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CAP COMMITTEE
Thursday, October 27, 2016 | 11:00 a.m.-12:15 p.m.; Learning Teaching Center-Meeting Space (028)

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

Excused: John Goebel, Linda Hartley (ex officio)

Guests: Steve Bein, Simanti Dasgupta, Grant Neeley, Leslie Picca, Anthony Smith, Daniel Thompson

I. Course Reviews

1) POL 381: Film and Politics
   A. Course Proposal Information:
      1. Proposer: Michelle Pautz could not be present for the committee’s discussion. Grant Neeley, department chair, was present.
      2. Component: Crossing Boundaries-Integrative
      3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (advanced), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (expanded)
   B. Discussion:
      1. Prerequisites: The Humanities Commons doesn’t need to be listed because it’s generally understood that students will complete the Humanities Commons before taking Crossing Boundaries courses.
      2. Since POL 381 is proposed as an Integrative course, a question was raised whether students will be aware that it will draw from other disciplines. Other disciplines are mentioned in the section how the course satisfies the selected CAP components, and the course topics and outline also make it clear that the course is interdisciplinary. It was agreed that the course description will be revised to reflect the interdisciplinary nature of the course since that is something students focus on when selecting courses. In addition, course objective #1 will be revised as follows: Students will be able to: “Categorize and evaluate background interdisciplinary information on the American film industry and its role in society.”
      3. The committee had positive feedback about the course overall.
   C. Committee’s Actions:
      1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal pending the requested minor revisions. There was no further discussion.
      2. Vote: 10-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).
   D. Follow-up: Revised wording for the course description and the course objective mentioned above was provided to Sawyer Hunley. She made the changes in CIM and approved the course on behalf of the committee on October 27.

2) REL 457: Living as Marianist Student Communities
   A. Course Proposal Information:
      1. Proposer: Neomi DeAnda could not be present for the committee’s discussion. Daniel Thompson, department chair, was present.
      2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Integrative, Advanced Religious Studies
      3. Student Learning Outcomes: Faith Traditions (advanced), Community (advanced), Vocation (expanded)
   B. Discussion:
      1. Since REL 457 is proposed as an Integrative course, the previous question was again raised whether students will be aware that it will draw from other disciplines. The course content information is implicit about this. The committee requested that the course description and course objectives be amended to reflect the interdisciplinary nature of the course. An existing course objective could be revised or a new one could be added.
2. The committee had positive feedback about the course overall and suggested that the
department consider developing a Marianist-focused course that would be open to all
students. REL 457 is limited to students living in a Marianist Student Community.
3. Criteria for Evaluation of Student Learning: The proposal includes the following: “The criteria
used will include a student’s critical engagement of course sources and a student’s ability to
move beyond one’s own perspective to see a variety of perspectives as valid rather than only a
need to defend one’s own perspective (C.O. 1, 3, 4). A question was raised how this will happen
and how it will be evaluated. This inquiry will be conveyed to the proposer.

C. Committee’s Actions:
1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal pending the
requested minor revisions. There was no further discussion.
2. Vote: 10-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

D. Revised wording for the course description and a new course objective was provided to Sawyer
Hunley. She made the changes in CIM and approved the course on behalf of the committee on
October 28.

3) REL 270: Popular Culture, American Religions
A. Course Proposal Information:
   1. Proposer: Anthony Smith was present for the committee’s discussion. Daniel Thompson,
      department chair, was also present.
   2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Faith Traditions, Diversity and Social Justice
   3. Student Learning Outcomes: Faith Traditions (expanded), Diversity (expanded)
B. Discussion:
   1. In response to a question from the committee, the proposer clarified how students in the
course will “examine their own faith commitments” and “participate in dialogue with other
faith traditions” (required for Faith Traditions courses).
   2. A question was raised whether the Advanced Religious Studies component was considered for
this course. Through the department’s developmental approach to its curriculum, Faith
Traditions courses are prerequisites for Advanced Religious Studies courses. This is an internal
department policy and not CAP policy. This approach means that students in the professional
schools are unlikely to take Advanced Religious Studies courses through the Department of
Religious Studies because the schools’ degree requirements offer little flexibility students need
to take courses that double count. There has been ongoing conversation about this issue.
C. Committee’s Actions:
   1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There
was no further discussion.
   2. Vote: 10-0-0 (for-against-abstention).

