CAP COMMITTEE
Thursday, October 13, 2016 | 11:00 a.m.-12:15 p.m.; Kennedy Union 211

Present: Lee Dixon, Heidi Gauder, Keigo Hirakawa, Sawyer Hunley, Fred Jenkins (ex officio), Danielle Poe, Scott Segalowitz (ex officio), Bill Trollinger, John White
Excused: Brad Balser, Serdar Durmusoglu, Linda Hartley (ex officio), Terence Lau (ex officio), Shuang-Ye Wu

I. CAPC Procedures
   A. Document: CAPC Procedures (10/11/2016 draft revisions)
   B. Discussion
      1. The CAPC Procedures have been revised to include details of the four-year review process for CAP courses. The committee’s feedback from previous meetings has been incorporated.
      2. Deferral for courses offered less than once a year (see CAPC Process: 4.8.2.D): The committee agreed that no changes in the draft are required. It was recognized that more time might be needed through offering a course multiple times in order to develop an assessment plan. For example, the course learning outcomes might need to be addressed prior to developing an assessment plan. The deferral period will be two years and a maximum of one deferral will be allowed for each course.
      3. Conditional re-approval for two years (see 4.9.3): The committee did not think that items B and C in this section (listed below) contradict each other. Therefore, no changes in the draft are required.
         B. A conditional re-approval would be applicable for courses that provide a description of an assessment plan, but have no current assessment process or data. During the two-year re-approval, the assessment process would be used. In the next review period (after the two years), information resulting from this process would be provided. A maximum of one conditional re-approval is allowed for each course.
         C. This action should not be taken if a course does not have a current assessment plan and does not provide a plan for assessment of the University of Dayton Student Learning Outcomes. In those cases, the course will not be re-approved for CAP.
      4. Course is not re-approved (see 4.9.4): From the committee’s discussion, the following revision was made to item B in the draft and item C was added:
         B. By taking this action, the CAPC communicates its decision that the course, as designed, does not clearly satisfy the criteria for at least one of the proposed CAP components or the proposed University of Dayton Student Learning Outcomes, or that the proposal is incomplete.
         C. This action will be taken if a course has no current assessment plan and does not provide a plan for assessment of the University of Dayton Student Learning Outcomes.
      5. The committee discussed feedback that the document is too wordy. The committee’s perspective is that the details are needed to clarify the process. The committee was in favor of not making further edits.
6. Approval: A motion was made and seconded to approve the CAPC Procedures with the additional revisions noted in item 4 above. There was no further discussion and the motion passed by a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions. The amended procedures will be forwarded to the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate for review and approval.

7. As previously discussed, after the APC approves the amended procedures, letters will be sent to departments and programs to notify them about the four-year review process for CAP courses. Their respective lists of CAP courses and four-year review schedules will be provided. This information has already been distributed for the courses up for four-year review this year.

II. CAP Course Reviews
   A. Documents: (1) CAPC Isidore site instructions; (2) Course Review Disposition Report (10/05/2016); (3) Providing feedback in advance to proposers
   B. Discussion
      1. Quorum: Six voting members are required for quorum. Committee members were requested to provide notification as soon as possible if they are unable to attend a meeting. There was one instance last spring where course reviews had to be rescheduled because the quorum requirements were not met.
      2. CAPC Isidore site: A brief overview was given about the organization of the site and instructions were shared with committee members.
      3. The committee discussed pros and cons of providing feedback about course proposals prior to the meeting when they will be reviewed. Ultimately, the committee decided against doing so. The committee’s perspective is that dialogue with proposers has improved the review process and that it is more effective to communicate feedback in person. In cases where neither the proposer nor department chair are able to attend the meeting, they will be asked to have someone else attend to represent the course. If that is not possible, the respective associate dean on the committee could represent the course.

III. Minutes: The minutes of the September 29, 2016 meeting were accepted as written.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.
Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen