

- **Quantitative Reasoning**

- There has been discussion about changing requirements for Quantitative Reasoning at some of the CSUs. TAP requires that CC students take a Framework30 QR course that has a pre-req of Intermediate Algebra. This was a requirement championed by the 4-years during the initial development of TAP. It appears that ECSU has relaxed the requirement for native students, SCSU and CCSU may also be in the process of relaxing the requirement. This necessitates immediate reconvening of the Math Workgroup for at least two reasons

1. CC students should not have a higher bar than native students.
2. TAP requires that all CSCU students meet the same Framework30 student learning outcomes.
3. The Implementation Plan (IP) calls for the Coordinating Council (CC), to, “Approve process for changes in TAP Framework requiring shared governance approvals” (IP, p. 4). It appears that Carl Lovett is already addressing this issue with Math faculty.

- **Reporting Structure**

- Pathway Work Groups present the Pathway to FIRC for review. FIRC either returns the Pathway to the Work Group for further editing or FIRC members bring the Pathway to their campuses for endorsement. When multiple campuses fail to endorse due to curricular concern about the Pathway, those results are reported to the Co-Managers. The IP is relatively silent on how the decision is made to send a Pathway back to the Work Group. Past practice, starting with the initial Framework30 endorsements in 2012-2013, has been for the Pathways to go directly to BOR with a tally of endorsements and Co-Managers’ report/recommendation. Perhaps the CC should consider 1) an additional revision to have the Co-Managers bring the Pathways and the endorsement tally to the CC before going to the BOR and 2) criteria for the CC to utilize to determine if the Pathway should be returned to the Workgroup for revision prior to presentation to the BOR.

- A faculty member from CCC presented a proposal to the Academic Standards (AS) related to the Framework30 requirement for a pre-req of Intermediate Algebra for QR. AS scheduled a ‘hearing’ and then endorsed the proposal. This violates the Implementation Plan (IP) in three ways.
 4. “The TAP implementation benefits from clarity and transparency, including agreed-upon means for dispute resolution” (IP, p. 1).
 5. The Implementation Plan (IP) calls for the Coordinating Council (CC), to, “Approve process for changes in TAP Framework requiring shared governance approvals” (IP, p. 4).

6. AS does not have a role in TAP. FIRC reports to the Coordinating Council (CC), which reports to the BOR Provost (IP, p. 3). The CCC request should have gone to the Co-Managers and Coordinating Council and likely the Framework30 QR workgroup should have been called.

- **Communication/Participation**

- “The TAP implementation....acknowledges communication is essential and requires a structure. The TAP Coordinating Council, the TAP Framework Implementation and Review Committee, the TAP Pathways Work Groups, and the TAP Program Co-Managers each should have a plan for what to communicate, an identified audience, and a set regular period for communication” (IP, p. 1-2).
 - We have not communicated with the CC. A request for a meeting of the CC was made and the Council met on 5/3/17 with FIRC Co-Chair representation.
- “TAP Coordinating Council....[will] Receive reports at the end of each calendar month or more frequently as needed from... TAP Framework Implementation and Review Committee” (IP, p. 4).
 - The Co-chairs will need to rectify this. Including CC in distribution of the minutes may be a solution.
- “...participation of each campus is essential for the success of TAP” (IP. p. 1). NCCC has not participated and does not have an appointed FIRC representative. Requests for appointment of a representative have received no response.
- FIRC membership must include, “2 non-voting, non-teaching faculty with expertise and experience in transfer and articulation, one from a community college and one from CSU/COSC. These members shall be appointed by the Coordinating Council” (IP, p. 6). FIRC has solicited these members, they have not been appointed by the CC.
- Term limits/rotation for the non-teaching faculty members should be established and included in a revision of the IP.