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

Present Non-Voting: K. Pittman (TXCC)

Absent: N. Kullberg (WCSU), R. MacDonald (COSC), B. Merenstein (CCSU), E. Steeves (HCC), S. Williams (NWCC)

Guests: S. Logston (GCC), A. Mackenzie (MCC)

Call to Order: L. Doninger called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m.

Announcements: None

Minutes of 10/14/16: Approved with a corrected ECSU report:

Eastern has endorsed the Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, Social Work, English, and History pathways but not Physics or Computer Science.

Campus Updates

ACC: Has endorsed the Foreign Language and Business pathways.

CCC: Has endorsed the Physics pathway.

CCSU: No report

COSC: No report

ECSU: Has endorsed the Communications pathway and is reviewing Business and Foreign Languages.

GCC: Has endorsed Business and Foreign Languages. Will probably abstain on Computer Science pathway because cannot offer needed courses, but this decision is not final.

HCC: HCC has endorsed (has made it through the Curriculum Committee but not yet the Senate or President)

- Physics
- French
- Spanish
- Italian
- German (note that German is not offered at HCC)
The Business Department has chosen not to endorse Business, citing their concern that Intro to Business course was not included in the pathway.

As was reported previously, they also did not endorse the Computer Science pathway because of the misalignment of so many courses between schools.

Assessment of Social Phenomena is underway—a one-year small scale trial of Taskstream Assessment software is being purchased.

There is concern about all of these small degrees—how viable will they be? Several of the new workgroups will not have HCC reps on them for that reason.

**MCC:** The Senate did not endorse the Business pathway. Many voting members abstained, and no rationale for opposition was offered. All of the Foreign Language pathways were endorsed, despite some support for limiting the number of on-line FL courses students should be allowed to take. Some concern has been raised about the transferability of the Exercise Science internship class to CCSU.

**MXCC:** The Senate will be voting on the Business and Foreign Language pathways today.

**NVCC:** The Spanish and Italian pathways were endorsed at the division level, but German and French were not due to abstentions. The Physics and Business pathways are moving towards endorsement. The fate of the Computer Science pathway remains questionable, but it may be endorsed in the end.

**NWCC:** No report

**NCC:** The TAP umbrella degree has been endorsed. The Curriculum Committee endorsed History, while the Business and Foreign Language pathways have been endorsed at the departmental level.

**QVCC:** The QVCC Faculty Senate/ Curriculum, Instruction, and Policy Committee have not been able to consider the current TAP Pathways for affirmation due to the unusual schedule of the committees this semester. They will begin to process these in November, but may not be able to give them final consideration until the first meeting of the spring semester. Questions have been raised, in the process, about the meaning of this “local governance” process given that despite past determinations by the QVCC Senate and CIP Committees, the College has been told it must offer all pathways regardless of previous reasons given for non-affirmation of several from the original eleven. The local governance process will do its best to process the current considered pathways, and will notify the committee when these are completed. In the meantime, faculty are looking for clarification of the meaning of “local governance” in light of System mandates.

The previous question is noted too in relation to the *Gen Ed 1 and 2 requirements* that have been determined for QVCC pathways. Though the college has begun to implement the pathways by way of registering students according to their stated preferences, they continue to be concerned that instead of the faculty at QV determining appropriate “Gen Ed 1 and 2” requirements for the pathway 30 portion of degrees, these have been externally determined, resulting in requirements that are extremely ill fitting with what is actually offered at the college. Choices, in fact are narrowed down to: a drawing course that has a studio space of 18, and is offered for Fine Arts students’ programs; an
acting class (that has not been offered in many semesters); and a political science class that is infrequently taught. It is not clear to faculty why this determination cannot be made locally by those who know what is likely to be offered, how frequently, and for how many students.

**Items that have come up in System-wide meetings:**

- Faculty and staff need clarification about the relationship of “Transfer Pathways,” “Guided Pathways,” and the “Multi-State Collaborative,” that raise confusion by their simultaneous but disconnected discussion and pursuit in the System.
- Despite widespread concern about the language and marketing of “Transfer Tickets,” that have no resonance to higher education practice, history, or meaning (causing puzzlement, if not confusion among students, faculty, staff) Colleges have been exhorted to “use the language anyway.”
- “Rumor has it” (through various discussion with both faculty and administrators) that “FIRC is getting in to the assessment side of things.” Though I believe I know where this (mis-)understanding is coming from, it seems that this needs to be clarified around the System.
- A System meeting took place on Oct. 7 with staff, administrators, and several faculty, to look at support (in the short-term) for software that would facilitate assessment efforts at the 2 and 4 year institutions of the CSCU system. This was not a meeting to decide which ones we would all use (if any) but about how to use funds that are available in the short term, by users of Taskstream, Digication, TK20, and eLumen.

**SCSU:** All pathways have been endorsed to date

**TRCC:** The Business and Foreign Language pathways have been endorsed at the departmental level.

**TXCC:** Has endorsed Business and all the Foreign Language pathways save German (this due to the lack of courses offerings).

**WCSU:** No update

**TAP Co-Managers’ Report (K. Klucznik)**

- It remains to be seen if any TAP students will be eligible for transfer in the spring. It would be useful to have a small number of transfers to see how smoothly the transfer process proceeds and to identify and address any shortcomings and weaknesses.

- Registrars will be meeting to discuss TAP. How do students find information about TAP? What information do they have? Is this information accurate and useful? ASAP and as much as possible, registrars would like to automate the transfer process.

