

DRAFT Meeting Minutes Friday, 13 May 2022

TAP Framework Implementation Review Committee (FIRC)

Co-chairs Heidi Lockwood (SCSU) & Sarah Selke (TRCC)

Members Present: Joseph Berenguel (ACC), Sarah Selke, Co-Chair, (TRCC), Heidi Lockwood, Co-Chair (SCSU), Jennifer “Jen” Wittke (TxCC), Mark Lynch (GCC), Matthew Dunne (HCC), Becky DeVito (CCC), Maura O’Connor (MCC), Paul Morganti (COSC), Krista Heybruck-Santiago (WCSU), Amy Royal (NVCC), Kaitlyn Hoffman (SCSU), Gail Arroyo (MCC), Kauther Bradr (SCSU), Jennifer “Jen” Wittke (TxCC), Sharon Cox (CCSU)

TAP Manager: Steve Marcelynas

Members Absent: Brian Lynch (QVCC), Anita Lee (ECSU), Sharon Cox (CCSU)

Meeting Called to Order at: 9:33 AM

Approval of April minutes: Unanimous, 1 abstention

TAP Manager’s Report (S. Marcelynas)

S.M reported on the Safe Courses Task Force. S.M. discussed crosswalks and the TAP crosswalk form which he distributed. Faculty can select which form they would like to use. S.M. may need to step out to attend the Sociology workgroup. TAP census report will be distributed in more of a secure format as there are concerns about sharing student data. Members discussed different options for the distribution of the TAP census report. S.M. will distribute the census report in the FIRC Teams folder. S.M. thanked S.S. and H.L. for their contributions to FIRC.

Reports on status/final vote tally for endorsement of SLOs at each institution (FIRC reps)

- CCSU (S. Cox)
  - 7 of 9 SLOs were approved by Faculty Senate on 5/2/22. Scientific Reasoning and Quantitative Reasoning were *not* approved. Summary of CCSU vote is as follows:
    - The Faculty Senate at CCSU did not support the proposed SR SLOs due to the omission of several words from the current SLOs that express important components of the scientific method; in particular, the fact that hypothesis testing is nowhere mentioned is considered quite problematic.
    - The Faculty Senate at CCSU voted unanimously to reject the QR proposed SLOs for several reasons. First, the inclusion of “words” in the first SLO makes it possible for a course to satisfy #1 even if it contains no

equations, no graphs, no diagrams, and no tables. We do not believe that this is acceptable. Second, the inclusion of “arithmetic” in the second SLO makes it possible for a course to satisfy #2 even if it contains no algebra, no geometry, no statistics, and no logic. We do not believe that such a course would be at an appropriate level for a college general education curriculum. Third, we believe that “logic” should be changed to “formal logic”, to emphasize that a course does not qualify for this by virtue of inclusion of “logic puzzles” (such as the ones found on the LSAT), but rather by inclusion of the study of formal logic as found in discrete mathematics and philosophy courses. In this age where people are bombarded with vast amounts of numerical data that they do not know how to analyze properly, with discussions of “positivity rates” and related concepts, and with offers of credit cards and mortgages with high interest rates that will lock the applicant into an everlasting cycle of poverty and debt, we believe that community college and university students should take quantitative reasoning courses that are taught at the college level, and not at the middle school level.

- A FIRC member discussed that the QR CCSU issue above is a course vetting issue, not an issue with the SLO.
- Specific details regarding feedback on CCSU Scientific Reasoning and Quantitative Reasoning SLOs can be found via the following link:
- ECSU (A. Lee)
  - All SLOs were approved by a Senate Resolution at the University Senate on 4/19/2022.
- SCSU (H. Lockwood)
  - All SLOs passed as a package on 4/28/22 via vote in Undergrad Curriculum Forum (UCF): 39 in favor, 2 opposed. There were concerns regarding the proposed QR SLOs.
- WCSU (K. Heybruck)
  - Final vote will be held at Faculty Senate meeting on 5/18/22. K.H. discussed financial issues impacting the WCSU campus.
- COSC (P. Morganti)
  - SLOs will be presented to the council in early June. P.M. invited S.S. and H.L. to attend the meeting.
- ACC (J. Berenguel)
  - ACC: All SLOs passed as a package on 4/01/22 via vote in the Faculty Council. The decision was unanimous in support of all outcomes.
- CCC (B. DeVito)

