Minutes of the CAP Competencies Committee (CAPCC)

Date: January 28, 2013
Location: LTC Forum

Present:
Dominic Sanfilippo, SGA
Don Pair
Fred Jenkins
Jennifer Creech
Jim Dunne
Juan Santamarina
Kathryn Kinnucan-Welsch

Leno Pedrotti
Riad Alakkad
Scott Schneider
Elizabeth Gustafson
Becki Lawhorn
Jarred White, SGA
Keri Brown-Kirschman

Absent:
Sawyer Hunley (jury duty)
Joan Plungis
John White

Announcements:
• Welcome back to Keri Brown-Kirschman

Approval of Minutes:
• Approval of 12/3 minutes
  o moved for approval by Becki, Don pair second motion – all present in favor.

Update on CIM:
• Update by Jennifer – submitted last wave of revision; will send link out with final version and will move forward from there. Timeline not yet determined – should be soon after final revisions.
  o Leno asked if it makes sense to hold off on submissions
  o Don would like to be able to announce on Friday that the system is ready if possible or have a solid update
    ▪ Jennifer provide expected date before Friday, 2/1.

Discussion Items:
• Revision of Section 4.8 in CAPCC Procedures Document
  o The CAPCC procedures were approved with the exception of 4.8 in the fall. Last time we met we agreed to discuss this section
  o Jim and Leno created a rewrite of 4.8 and a possible electronic review process/procedure.
  o Related notes from APC were distributed
    ▪ Rewrite is from Leno not directed by the APC
  o APC questions on distributed notes were reviewed
    ▪ Effective date concern about possible delay in course actually being offered after approval; course could only be run once or twice before needing to be up for review again.
  o 5 year proposal is just as a starting point for discussion since we proposed 3 years initially and there was some question.
  o Proposed revision was shared.
Discussed reason for adding B) since the options exist to keep or review, there needs to be that option

- If A) is chosen there is still a means of communicating changes in structure (minor) versus C) if there is a major change

KKW: do we need to define minor/major changes?

- LP: leave to department; more to communicate changes in delivery, etc.
- JD: A) states course continues to meet SLOs and CAP Component(s) in same manner

  - Two scenarios: intent is to change; or, course has drifted over time...
    - Even if drifted it may need to continue to be taught so that it is available to students who need it to meet requirements.
  - Do we need language regarding what happens if deadline is missed? Must repeat review process...gives them another year? Trying to avoid disruption.
  - Confirming that the review driver is the department – not CAPCC
    - CAPCC notifies department that a review is needed
    - The review timetable initiates the review
  - CAPCC department does not initiate a review based upon any feedback.

  - Perhaps we need to know what the Assessment committee recommends
  - What about something that comes to our attention??
  - This process can be changed in the future, informed by the assessment process

**Review Time Frame Discussion:**

- Do we need to act on this now, since we have a timeline of three years as it is now, is there merit on holding off on this until program review and info from assessment committee?
  - DP there may be value in checking in w/ UAC to see where they are to inform 4.8.
  - It is believed Sawyer prefers to complete this document and prefers 3 years to 5.
  - Maybe include a statement of intent...what we initially believe the period of approval will be noting it could be revised.
  - Juan recommends settling on something now as most proposing courses now may believe that there is no review period (similar to gen ed)
    - We should add disclaimer that these guidelines may change but that we should arrive at some sort of guidance for now.
  - What if we had a 5 year review period but then the assessment piece refines and we determine that the courses approved have issues...
    - DP: if we decide 5 years, then change to 3 that is not a positive adjustment. Maybe better to approve a shorter time frame and make it longer in the future if deemed appropriate.
    - Option - state that periodically departments will need to recertify courses. The time frame will be decided upon after the initial 2 year comprehensive review of CAP.

- In CIM, courses approved do not go into the catalog until the next catalog year, although it can be taught before. Need to arrive upon a standard point of time when the review timeframe begins.
- If department certifies – CAPCC does not have to be involved in a review.
  - Department course review could easily be overlooked and get in a vicious cycle
  - Should it be more specific who within the department is responsible for review? JS...department chair responsibility.
- Discussed that we do not need to know the reason for B).
- Committee members agree to remove C). Move some detail from the form to the policy rewrite.
- The effective start date of the review time frame should be the date of the catalog in which the course first appears
- We will know much more in four years about meaningful ways to review; assessment data will be available to inform the process.

**Summary of Procedure Document Discussion:**
- Remove C)
- Review timeframe starts from date of the catalog year first time the course is listed as approved for CAP
- No agreement on 3 or 5 years...maybe 4 years?
- Considering putting in place a detailed statement of review until after first program assessment of CAP in two years?
- Leno will let APC know we need more input from UAC at minimum
  - APC meets next in two weeks.

**Other Discussion:**
- Leno confirmed that CAPCC reporting to APC is sufficient via overlap members.
- Confirmed all are in agreement with the course review process.
- Juan will draft a script for used at the approval meetings to drive the process within the allotted time, so that it is done the same way every time.
- Next two meetings/weeks we will do course reviews: 2/4 CMM 100, 2/11 HST Capstone and ENG proposal

**Next Meeting:** Monday, February 4, 2013, 3:00PM