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Minutes of the CAP Competencies Committee (CAPCC)
Date: November 26, 2012
Location: LTC Forum

Present:
Dominic Sanfilippo, SGA
Don Pair
Fred Jenkins
Jennifer Creech
Jim Dunne
John White
Juan Santamarina
Kathryn Kinnucan-Welsch
Leno Pedrotti
Leslie Picca
Riad Alakkad
Sawyer Hunley
Scott Schneider
Elizabeth Gustafson
Becki Lawhorn
Jarred White, SGA
Joan Plungis

Absent:
None

Guests:
None.

Meeting Minutes:

General:
• Two meetings remaining this year.
• There will be proposals received at the end of the month, but with the break approaching, approval will need to occur next semester.
• Sawyer: awaiting the electronic version to be available for entering the humanities commons program and courses before announcing their approval.

Course/Program Review Process Discussion (see included discussion points from Katie)
• Perhaps the committee could/should have discussed the proposals the week prior?
  o Might allow committee to provide questions/concerns to those submitting the proposal
  o May not need to be needed ongoing, but in this initial stage might be helpful
    • Discussed AAC process: executive committee, then to sub-committees which meet, including those proposing, before going to the AAC; lengthy process
• A longer meeting time may help; we need to be careful not to “rubber stamp”;
• Set up an Isidore group for CAP-CC Course/Program Approval
• At the 11/12 meeting, it was less a committee discussion and more a stream of questions to the guests
  o Going forward, process will be committee discussion and guests mainly there to observe and answer questions only if needed
• Should proposals be rewritten and resubmitted if clarification is deemed necessary?
• What minimum time should be allocated for approval of each course?
  o Perhaps start with 2-3 courses for review/approval per meeting, and adjust to more if/when we find we do not need the time
  o Proposal for conservative stance; two will be considered in the first meeting, then, if time is sufficient consider three the next.
Pending Courses for Approval
- AAC meeting this Friday – CMM 100 course, integration course, capstone course (single course proposals); also, sub committees will be meeting
- SOEAP – will have two for January

Course Expiration/Re-approval
- AAC has discussed the expiration/review timeframe for approved courses; three years may not be long enough initially;
- Jim and Leno will draft language for consideration at the 1/28 meeting

Meeting Minutes/Transcripts
- Minutes vs. Full Transcript-like Notes were discussed.
  - Don made motion for fuller notes; Riad made a second motion. All in favor.
  - Nita will post on the Porches site after committee review and approval

Updated Course Approval Rubric
- Corrections to be made:
  - pp. 11-12: duplicated entries
  - Provide clearer “key”/explanation of the SLO boxes
  - Page 2: need second year writing seminar points.
  - Mathematics – “suggested” is correct
  - Diversity p. 17 – diversity SLO should be highlighted
  - Name the tool “Guideline” instead of “Rubric”
  - Nita will share the document with the committee and any other needed corrections should be sent to her
    - Once corrected, will be posted on CAP website under Faculty Resources and link will be provided for committee to share with faculty

Plan for January
- The 1/28 meeting will be organizational, with two courses to be scheduled for approval on 2/4
- Discuss renewal time frame
- Plan/map the proposals and approval meeting dates

Next Meeting: Monday, December 3, 2:00PM-3:00PM, LTC Team Space
At this point, CAPCC meetings are scheduled for 1 hour. The review of the Humanities Commons Program and Course Proposal prompted the following thoughts:

1) The conversation focused on substantial points that are likely to have consequence for decisions about action by the committee

2) The conversation ended at approx. 2:55, with a call for vote for approval immediately prior to the end of the meeting, which did not allow time for the CAPCC to discuss options for action per our procedures.

3) The course proposers remained in the meeting during the vote.

I suggest we consider the following questions:

How should we ensure that we have time in the meeting to thoroughly summarize and discuss the points that were raised during the question and answer portion of the meeting?

Should the course proposers remain in the room during discussion and vote?

How should we ensure that the 3 options for action are being considered in our discussion?

How are the comments collected during the open comment period presented to the CAPCC while we are still using the paper form? (I am assuming this will be incorporated into the electronic system)

How do we communicate to campus our charge per our procedures: ie, the review process, criteria for approval by CAPCC, and possible actions?