- CCC: All SLOs passed as a package on 4/28/22 via vote in the College Senate, the Senate decision was subsequently approved by CEO Harris on 5/4/22.
- GCC (M. Lynch)
  - *abstain*
    - Humanities and Fine Arts Dept. (WC, OC, AH, CL/IL): chose not to vote
    - Mathematics/Science Dept. (QR, SKU, SR, CL/IL): no approval vote taken; however, department chair asked for any opposition to the outcomes – no opposition by the department
    - First Year Studies [remedial English and Math] (WC, OC, QR, CL/IL): no vote taken
    - Social Sciences (HK, SBS, CL/IL): chose not to vote
    - Automotive Dept. (CL/IL): unanimous approval
- HCC (M. Dunne)
  - HCC: All SLOs passed except for Scientific Reasoning at HCC's Gen Ed Subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee on April 7.
  - The Gen Ed Subcommittee's vote was subsequently presented to the Curriculum Committee on April 14 and HCC's College Senate on April 19.
  - HCC's Math & Science department presented the following rationale for not approving the Scientific Reasoning outcome:
    - "The Science Faculty at Housatonic feel strongly that the Scientific Reasoning outcomes of a 4-credit Laboratory Science cannot be adequately met by a virtual laboratory simulation and that the proposed 2022 Scientific Reasoning outcomes should include the qualifier that outcome #1 take place **during an on-campus laboratory experience**. (as below). Given that the proposed 2022 Scientific Reasoning outcomes do not include this qualifier, the Housatonic Math & Science Department and the Housatonic General Education Subcommittee vote to not approve the proposed 2022 Scientific Reasoning outcomes.
  - HCC Proposed modification:
    - **Scientific Reasoning:** Apply scientific methods to investigate phenomena of the physical or natural world through prediction, observation or experimentation, data acquisition, and evaluation **during an on-campus laboratory experience**.
    - Represent and report scientific data symbolically, graphically, or numerically.
    - Interpret and evaluate scientific data in order to draw reasonable and logical conclusions." Written and revised by Elizabeth Steeves.

- A member discussed that the 2012 SLOs did not mention modalities and another member discussed that these are issues that fall outside of the purview of FIRC.
- MCC (M. O'Connor)
  - MCC: All SLOs passed as a package on 4/7/2022 at the Academic Senate, by unanimous approval vote. M.O. gave her report in April and there was unanimous approval.
- MxCC (F. Stellabotte)
  - MxCC: SLOs were not endorsed by the MxCC Curriculum Committee, citing the following:
    - Assessment shouldn't drive course outcomes, it's like putting the cart before the horse.
    - The committee had deep concerns that the revised SLOs were over-simplified. Reducing core learning outcomes to two outcomes per course is too much of an extreme. There should be at least four to five student learning outcomes per category.
    - History Knowledge and Understanding SLOs should retain outcomes #2, #3, and #5. The two proposed outcomes would not guarantee that enough historical knowledge is taught in history courses. Members of the committee were very upset to learn that history courses had been submitted to the APRC with only the two student learning outcomes.
    - The two proposed Arts and Humanities SLOs represent over-simplified Aesthetic Dimension SLOs and do not include other disciplines that fall under humanities such as philosophy, languages, and theater courses.
    - Committee members were concerned that the State Universities would not accept courses that only satisfied two outcomes. F.S. pointed out that CSUs served on FIRC.
    - Curriculum Committee Vote: 3 in favor, 6 against, 1 abstention. Each vote represents an area of study or a department.
  - Since the proposal was not endorsed it could not be voted on by the Academic Assembly.
- NVCC (A. Royal)
  - During the time in which the vote occurred, there was confusion over the governance structure due to consolidation. With this in mind, the vote was brought to all faculty. The SLO's were approved by 62.5% of those faculty members who voted.
    - Concern over using ONE assignment or artifact was expressed.