4) ANT 336: Topics in Medical Anthropology
A. Course Proposal Information:
   1. Proposer: Simanti Dasgupta was present for the committee’s discussion. Leslie Picca,
      department chair, was also present.
   2. Component: Crossing Boundaries-Integrative, Diversity and Social Justice
   3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (advanced), Diversity (advanced)
B. Discussion:
   1. In reference to the interdisciplinary aspect for Integrative courses, it was noted that this
proposal is explicit in the course description and course objectives. The proposer noted that
faculty from other disciplines (e.g., premed) are invited to guest lecture. In additions, readings
and case studies are interdisciplinary.
   2. This course had received a Diversity and Social Justice course development grant and variations
of the course have been taught for the past few years. Students from this course have given
presentations at the Stander Symposium.
3. The committee had positive feedback about the inclusion of an experiential learning aspect and about the course overall.

C. Committee’s Actions:
1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
2. Vote: 10-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

5) **ANT 340: Place, Culture, and Social Justice**

A. Course Proposal Information:
1. Proposer: Miranda Hallett was not present for the committee’s discussion. Leslie Picca, department chair, was present.
2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Practical Ethical Action, Diversity and Social Justice
3. Student Learning Outcomes: Diversity (expanded), Community (expanded), Practical Wisdom (introduced)

B. Discussion:
1. The committee had positive feedback about the course overall and the inclusion of an experiential learning aspect. A question was raised about photography and visual analysis, which is listed under instructional methods for experiential learning. It was for informational purposes what visual analysis entails and not related to how the course fulfills CAP requirements.

C. Committee’s Actions:
1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
2. Vote: 10-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

D. A procedural question was raised about consultation for Practical Ethical Action courses. Is the assumption that the Department of Philosophy will be consulted? From the AAC perspective, they are looking for endorsement from a department with expertise in ethics – either Philosophy or Religious Studies. From the CAPC’s perspective, action on a Practical Ethical Action course wouldn’t be delayed if Philosophy or Religious Studies were not consulted; however, the committee would be looking for evidence in the proposal that the course addresses ethics. Since consultation questions are periodically raised in the AAC, the College Dean’s Office drafted a procedures document used the language from the CAPC Procedures as a starting point. The document was reviewed by the College Chairs and Program Directors (CCPD) and will be on the AAC agenda in November.

6) **PHL 301: Practical Logic**

A. Course Proposal Information:
1. Proposer: Paul Tibbetts was not present for the committee’s discussion.
2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry, Advanced Philosophical Studies
3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (expanded), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (expanded)

B. Discussion:
1. The committee requested that a course objective be revised or added to address the reflective and comparative aspect Inquiry courses (i.e., examine methods of inquiry in the student’s own major with those in the field of the Inquiry course).
2. The committee recommended that the reflective assignment included in the section how the course satisfies the selected CAP components be incorporated into a new course objective as follows: Students will be able to: “reflect on the difference between a practical logic response and a discipline-specific response.”
C. Committee’s Actions:
   1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal pending the requested minor revision. There was no further discussion.
   2. Vote: 10-0-0 (for-against-abstention).

7) **PHL 347: Japanese Philosophy**
   A. Course Proposal Information:
      1. Proposer: Steve Bein was present for the committee’s discussion.
      2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Faith Traditions, Advanced Philosophical Studies
      3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (advanced), Faith Traditions (advanced)
   B. Discussion:
      1. The committee had positive feedback about the course overall.
   C. Committee’s Actions:
      1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
      2. Vote: 10-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

8) **PHL 381: Sexual Ethics**
   A. Course Proposal Information:
      1. Proposer: Rebecca Whisnant could not be present for the committee’s discussion.
      2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Practical Ethical Action, Advanced Philosophical Studies
      3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (expanded), Practical Wisdom (expanded)
   B. Discussion:
      1. The proposal addresses the Catholic intellectual tradition under the section how the course satisfies the selected CAP components and is referenced under course topics or outline. The committee discussed whether it should be addressed in the course objectives as well. Ultimately, the committee agreed that the proposal is satisfactory as written and noted that addressing the CIT is a component requirement for Advanced Studies courses. It will be sufficient as long as a course addresses the CIT somewhere in the proposal.
   C. Committee’s Actions:
      1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
      2. Vote: 10-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

II. **Announcements**
   A. The committee’s next meeting is Thursday, November 10.
   B. The proposed meeting time next semester is Mondays from 2:30-3:45 p.m. A follow-up notice will be sent to the committee.
   C. Sawyer Hunley will attend the Academic Policies Committee meeting on Tuesday, November 1 for the discussion about the revised CAPC procedures.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen