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Minutes of the CAP Competencies Committee (CAPCC)

Date: April 8, 2013
Location: LTC Forum

Present:
Leno Pedrotti
Keri Brown-Kirschman
Joan Plungis
Jennifer Creech
Jim Dunne
Scott Schneider
John White
Juan Santamarina

Don Pair
Becki Lawhorn

Ex Officio:
Kathryn Kinnucan-Welsch
Riad Alakkad
Fred Jenkins
Elizabeth Gustafson

Absent:
Sawyer Hunley
Dominic Sanfilippo
Jarred White

Guests:
Dan Fouke
John Inglis

A. Review/Approval of Prior Minutes:

1) Review of CAPCC Minutes from March 25, 2013
   a) Amendments: Correct Heading on Notes
   b) Move made to approve (as amended): Leno Pedrotti
   c) Second Motion: John White
      i) All in favor; none opposed or abstained. Minutes approved.

2) Nita will follow up with Judith H. re: revision from 3/18

B. Don – Announcement

1) Annual CAS event honoring retirees, awards, will be joined @3 PM by Jim Heft will talk about CIT and CAP – want to extend invitation to CAPCC in Sears recital hall – no university-wide invitation, CAPCC invited to attend; he will answer questions posed and submitted by faculty related to CIT; will be taped and available afterward for faculty use

C. CIM Update

1) No updates – still making tweaks and changes as needed

D. Review of PHL 321

1) Reminder – we have reviewed previously – asked for changes to be made
   a) Changes are in bold type to easily recognize

2) Concern was raised that these courses are addressing two CAP components as well as 6 of 7 SLOs, 3 at advanced level
   a) Discussion surrounding whether course needs to fully complete an SLO at the advanced level or simply 4.5 the context in which the advanced level is indicated is a well-designed research project and a project at this level should be able to pull the students into demonstrating advanced understanding
b) If the SLO information is in the project and students have to draw upon it, then they are demonstrating advanced level
   i) Dan – has been teaching course for quite some time – the advanced SLOs are so integrated, would be impossible to remove; requires advanced scholarship – research presentation and final paper requires students to know problem, deal with scientific dimensions, show that there are social, political, economic conditions to address.
   ii) Don – in the catalog currently, these three courses have always been among the most integrated and complex courses offered in the CAS; authentically cause students to really reach
      (1) Katie – we are struggling with how to define advanced; hearing this answer was helpful

c) Jim D. – re: Critical Eval of Times – description says informed by familiarity w/ Catholic Social Teaching…does that come into play in courses?
   i) Dan – had intended to add specific references, i.e., to Pope, but did not want to set that precedence for faculty who might not want to incorporate those specific documents; is well established in the course;
   ii) Leno – CIT automatically draws upon Catholic Social Teaching
      (1) John I – with Leo XIII Catholic teachings part of the history in Philosophy (?) “reason” is part of the Catholic Identity…how to do today, is a culture we have to create
      (2) Dan – integral relationship between philosophy and the Catholic church – wording was used to explain consistency with CIT…have a Jewish person on faculty who is not comfortable with referring to specific Catholic documents;
      (a) Leno – should be able to contribute to Critical Eval of Times w/o addressing Catholic Social Tradition
      (b) Don – language is not meant to be exhaustive

3) Katie – feels clarifications were made and questions answered
4) Juan – requested a vote
5) Motion to approve: Juan
6) John White - Second
7) Vote: 9 in favor, none opposed or abstained. Course is approved.

E. Review of SEE 401
1) SEE stands for Sustainability and Energy in the Environment – is a minor in CAS; is an interdisciplinary minor
2) Leno: moves for approval
3) Becki second motion
4) Vote: 9 in favor, none opposed or abstained. Course is approved.

F. Review of SEE 402
1) Jim – it did not have Critical Eval of Times checked but the course does address in narrative and level is checked; is checked on p. 11 and in the advanced, but not in the bubble; needs to be marked; it is checked on the online version – simply a typo and is fine in the system
2) Becki motion to approve
3) Don: Second
4) Vote: 9 in favor, none opposed or abstained. Course is approved.

Other Discussion:
1) Discussion about possibility of second year student taking a course that addresses an SLO at an advanced level but had not yet had the SLO at the expanded level before taking advanced
   a) Agreed that this will happen, nothing that can or should be done
   b) We will only have a good sense of any implication after assessment is performed
2) Regarding courses submitted for approval which have checked several SLOs, we could possibly approve based on fewer SLOs
   a) SLOs need to be intentionally brought forth - not just assumed to be going to happen, such as community being addressed via a group project
3) Leno reported that APC is prepared to approve the CAPCC procedures; the three year review is intended to assist with any necessary revisions
4) Leno – what about how do we deal with minor changes that we would like but not approved contingent upon these changes; as with courses today, Don took to AAC, and they came straight back to us rather than going all of the way through the workflow
   a) We are without a process for courses approved with minor changes so that it does not need to go back through workflow process;
   b) Juan – if substantive enough to need review – then we vote no action; if minor, could possibly do an administrative hold
   c) Katie – it is not the call of CAPCC to decide whether a change can or should be made without going through workflow;
   d) We should have approved or taken no action on the Arts courses – we need to not do that again; we would have approved it anyway – it was our committee desire for the changes; maybe should have taken no action and allowed for the revisions and then voted again.
5) We will not revise procedures – we will no longer approve based on any change in content; we may need to modify the electronic workflow process to match our culture so that the system works the way we need it to work.
6) Discussion that SLO does not have to be fully completed in a course if checked, just contributed to.

Upcoming CAPCC Schedule:

April 15
- VAF 104
- VAF 242
- VAF 203
- VAF 225
- VAP 100

April 22
- VAH 320
- VAP 200
- EDT 305

April 29
- Finals week, unsure whether CAPCC will meet

Fall 2013
- Need to schedule; is one hour sufficient?
- Committee members should know their schedules by 4/15

Next meeting Monday, April 15, 2013 at 3:00 PM