed to be a slate of courses from across the disciplines that would assess the Outcomes.

Reminder – these are for F30 and the TAP programs required for transfer. These degrees prepare students to transfer at these 5 institutions.

What are our goals?

How do we work toward them?

What is the composition of the groups crafting the Outcomes? Who is included?

How do we do all this in a timely manner?

What is timely? What is our timeline?

What will interfere with that work?

When will they go back out to the colleges?

What about the colleges without a FIRC rep?

Who beyond FIRC should be included in the review of the outcomes?

TAP Working Groups

Discipline Groups

Other?

We need a CLIL meeting? Written Comm? Oral Communications? Ethics? CALT?

Which are ready for review?

Timeline should be more clearly defined at our next (Dec) meeting.

Dec meeting revisions: CLIL, Ethics, and CALT?

Knowing that CALT is now embedded – every time we are reviewing the categories, we need to remember to remember that CALT must be embedded in at least one outcome for each category.

Ideally, we would send these out over winter break. What should we ask of/from the colleges?

Folx who want to opt in, we will continue to work on the outcomes in smaller groups as we can:

The Nov 2020 version was created with these thoughts in mind:

1. Consistency in language

2. Embedding

Ethics

CALT

3. Outcomes: Broad or discipline specific?

4. Assessable

Adjourn 12:05pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Elle Van Dermark

Secretary, FIRC