Central Connecticut State University
UNIVERSITY SENATE ACTION

Senate Motion Number FS 21.22.022B

TO: President Zulma Toro

FROM: President of the University Senate

1. The attached motion of the University Senate, dealing with: **Feedback on FIRC proposal for Community College SLOs**, is presented to you for your consideration.

2. This motion was adopted by the University Senate on **05/02/2022**.

3. After considering this motion, please indicate your action on this form, and return it together with the original copy to the President of the University Senate.

4. Under the By-Laws of the University Senate, Section 3.7, the following schedule of action is to be observed.

    a) By **06/03/2022**, Senate action reported to the President of the University. (Within five school days of the session in which they are adopted).

    b) By **06/17/2022**, the President of the University to return the motion to the President of the Senate. (Within ten school days of its receipt).

06/03/2022   _Frederic Latour_ _____
Date   Frederic Latour, President, University Senate

ENDORSEMENT:

TO: President of the University Senate

FROM: President Zulma Toro

1. Motion Approved :_____

2. Motion Disapproved:_____ (Explanatory statement must be appended).

3. Action "is deferred":_____

4. Resolution Noted:_____✔_____

5. Other:_____

___6/8/2022___   _____
Date   President Zulma Toro

<u>CCSU Faculty Senate motion on the Proposed TAP Framework30 SLOs</u>

Written Communication – APPROVED

Oral Communication – APPROVED

Quantitative Reasoning – REJECTED

The Faculty Senate at CCSU voted unanimously to reject the 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.

Scientific Knowledge and Understanding - APPROVED

Scientific Reasoning - REJECTED

The Faculty Senate at CCSU did not support the proposed 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. In this age where scientific misinformation is rampant on the internet and elsewhere, we believe that community college and university students deserve a rich scientific experience in which they learn about all aspects of the scientific method, and get a chance to practice the use of the scientific method in their courses, including at least one laboratory science course.

Historical Knowledge and Understanding – APPROVED

Social and Behavioral Sciences – APPROVED

Arts and Humanities – APPROVED

Continuing Learning/Information literacy - APPROVED

Presentation of New Proposed TAP Framework30 SLOs

Written Communication

1. Craft a thesis-driven, supported, logically organized argument that applies conventions of English appropriate to the audience, purpose, and context.
2. Interpret and evaluate credible sources and integrate ideas from those sources in an ethical manner with appropriate documentation.

Oral Communication

1. Create and express oral messages appropriate to the audience, purpose, and context.
2. Employ Communication theories and strategies to convey an oral message.
3. Critically analyze messages.

Quantitative Reasoning

Given an authentic context or everyday life situation:

1. Convert relevant information into an appropriate mathematical form, such as an equation, graph, diagram, table, or words.
2. Use arithmetic, algebra, geometry, statistics, or logic to solve related problems.
3. Interpret the significance, reasonableness, or implications of calculated results.

Scientific Knowledge and Understanding

1. Communicate scientific knowledge using appropriate terminology, and representations, models, or analysis.
2. Describe how a scientific explanation or theory is refined or replaced.
3. Evaluate the quality of a scientific claim on the basis of its source, and the logic or methods used to generate it.

Scientific Reasoning

1. Apply scientific methods to investigate phenomena of the physical or natural world through prediction, observation or experimentation, data acquisition, and evaluation.
2. Represent and report scientific data symbolically, graphically, or numerically.
3. Interpret and evaluate scientific data in order to draw reasonable and logical conclusions.

Historical Knowledge and Understanding

1. Define and interpret primary and secondary historical sources.
2. Explain and evaluate the influence of historical agency (race, class, gender, region/location, or belief system) in the context of defined periods.

Social and Behavioral Sciences

1. Explain social, organizational, psychological, political, economic, historical, geographic, or cultural elements that influence and are influenced by individuals or groups.
2. Describe theories and concepts, or research methods used to investigate social or behavioral phenomena.
3. Identify and describe ethical issues pertaining to social contexts and phenomena.*

   * Examples include but are not limited to: how economic policies affect social classes or marginalized groups; consumer behavior and governmental control over regulation; what counts as ethical or unethical research methods conducted with human subjects; codes of ethics used by specific disciplines in social & behavioral sciences; and issues pertaining to systemic inequality, structural oppression, and intersectional justice.

Arts and Humanities

1. Identify and describe key features of visual works, performances, texts, or other artifacts in relation to a context (such as historical, geographical, social, political, cultural, linguistic, or aesthetic).
2. Apply key concepts, terminology, techniques or methodologies in the analysis or creation of visual works, performances, texts, or other artifacts.

Continuing Learning/Information Literacy

1. Use current, relevant technologies to identify and solve problems, make informed decisions, communicate, or create information.
2. Evaluate the authority, relevance, and accuracy of various sources of information to address issues that arise in academic, professional, or personal contexts.
3. Identify ethical issues related to access or use of information, such as the impact on security, privacy, censorship, intellectual property, or the reliability of information.

How do these differ from the existing TAP Framework SLOs?

To see a side-by-side comparison of the existing SLOs, which were written in 2012, and the new proposed SLOs, please go to the Comparison of Existing SLOs versus New Proposed SLOs

document. This document also contains links to documents for each set of SLOs with the first (Spring 2021) draft of the revised SLOs — along with all of the feedback received from each institution on the first draft, and FIRC's responses to the feedback.

Please note that the new proposed SLOs are the product of a multi-year process of actively engaging faculty and disciplinary groups from across the system, and that TAP FIRC is a body on which all 17 institutions in the CSCU system have an opportunity for representation, and in which voting members are all elected faculty. FIRC initiated the revision process in response to faculty feedback that the TAP Framework30 SLOs were difficult to assess — not just in the interest of closing the assessment loop, but also with the aim of being responsive to faculty feedback. In other words, the new proposed SLOs are written by and for the faculty of the CSCU system at the request of faculty from the CSCU system.

If a set of new proposed SLOs is not approved, no change will be made, and FIRC will go forward with the existing SLOs.

In the form of a letter from Dr. Michael Rooke, sent while he was in his previous role as CSCC Interim Provost and VP for Academic Affairs, FIRC has received reassurances that this faculty-driven work will be honored moving forward. Dr. Rooke affirmed that FIRC will continue to have ownership of, and responsibility for, the Framework30 SLOs.

What is the next step?

FIRC is asking your institution to approve the new proposed TAP Framework30 SLOs as a package. A response from each institution will be solicited by, and should be funneled through, your elected TAP FIRC representative.

As is customary with voting on TAP matters, if your institution votes no or abstains from voting, it should send to FIRC a written rationale for the no vote/abstention.

In a no vote, objections to *individual sets of* new proposed SLOs should be identified, with rationale for why the institution is objecting to the revisions to each particular set of SLOs. Any set of new proposed SLOs not mentioned and accompanied by a rationale will be considered to be approved.

FIRC members must report the outcome of their institution's vote to FIRC no later than May 27, 2022. The votes will be tallied and sent back to FIRC representatives no later than May 31, 2022.

If you have any questions about the process, please email the TAP FIRC Co-Chairs: Prof. Sarah Selke (Three Rivers CC, sselke@trcc.commnet.edu) and Prof. Heidi Lockwood (Southern CT

State University, lockwoodh1@southernct.edu).