- Ten new pathway work groups will be meeting later today.

- A policy on the TAP framework and swirl students exists. In a nutshell, when deciding how to apply Framework30 courses received from other institutions, advisors should do what is in the best interest of the student.
The language on the TAP learning outcome rubrics has been clarified on the system website.

Those institutions that did not endorse the Physics pathway or Computer Science pathway should forward a rationale to the TAP co-managers.

The deadline for submitting campus endorsement votes on the Business and Foreign Language pathways to the TAP co-managers is December 9.

**Unfinished Business**

**Early Childhood Teaching Credential Pathway:** S. Logston offered an overview of this pathway, which is being proposed to allow early childhood educators to complete the credential they will need to enable them to continue to teach at any state-funded pre-school beyond 2019. There is great demand for this credential. The terminal ECE degree and the proposed pathway share a common core of eighteen credits of ECE coursework and Child Development. Both align with NAEYC standards as well. The creation of this pathway did not necessitate any modifications to the existing two-year degree program. The goal is to create three separate options for ECE students: a terminal career degree program, a pathway to a four-year credential, and a transfer track for teaching certification.

All of the pathways documents are complete save ECSU’s, which lack course equivalent information for six specific courses. Some committee members pointed out that having this list of courses is important so that faculty on each campus are able to cast an informed pathway endorsement vote. The TAP co-managers will have this list of courses before the pathway goes to the BOR for final approval.

The members of the committee offered their thanks to the ECTC work group members for engaging in some difficult work to craft this proposed pathway.

**Exercise Science Pathway:** A. Mackenzie presented an overview of this pathway. Community college faculty are “a little concerned” about the absence of an internship course in the pathway (students will complete an internship as part of their University60 requirements). This course provides students, some of whom will choose not to complete a four-year TAP degree but instead will go on to earn an associate’s degree in Exercise Science or either a two-year or four-year degree in fitness, with invaluable hands-on experience. This decision was necessary because CCSU has no room for additional credits in their program and has already agreed to waive two science requirements for incoming community college students so that said students will not have to complete more credits than native four-year students. At the moment, there is no way to perfectly harmonize the TAP pathway with the other degree and career options, although that remains a goal. The proposed pathway and existing terminal career degree program are similar, and indeed common for the first two semesters. There has been some thought given to creating an embedded certificate program that would include the internship course.
The committee offered heartfelt congratulations and thanks to the Exercise Science pathway group members for their dedication and hard work.

The deadline for submitting campus endorsement votes on the ECTC and Exercise Science pathways to the TAP co-managers is **February 11, 2017.**

**New Business**

**Theater Studies Pathway:** B. Tedesco briefed those present on this pathway, which took only one hour to craft. (Perhaps the faculty on this work group should all run for public office). HCC and NVCC have theater programs, CCC is beginning such a program, and MCC is considering doing so.

In line 20 of the Pathway30, delete Introduction to Theater and replace with Theater History. Language explaining sophomore promotion requirements and expectations needs to be added to the WCSU template: the TAP co-managers will take care of this.

Some committee members expressed doubts that this pathway will be viable on those campuses that lack a theater program (i.e., the large majority). The Academic Council is seeking ways to facilitate students taking courses at other CSCU institutions. It remains to be seen, however, how many students will choose to do this.

A discussion ensued concerning the General Education I and General Education II requirements, listed in the Pathway30 portion of this pathway instead of the Framework30 portion. These courses are not unrestricted electives but rather courses that will satisfy a general education requirement (above and beyond what the Framework30 requires) at any of the CSUs or COSC. At present, this list of courses is quite brief (too short, in fact), and the TAP co-managers are mulling over how to clarify what this requirement is and devise more options to allow students to be able to complete these credits. Their goal is to resolve this problem by the time the 2017-2018 CSCU catalogs go to print (sometime in Spring 2017).

Given the need to clarify various portions of this proposed pathway, the majority of the FIRC members present favored returning this pathway to the Theater Studies work group for further work. The FIRC will review the revised pathway in December.

**Transfer Tickets:** Not a single FIRC member or CSCU faculty member who has voiced an opinion on this unfortunate essay into branding likes it, but we are only peons and have no power to stop this train from leaving the station (pardon the pun). Those present agreed to transfer their energies and efforts elsewhere and avoid being ticketed for speeding.

**FIRC Role in Assessment:** While the FIRC has jurisdiction to review the TAP learning outcomes, rubrics, and assessment data and make recommendations in each of these areas, it is not clear how best to proceed or what to concentrate on first. Should the committee start with reviewing assessment results from the various campuses? In order to bring some order to this process, some
members expressed support for establishing a cycle of assessment for all CSCU institutions. It was pointed out, however, that such a cycle cannot be mandated, but only recommended. Other members suggested creating a repository of the rubrics that each campus is using to assess the TAP competencies. Finally, several members opined that some of the more ambitious, specific, or voluminous learning outcomes (e.g., for Written Communication and Critical Analysis and Logical Thinking) should be reviewed and modified before assessment begins in earnest. Committee members were urged to poll the faculty on their respective campuses to get a sense of those competencies and learning outcomes that might be problematic to assess.

**Next TAP FIRC Meeting:** December 9, 2016, 10:00 a.m.—Noon, 61 Woodland Street, Hartford or Charter Oak State College, New Britain.

**Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 12:04 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francis M. Coan