

TAP Framework Implementation Review Committee (FIRC) Committee
Friday, February 20, 2015. 10:00 am – 12:00 pm
61 Woodland Street, Room 305, Hartford, CT

Present voting: D. Weiss (co-chair, SCSU), L. Doninger (co-chair, GCC), M. Garcia-Bowen (CCSU), M. Coach (ACC), F. Coan (TXCC), S. Fagbemi (CCC), K. Gorniak-Kocikowska (COSC), B. Donohue-Lynch (QVCC), P. Raymond (MXCC), S. Selke (TRCC), D. Simmons (MCC), E. Steeves (HCC), S. Steiz (NCC), B. Tedesco (NVCC)

Present non-voting: N. Kullberg (WCSU)

Teleconferencing: G. Gelburd (ECS), R. James (WCSU)

Absent: S. Gusky (NWCC), K. Pittman (TXCC)

Call to Order: D. Weiss called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Minutes: The minutes of the December 12 meeting were approved with two minor corrections.

Announcements: The next two TAP FIRC meetings will take place on March 13 and April 17, respectively, places to be announced. Interim Provost Lopez offered greetings and thanks to those present for their dedication and valuable work.

Reports

TAP Co-Managers

- The BOR has resolved that existing College of Technology transfer agreements will not be altered or replaced and will be exempt from TAP requirements.
- The co-managers distributed copies of a draft TAP course certification inventory template, to be filled in and submitted by each community college. Those present suggested combining the Written Communication I and Written Communication II boxes into one Written Communication box and, in Section B, making some allowance for those institutions that have chosen to distribute TAP learning outcomes among multiple courses.
- The TAP pathways committees are making progress, but some groups have encountered more difficulties and disagreements than others. The co-managers prefer to allow each committee to work until a consensus emerges and the pathway the committee produces is "something that everybody is comfortable with." They acknowledge, however, that they may have to become more directly involved in the work of those pathways groups that cannot come to agreement.

- The pathway ratification process has not yet been fully developed. More specifically, it is not clear what will happen to a pathway if one or more CSCU institutions vote against approving it. Several of those present insisted that the ratification process needs to be clear and concrete and communicated to every campus before the various governance bodies begin to vote on pathways. The TAP FIRC will address this matter in March.
- At the behest of Vice President Núñez, the TAP co-managers will be revising the “Strengthen the Liberal Arts Core” roadmap. While each institution will decide how to assess the TAP competencies, a committee of faculty will be assembled to establish some system-wide parameters that will allow for comparison of assessment data among CSCU institutions. One parameter being considered is the requirement that student artifacts assessed by faculty also be reviewed by a third party not affiliated with the pertinent institution.
- The co-managers distributed a BOR policy statement on associate degrees, which identifies three degree types (A.A.S., CSCU Transfer, and degrees that may or may not transfer seamlessly to CSCU or private institutions) and outlines a process for the creation of new associate transfer degrees. Most new degree programs will be expected to conform to TAP, but there will be some exceptions. This policy will apply only to new degree programs. While some existing transfer agreements will be replaced by TAP pathways, none will be eliminated due to TAP. The co-managers asked the TAP FIRC representatives to circulate the policy statement on their respective campuses and solicit feedback by March 6. An audit of existing articulations will be undertaken at some point in the near future, perhaps by personnel at the four-year institutions.

CCSU: Revision of the institution’s general education program has stalled.

SCSU: Nothing new to report

ECSU: A second science course requirement has been added to the institution’s common package. Students will be encouraged to complete their language requirements as part of their open General Education electives.

WCSU: Has completed and submitted its common package. A vote on new institutional General Education competencies will take place in April.

COSC: Has nearly completed its common package.

TRCC: Is in the process of vetting courses for TAP and hopes to complete said process by Fall 2015.

ACC: Plans to vote on May 1 on approval of the list of TAP courses.

NWCC: No report

TXCC: Done

CCC: The vetting process has almost been completed.

QVCC: Final approval of TAP courses should take place in March or April.

NVCC: All TAP courses should be approved by the end of the semester.

MXCC: Most TAP courses have been identified.

HCC: The list of proposed TAP courses needs only to be approved by governance.

GCC: Vetting of courses for TAP has slowed down. Twenty-one TAP credits have been proposed as a General Education core.

MCC: Vetting is underway for designated TAP courses.

NCC: Courses in the college taxonomy have been mapped to all TAP competencies. The institution will probably not be adopting TAP as its General Education core.

Old Business

Rubrics: After a brief discussion, a motion was made and seconded to endorse the revised TAP rubrics, which will be distributed to the various CSCU campuses. Use of the rubrics will be optional, not mandatory. The motion passed with 15 yea and 1 nay vote.

New Business

TAP Composite Common Packages Document: The committee briefly examined said document, which identifies commonalities among the four-year institutions and will assist in the design of the transfer pathways.

Naming of the TAP Pathway Degrees: The BOR will make the final decision on naming but desires feedback from various constituencies, including the TAP FIRC. Some committee members expressed dislike for the proposed name ("CSCU Pathway Transfer A.A./A.S. Degree: [Discipline] Studies"), pointing out it is cumbersome and inelegant. The TAP co-managers stated that the degree name that appears on each student's diploma and transcript may be different than that which appears in catalogs and on websites and matriculation guides. Each community college will have to decide where TAP programs will be housed and who will be responsible for overseeing them.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 12:02 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francis M. Coan