- “Although I appreciate the attention given to this matter, I find its timing and confusing political agenda problematic as we are being mandated to move to a new Gen Ed due to the consolidation.”
  - Voting was carried out electronically.
- TRCC, NWCCC, NCC, QVCC (S. Selke)
  - TRCC: All SLOs passed as a package on 4/8/22 via vote in Faculty Senate, vote was unanimous
  - NWCC: S.S. attended Faculty Senate meeting in May to present SLOs and answer questions. Electronic vote by Faculty Senate is in progress and will close on May 24<sup>th</sup>
  - NCC: S.S. attended the General Education meeting. All SLOs passed in the Faculty Senate with the exception of Written Communication. Faculty Senate representatives will submit written feedback.
  - QVCC: SLO documents have been distributed to faculty. Faculty Senate will discuss and vote on May 23<sup>rd</sup>. S.S. offered to attend meeting.
  - S.S. pointed out that the faculty at NWCC, NCC, and QVCC were engaged despite not having a FIRC rep.
- TxCC (J. Wittke)
  - Curriculum committee (Academic Affairs) voted on Thursday, 05/12/22 and then the final vote will be at our governance committee will be on 5/19/22.

Tally of Votes on TAP Framework30 revised SLOs

Institution:	Approved	Not Approved	In Progress	Abstained	Notes
CCSU	7 of the 9 approved by Faculty Senate on 5/2/22	SR and QR			Scientific Reasoning and Quantitative Reasoning were <i>not</i> approved. Concerns from Eng. Dept. about WC (need more rigor)
ECSU	All SLOs were approved by a Senate Resolution at the University Senate on 4/19/2022				
SCSU	All SLOs passed as a package on 4/28/22 via vote in Undergrad				

	Curriculum Forum (UCF): 39 in favor, 2 opposed.				
WCSU			Final vote will be held at Faculty Senate meeting on 5/18/22. Krista should have the letter by 5-20-22.		
COSC			to be voted on in early June		
ACC	All SLOs passed as a package on 4/01/22 via vote in the Faculty Council. The decision was unanimous in support of all outcomes.				
CCC	All SLOs passed as a package on 4/28/22 via vote in the College Senate, the Senate decision was subsequently approved by CEO Harris on 5/4/22				
GCC				Abstained	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Humanities and Fine Arts Dept. (WC, OC, AH, CL/IL): chose not to vote</li> <li>▪ Mathematics/Science Dept. (QR, SKU, SR, CL/IL): no approval vote taken; however, department chair</li> </ul>

					<p>asked for any opposition to the outcomes – no opposition by the department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ First Year Studies [remedial English and Math] (WC, OC, QR, CL/IL): no vote taken</li> <li>▪ Social Sciences (HK, SBS, CL/IL): chose not to vote</li> <li>▪ Automotive Dept. (CL/IL): unanimous approval</li> </ul>
HCC	HCC: All SLOs passed except for Scientific Reasoning at HCC’s Gen Ed Subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee on April 7.	SR			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o HCC Proposed modification:  <b>Scientific Reasoning:</b> Apply scientific methods to investigate phenomena of the physical or natural world through prediction, observation or experimentation, data acquisition, and evaluation <i>during an on-campus laboratory experience.</i> Represent and report scientific data symbolically, graphically, or numerically. Interpret and evaluate scientific data in order to draw reasonable and logical conclusions.” Written and revised by Elizabeth Steeves.</li> </ul>
MCC	All SLOs passed as a package on 4/7/2022 at the Academic Senate, by unanimous approval vote.				
MxCC		MxCC: SLOs were			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assessment shouldn’t drive course</li> </ul>

		not endorsed by the MxCC Curriculum Committee			<p>outcomes, it's like putting the cart before the horse.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The committee had deep concerns that the revised SLOs were over-simplified. Reducing core learning outcomes to two outcomes per course is too much of an extreme.</li> <li>▪ History Knowledge and Understanding SLOs should retain outcomes #2, #3, and #5. The two proposed outcomes would not guarantee that enough historical knowledge is taught in history courses. Members of the committee were very upset to learn that history courses had been submitted to the APRC with only the two student learning outcomes.</li> <li>▪ The two proposed Arts and Humanities SLOs represent over-simplified Aesthetic Dimension SLOs and do not include other disciplines that fall under humanities such as philosophy, languages, and theater courses.</li> </ul>
NVCC	During the time in which the vote occurred, there was confusion over the governance structure due to				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Concern over using ONE assignment or artifact was expressed.</li> <li>▪ "Although I appreciate the attention given to</li> </ul>



	consolidation. With this in mind, the vote was brought to all faculty. The SLO's were approved by 62.5% of those faculty members who voted. Voting was carried out electronically.				this matter, I find its timing and confusing political agenda problematic as we are being mandated to move to a new Gen Ed due to the consolidation."
NWCCC			Electronic vote by Faculty Senate is in progress and will close on May 24 <sup>th</sup>		
NCC	All SLOs passed with the exception of Written Communication	WC	WC rationale still needs to be submitted as of 5/13/2022		
QVCC			SLO documents have been distributed to faculty. Faculty Senate will discuss and vote on May 23 <sup>rd</sup> .		
TRCC	All SLOs passed as a package on 4/8/22 via vote in Faculty Senate, vote was unanimous				
TxCC			Curriculum committee		

			(Academic Affairs) will vote on Thursday and then the final vote at our governance committee will be on 5/19/22.		
Totals:	10 for all SLOs, with exception of individual SLOs as noted in other categories	All SLOs: 1 SR: 3 total QR: 2 total WC: 2 total (totals include "all SLO" votes and individual SLO rejections	5	1 (for all SLOs)	

Members discussed the tally of all votes; nine affirmative votes are required to pass an SLO. There are 8 votes in favor of SR, 9 in favor of WC and QR. A ninety-day deadline of May 31, 2022 was set once SLOs were released. Members discussed whether Charter Oak would be able to vote by the deadline.

Co-Chair report (H. Lockwood & S. Selke)

H.L. and S.S. attended the FAC meeting as guests. H.L. mentioned it would be helpful if a notification between committees existed. An FAC meeting member who was against consolidation expressed concerns that FIRC is doing the work of consolidation. S.S. reported that the CCSU representative had issues with CCSU being left out of the SLO revision process. This encouraged other voices to chime in with statements tying FIRC to consolidation. FAC members felt that FIRC should have written SLOs to ensure that ACME didn't cause an erosion of rigor in community colleges. H.L. expressed concerns about miscommunication. S.M. pointed out that individuals who have issues with FIRC should be invited to attend.

#### Selection of 2022-23 AY co-chairs

Four-year representatives will vote for the four-year co-chair. CC representatives will vote for the CC co-chair.

Joseph Berenguel (ACC) was nominated and voted in unanimously as the CC co-chair.

Kauther Bradr (SCSU) was nominated and voted in unanimously as the four-year CSU co-chair.

#### Membership:

S.S. thanks members for returning and recognized Anita Lee (ECSU) and Maura O'Connor (MCC) who are not returning. S.S. and H.L. thanked FIRC members for productive and peaceful meetings especially with respect to revising all nine SLOs. S.S. and H.L. will reach out to new co-chairs.

Meeting adjourned at 12:02 PM.

*Respectfully submitted by F.S. with contributions from other members.*