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Minutes of the CAP Competencies Committee (CAPCC)
Date: September 17, 2012
Location: LTC Forum

Present:
Sawyer Hunley
Don Pair
Juan Santamarina
Leslie Picca
Joan Plungis
Jim Dunne
John White
Riad Alakkad
Kathryn Kinnucan-Welsch
Elizabeth Gustafson
Leno Pedrotti

Absent:
Becki Lawhorn
Scott Schneider
Fred Jenkins

Announcements:
Leno Pedrotti has been called upon to take on a course which is held during our meeting time. He is hoping that he will not have to continue teaching it when the original faculty member returns. If that is the case, he will remain on the committee. If not, we will have to find a temporary replacement.

Meeting Minutes:
Motion to approve Minutes from 9/10/2012 by Elizabeth Gustafson; second motion by Juan Santamarina with no further discussion, committee voted all in favor to approve.

Old Business:

Procedure document deadline:
Final version of CAP-CC Procedure document needs to be to APC in approximately three weeks.

New Business:

Procedure Document Discussion:
4.4 Discussion surrounding meaning/implication of the “welcome to attend and speak” verbiage. After discussion, decision was to change first sentence to “Written communication.....” and adapt to “all who wish to speak” and adapt to “serve as a resource”.

4.6 Status of Proposal Discussion: Will leave as is.

4.7 If the changes made in a request for more information are substantial enough, committee could need to request that it be sent through the entire process as a “new” course proposal.

Committee will need to communicate that “rejection” is an invitation for revision. We will want to be sure that we have access to the original submission when a revision is submitted.
Correction to add “dean” into the workflow communication chain

Notifications will follow the workflow of the submission process. May not need to specify the 2 week timeframe for resubmission to avoid inaction for extended periods, however, the onus is on the proposer, not the committee. Strike any reference to time period.

Discussion: Do we need to add chairperson of the APC?? No – we are a subcommittee of the APC. There is wide communication for approved courses.

General
Also, add a “blanket statement” within the procedures to communicate “the wording of this document is dependent upon the finalization of the system technicalities”.

CourseLeaf Approval Process and Form Distribution Discussion:
(Sawyer reported on discussion with Jennifer Creech) Current plan for proposer to enter into CourseLeaf, it will go through Dept. Chair to Dean’s office, from Dean’s office to Sawyer, Juan and Nita, who will then do “something” to send it out to everyone electronically. It is unknown at this time how this will/could be done in CourseLeaf. Once approved, it will go to all in the process and the registrar...if not approved, need to return to all in the process through the reverse of the workflow procedure.

Next Meeting: Monday, September 24, 2:00PM-3:00PM, LTC Forum

• Start with 4.8 of the Procedures Document regarding time limitation
• How do we address “Competency”
• Humanities Commons courses on track for submission 10/5
• Harder look at the added piece from Don Pair/Tim Wilbers – committee should thoroughly review prior to next meeting

Meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Nita Teeters, CAP Assessment Coordinator