

Meeting Minutes Revised
TAP Framework Implementation Review Committee (FIRC)
Co-chairs Heidi Lockwood (SCSU) & Sarah Selke (TRCC)
Friday, 29 January, 2021
The meeting was held via WebEx.

Members Present: Sarah Selke, (TRCC) Heidi Lockwood (SCSU), Jamie Begian (WCSU), Amy Lenoce (NVCC), Meghan Finley(MCC), Anita Lee (ECSU), Patty Raymond (MxCC), Gail Anne Arroyo (Registrar-MCC), Jennifer Wittke (TxCC), Mark Lynch (GCC), Martha Kruey (CCSU), Matthew Dunne (HCC), Susan Steiz (NCC), Becky DeVito (CCC), Paul Morganti (COSC)

TAP Manager: Steve Marcelynas

Meeting was called to order by Sarah Selke at 10:02am

Introduction: Patty Raymond (MxCC) who is replacing Donna Bontanibus. The committee thanks Donna for her contributions to FIRC.

December minutes were unanimously approved with the suggestion that minutes be converted to PDF so there are not subsequent changes to minutes that are not approved by the Committee.

March 12th meeting will begin at 9:30am

TAP Manager Report - S. Marcelynas

1. Social Work (SW) and Early Childhood Teaching Credential (ECTC) programs will be suspended for revisions. In the meantime, ECE can run its alternate program without interruption while SW needs to determine how it will proceed without an established program for students. The SW faculty at community colleges have appointed two faculty to begin this work. S. Marcelynas is awaiting faculty from SCUs to be appointed. This group will determine the timing of the suspension and devise a plan to notify and work with students in these programs.
2. Campus Cross-functional teams – Campus Cross-functional teams are comprised of faculty and others who are involved in the transfer of students including Registrar, Admissions, Advising, and, in some cases, Financial Aid. Initially, these teams focused on the academic piece of transferring credits. Second, these teams had to begin to look at what these programs mean (credit transfers, course availability, and how it fits into the CSUs General Education). These teams should meet at least once a year and invite S. Marcelynas to join in these meetings. If you do not have such a team on campus, S, Marcelynas strongly encourages the college to create one.

Letter from Michael Rooke, Interim Provost & Vice President of Academic Affairs, Connecticut State Community College

1. S. Selke: In the December 2020 FIRC meeting, FIRC asked that its work be respected by System Office. S. Selke, H. Lockwood, S. Marcelynas, F. Rosselli, M. Stefanowicz met on 12/XX/2020 to discuss the work, process and timeline of developing student learning outcomes (SLOs) for Framework30 outcomes. FIRC originally had given a timeline of finishing the SLO work by December 2020 but COVID had delayed this work and a new timeline was developed. FIRC will now have a draft of SLOs to System Office at the March 2021 FIRC meeting so the System Office can submit a draft of SLOs to NECHE in April. System Office will only use SLOs developed by FIRC.

FIRC members discussed the process for developing and adopting revised student learning outcomes so that campuses genuinely have a chance to reflect and respond to them. A 3/12/21 deadline will not provide ample time for campuses to weigh in on the SLOs. Also, what does it mean if an institution endorses or does not endorse SLOs? What is the process and timeline for feedback, finalizing SLOs, and formal endorsement? What happens in campuses that do not endorse some or all of the proposed SLOs, even after feedback and revisions? Finally, what do we do with campuses that have removed themselves from everything related to consolidation?

The ideal plan is to have a draft of SLOs for the 3/12/21 FIRC meeting; a draft will be distributed to institutions for feedback; and, in the fall, there will be a formal endorsement of the SLOs. A more detailed process will be established by a FIRC shared governance ad-hoc committee.

