I. Chairperson Election: Lee Dixon was nominated to serve as chair again this year. The committee voted to elect him as the 2016-17 CAPC chair by a vote of 7 in favor, 0 opposed and 1 abstention.

II. CAPC Course Review Guidelines

A. Documents: (1) CAPC course review guidelines for all CAP components; (2) Required HIR Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for CAP components

B. Discussion

1. Expectations for fulfilling the HIR Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) through the three developmental levels (introductory, expanded, and advanced). When reviewing CAP course proposals, the committee’s understanding in the past is that a SLO won’t be met in its entirety at the introductory and expanded levels and more is expected at the advanced level. For example, public presentation and defense is not required for Scholarship at the introductory and expanded levels. The philosophical approach to the seven HIR SLOs is that the SLOs will be so prevalent across courses and experiences that students will have multiple opportunities to engage with them. In addition, the University community has learned over time that the HIR SLOs can be viewed more as value statements about the skills and capabilities that UD students should have when they graduate, rather than outcome statements that can be directly assessed. Course learning objectives should be more concrete and observable. At the end of the discussion the committee agreed to or recommended the following:

   a. The committee did not see a need to add a statement to the CAPC procedures in light of the discussion about fulfilling the SLOs through the three developmental levels.

   b. The Deans’ Offices should highlight that faculty can consult with Sawyer Hunley and/or their associate dean for assistance developing CAP course proposals. For the College of Arts and Sciences, Phyllis Bergiel (Coordinator for Academic Initiatives) is the point person.

   c. The committee was in favor of sending formal approval letters to the proposers and chairs when courses are approved for the Common Academic Program, indicating the component(s) and SLO(s) for which the course was approved, the year when the course will be up for four-year review, and the expectation that the course learning objectives should be assessed from the beginning to demonstrate students’ level of achievement.

   d. Once the 4-year review process is determined beyond this first year, the committee was also in favor of sending letters for all previously approved CAP courses, indicating the component(s) and SLO(s) for which they were approved, the year when they will be up for review, and the expectations of the review process.

2. Revisions to CAPC Course Review Guidelines: The committee discussed proposed revisions, noted below, in the guidelines that were distributed. Committee members were asked to send feedback about additional revisions to Sawyer Hunley. Proposers should consult the
guidelines when developing CAP course proposals. The committee utilizes the guidelines when reviewing CAP course proposals. Once revisions are finalized, the guidelines will be re-posted on the CAP website and the CAPC Isidore site.

a. Oral Communication: Remove Community as a required SLO. CMM 100 was originally CAP-approved in February 2013 with four SLOs: Scholarship, Diversity, Community, and Critical Evaluation of Our Times. The course review guideline includes Diversity and Community as required SLOs. The Communication Department determined that they couldn’t adequately address all four SLOs and submitted a revised proposal to remove Community. The CAPC approved the revision in October 2014. Therefore, the course review guideline needs to reflect that change by removing Community as a required SLO.

b. Crossing Boundaries (Faith Traditions, Practical Ethical Action, Inquiry, and Integrative): Remove a duplicative statement and adding a phrase to reflect what is included in the CAP Senate Document (Doc-10-04).

c. All of the guidelines were reformatted to highlight more clearly which SLOs are required.

3. Required SLOs for CAP Components: The CAPC developed the course review guidelines based on how the CAP components are defined in the CAP Senate Document. SLOs were set as required only when they were specified in the CAP Senate Document. The committee discussed the possibility of having further conversation about reconsidering required SLOs. For example, would Critical Evaluation of Our Times be appropriate as a required SLO for Arts courses? Currently, the Arts component doesn’t require any specific SLOs; courses must select a minimum of one SLO, which is the case for all CAP courses. The committee requested data for SLOs for CAP-approved Arts courses. They also requested overall data for SLOs to see if any are underrepresented.

4. APC Clarifications for CAP: It was noted that the clarifications that the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic voted on last spring will be inserted into the CAP Senate Document as footnotes. The clarifications were regarding the Capstone, Mathematics, and Natural Science requirements, as well as the renewal of CAP courses.

III. 4-Year Review of CAP Courses

A. Documents: (1) Department chair letter for the 24 CAP courses up for 4-year review in 2016-17 (8/30/2016); (2) APC clarification concerning renewal of CAP courses (4/15/2016); (3) Issues for the schedule of 4-year review of CAP courses; (4) CAPC Procedures (revised 3/15/2016)

B. Discussion

1. The committee agreed to base the 4-year review schedule on the most recent CAP approval date under the following circumstances:

   a. Courses that were reapproved for CAP with changes to components and/or SLOs and the approval and re-approval dates fall under different Catalog years (CMM 100, SSC 200, MUS 327, and VAH 320). Refer to the handout for further details.

   b. Cross-listed courses that were not approved simultaneously and fall under different Catalog years (EDT/ENG 466 and PHL/THR 322). Refer to the handout for further details.

2. Background information was provided as to how the 4-year review process was developed as outlined in the sample department chair letter shared with the committee. The APC was consulted last year and determined that the process outlined in the CAPC Procedures was insufficient to fulfill the requirements in the CAP Senate Document. A set of six questions
was developed to use this year and the APC will have further conversation to develop a long-term solution. The CIM course form is currently being revised and the 4-year review questions will be embedded so that departments can submit their responses. The CAPC will review them once they are submitted; the due date is February 15, 2017. To assist departments with the 4-year review process, Sawyer Hunley met individually with each chair that has courses up for review to discuss what they need to complete the process. In addition, a series of 2-3 group sessions will be scheduled this fall to provide opportunities to collaborate with the Learning Teaching Center, UDit, and CAPC to answer the six questions and refine the review process, including providing input into the development of a data collection system.

3. The committee was supportive of the idea of giving provisional re-approval for courses that develop plans for conducting assessment but do not have fully implemented assessment solutions by the time their responses for the 4-year review are due in mid-February. Consultation with the APC is needed about this suggested approach.

IV. Agenda Topics for Future Meetings
   A. Finalize revisions to CAPC course review guidelines
   B. Requested data for Arts courses’ SLOs and underrepresented SLOs
   C. Revised CIM course form
   D. Continue 4-year review discussion, including qualities the CAPC will be looking for in responses

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen