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Minutes of the CAP Competencies Committee (CAPCC)
Date: March 18, 2013 (as amended)
Location: LTC Forum

Present:
Don Pair
Leno Pedrotti
Keri Brown-Kirschman
Joan Plungis
Jennifer Creech
Jim Dunne
Scott Schneider
Dominic Sanfilippo
Jarred White
John White
Ex Officio:
Kathryn Kinnucan-Welsch
Elizabeth Gustafson
Riad Alakkad
Fred Jenkins

Absent:
Juan Santamarina
Sawyer Hunley

Guest:
Judith Huacuja, Arts

Review/Approval of Prior Minutes:
- Review of CAPCC Minutes for March 11, 2013
  - Add bullet point:
    - we hope that what we have suggested is not simply a cut and paste exercise, but that,
      for example, the course designs will build on the CIT and truly are focused on
      accomplishing the CAP SLOs listed
  - Move to approve as amended: Leno
  - Second Motion Jarred:
  - Vote: All in favor

General Discussion:
- Don reported that after the fire alarm, some returned but minutes reflect discussion prior to the
  fire alarm. One discussion point that came up in that post-fire drill period was whether perhaps
  a procedure could be developed for quick review of REVISED documents (such as PHL 321)
  brought forth for the future to allow for pre-review discussion that could lead to a vote if the
  changes requested had been made by the proposer.
- Jim mentioned pp. 14-15 of the new Common Themes in the Mission and Identity of the
  University of Dayton publication that explains the CIT
- Katie: what we are discovering is that making it clear in the course proposal form is as simple
  and straightforward as we thought it might be; evolutionary process for all
- Don is in receipt of draft revisions of Dan Fouke’s proposals
  - Will discuss with Juan and Sawyer regarding a review process to be completed before
    CAPCC stops meeting in May.
  - Dan/John stated it was very helpful to have been here to hear the comments.

CIM Update:
- Changes have been submitted
o vendor working on the privacy issues, it is a new development, no timeline as of yet for completion
o one question is missing in section 4

- Some CIM users are entering existing courses as new instead of editing;
- Program proposal functionality will be launched 4/1
- Discussion surrounding email notifications throughout the CIM workflow process
  o All affected should be made aware that these notifications will be sent automatically during various stages or with changes
  o All departments which list a course on any page will be notified when content changes are made to that course (i.e., CMM and HC courses are listed in all majors)
- Don is in receipt of draft revisions of Dan Fouke’s proposals
  o Will discuss with Juan and Sawyer regarding a review process to be completed before CAPCC stops meeting in May.
  o Dan/John stated it was very helpful to have been here to hear the comments.
- Existing courses should be updated in CIM when course is approved all along the way going forward, i.e., AAC approval information /comments, rather than committee needing to refer back to the AAC documentation

**REVIEW OF VAH 101, VAH 201, VAH 202 and VAH 203:**

All four are proposed for inclusion and recognition as CAP Arts.

**VAH 101**
- Course proposal was clear
- Proposer asked to clarify what about the existing course was revised for CAP approval
  o Course introduced in 90s, revised 08-09; for CAP approval, committee began revisions to include non-western cultures to be more inclusive, post-colonial methods, globalization – more contemporary and more diverse artworks from around the world
- Proposer was asked to explain how specifically the course addresses the “value” piece; how is curriculum to support experiences that generate “valuing” of..
  o Students looking “so closely” that student does analysis re: motivations, political and social themes of the day; much writing and talking; communicate motivations, begin to explain social context – analysis explanation to other, deepens appreciation, value art
- Discussed issue of the definition of Critical Evaluation of our Times and whether an introductory-level course needs to hit all points
  o Committee agrees this course satisfactory in this regard but there is a need to discuss and define further for the future
- Rubric was reviewed and no concerns were raised
- Motion made to approve.
- Second motion made.
- In favor: 9
- Opposed: none
- Abstained: none
- Course is approved.

**VAH 201 and VAH 202**

These courses will be considered together.
• Section 4.6 could have been more specific with regard to how it satisfies versus just whether it satisfies the component
  o Proposer shared the manner in which VAH 201, 202, 203 203 all draw from study of philosophy and religious studies; have intensive writing components; also heavily history based
  o Proposer will submit a revision for this section to Nita; the course will be amended with this revision so that the course may serve as a model for other courses going forward
    ▪ With proposer permission we may post this and others as examples on the CAP website (Faculty Resources)
  o Don will take changes to CAS Executive Committee for the AAC
• Course objectives contain no reference to religious, faith traditions – clear reading further in the proposal; assume course objectives is what students would see
• Rubric was reviewed and no concerns were raised
• Motion made to approve.
• Second motion made.
• In favor: 9
• Opposed: none
• Abstained: none
• Courses are approved.

**VAH 203**

• 4.6 did good job of referring back to HC – not necessarily mentioned the later courses that could benefit from having taken this course
• Discussed who would typically take this course
  o Proposer states most who take are interested in humanities or social science area and doing a lot of research and writing; visual arts students usually take 203 and one of the others unless art history, then all three
• Rubric was reviewed and no concerns were raised
• Motion made to approve.
• Second motion made.
• In favor: 9
• Opposed: none
• Abstained: none
• Course is approved.

**Next meeting Monday, March 25, 2013 at 3:00 PM**
• add discussion about SLOs/Critical Evaluation of our Times – to what extent does a course need to address the entire SLO content depending upon the level (introductory, expanding or advanced)
• discussion regarding an expedited review and approval process for REVISED documents (for ex. PHL 321, SEE 401, 402).