2. Please circulate Rooke's 1/22 letter to respective campuses.

Draft Framework30: CLIL

1. There was a brief overview of the CLIL SLOs and the unique challenges it presents. FIRC discussed framing what CLIL is and how to measure it. There are multiple stakeholders in the development of CLIL from community colleges and CSUs: faculty, librarians, information technology faculty and staff. There are multiple lenses, definitions, and ideas of what it means for a student to demonstrate success in Continuing Learning and Information Literacy. In other words, to what degree should CLIL SLOs focus on the knowledge and skills related to technology (business needs and soft skills such as Microsoft, social media) and research (literature searches, analyzing data, evaluating and citing sources)? In addition, what types of artifacts shall CLIL-certified courses be expected to collect without being overly prescriptive as this is both a specific and broad category? What will 100-level artifacts look like? Finally, how does one develop and measure an outcome for "Continuing Learning?"
2. FIRC reviewed the "Draft Outcomes fall 2020" that reflected the multiple proposals for CLIL. Members discussed the merits of SLOs from each of the three proposals. Most of the discussion focused on the November 2020 version.

November 2020 version:

1. *Use current, relevant technologies to identify and solve problems, make informed decisions, and/or communicate information.*
2. *Demonstrate the legal and ethical access and use of information and relevant technologies through attribution of sources in research projects or papers.*
3. *Identify authoritative information sources, and evaluate the authority of those sources.*

Some liked the first outcome from the Nov 2020 version (focus on tech skills), while others preferred the second and third outcomes of the same version because the first outcome had too many components and was hard to assess. One member suggested that some of these skills will be gained in First Year Experience (FYE) course. Others were reluctant to consider FYE in the overall SLOs development because they did not want the System Office's intent to include FYE to influence FIRC's SLOs. Finally, one member cautioned the group to make sure whatever the outcomes are, they must be achievable in a 100-level course.

A proposal [see below] to crosswalk these outcomes with those of the November 2020 draft of Written Communication revealed an overlap between the two competencies (in research, not technology). One person suggested this proposal may be problematic as not all English courses (that are Written Communication-certified) offer research papers. Another worried that this version oversimplifies research conducted across the disciplines. There was a suggestion to pull language from a previous version of CLIL, "produce independent and collaborative work," and include it in a new version of CLIL. Finally, there was a suggestion to make an exception to CLIL and collect two artifacts for it to be assessed as this competency is trying to capture two very different sets of knowledge/skills.

Written Communication, November 2020 version:

1. *Craft a thesis-driven, supported, logically organized argument that applies the conventions of standard English.*
2. *Identify **college-level** sources and integrate ideas from those sources in an ethical manner, with appropriate documentation.*

Written Communication with info literacy from CLIL added:

1. *Craft a thesis-driven, supported, logically organized argument that applies the conventions of standard English.*
2. *Identify **and access authoritative** sources and integrate ideas from those sources in an ethical manner, with appropriate documentation.*

Continued Learning/Information Literacy that now has room for more IT focus, November 2020 version:

1. *Use current, relevant technologies to identify and solve problems, make informed decisions, and/or communicate information.*
2. *Evaluate the authority of various sources of information. [To address the point about IL being more than academic research]*
3. ~~*Demonstrate the legal and ethical access and use of information and relevant technologies through attribution of sources in research projects or papers.*~~
4. ~~*Identify authoritative information sources, and evaluate the authority of those sources.*~~

The group decided to end discussion of CLIL. Those on the CLIL ad-hoc committee will take these ideas into consideration as they move forward with the development of CLIL SLOs.

[As an aside, H. Lockwood asked that we include an edit to Written Communication where “college-level” is replaced with authoritative. “Identify college-level sources and integrate ideas from those sources in an ethical manner, with appropriate documentation.”]

Formation of ad-hoc committees for AD/Arts & Humanities, SP/Social and Behavioral Sciences and CLIL

[Representation on these committees may be limited because some campuses asked that their FIRC representative not participate in this work]

The following ad-hoc committees will work between now (1/29/21) and the 3/12/21 FIRC meeting to complete drafts of SLOs (CLIL, AH, SBS) and a process/timeline for institutions’ feedback and endorsement (Shared Governance)

Continuing Learning / Information Literacy: M. Kruey, P. Raymond, B. DeVito, S. Steiz

Shared Governance: M. Lynch, M. Dunne, S. Steiz, J. Begian, S. Selke, H. Lockwood

Arts and Humanities: H. Lockwood, B. DeVito, M. Finley, M. Kruey

Social and Behavioral Sciences: H. Lockwood, B. DeVito, M. Finley, M. Kruey

Adjourn 11:58am

Respectfully Submitted,

Meghan Finley