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I. Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry Courses: Interdisciplinary Programs and Unit/Division Delineations
   A. Discussion
      1. Background: Those working on developing a new major in Sustainability Studies raised a question about how the Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry component might be handled since it is an interdisciplinary program. As the number of interdisciplinary programs grows, the CAPC is having the discussion to clarify how the Inquiry component is fulfilled. The language used in the CAP Document (DOC-10-04) is as follows: “The Inquiry component of CAP requires that students select a course outside their own division to better understand the ways of knowing found in other academic disciplines....” (lines 489-490; description of the component continues through line 503). Currently, Criminal Justice is the only interdisciplinary major that has specific coding in DegreeWorks. That major is housed within the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work and does not allow Inquiry courses from the social sciences to fulfill the requirement. Other interdisciplinary programs currently allow any Inquiry course to fulfill the requirement.
      2. It was noted that the practice for dual majors is that the Inquiry course has to be taken outside of the division of the primary major. It was also noted that this practice doesn’t seem to be documented anywhere.
      3. The College of Arts and Sciences is the only academic unit that has formalized divisions: Arts, Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences.
      4. To proceed with clarifying how the Inquiry component is fulfilled for interdisciplinary majors, the committee agreed to the following approach: The heads of interdisciplinary programs will be asked to provide input about fulfillment of the Inquiry requirement in their program. At this point, all of the existing interdisciplinary programs are in the College of Arts and Sciences. Danielle Poe will be consulted before others are contacted. The CAPC will receive an update after the conversation has taken place.
      5. Other issues related to the Inquiry component were raised:
         a. Are some students taking Inquiry courses too early? Since the intent is to reflect upon and compare their major discipline with the discipline of the Inquiry course, can they achieve that if they haven’t had much exposure to their major discipline?
         b. Students can fulfill the Inquiry component with AP or transfer credit and, thus, might not have other opportunities for the reflective/comparative aspect. An additional issue was raised regarding inconsistency between AP and transfer credit decisions (e.g., HST 251 and 252). It was suggested that the CAP Associate and Assistant Deans Committee discuss that issue.
         c. How often are students taking Inquiry courses while they are in Discover programs (undeclared)?
         d. The CAP Office is trying to get data about how students are fulfilling the Inquiry component. The committee will revisit these issues once data are available.
         e. It was advised to keep in mind how policy decisions could constrain students’ options. Policy should be created for the rule, not the exception.
II. Catholic Intellectual Tradition (CIT) and CAP

A. Document: “Guidelines for Addressing the Catholic Intellectual Tradition in Advanced Study CAP Course Proposals”

B. Discussion

1. Background: The “Guidelines for Addressing the Catholic Intellectual Tradition in Advanced Study CAP Course Proposals” were developed in response to frequent conversations the committee was having around three years ago about how the CIT should be addressed – whether students need to understand explicitly that what they are learning about in the course contributes to the CIT. The CAPC had a discussion in April 2015 specifically about the CIT and invited guests to participate (Humanities Chairs and others with expertise about the CIT). One guest conveyed that the ideal is for students to have an explicit understanding, but that isn’t necessarily have to happen that way.

2. Most of the Guidelines document draws directly from the CAP Senate document and also includes resources for the CIT.

3. Since developing the Guidelines, the committee hasn’t had significant issues with the CIT being addressed in Advanced Studies proposals the past couple of years, until a recent meeting.

4. While the committee has generally had consensus when reviewing course proposals, it was recognized that the committee has representatives from different areas who bring different perspectives. It shouldn’t be a concern if the committee’s votes aren’t unanimous.

5. Going forward, the committee agreed about the importance of having requested clarifications during course reviews documented in CIM.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen
Common Academic Program
Four Year Review Report

Section 1: Course Information

1-A. Course Number and Title:


1-B. Department:


1-C. Faculty member(s) who teach the course:


1-D. When has the course been taught in the last four years since CAP approved (year/semester – list all that apply)?

Please contact the CAP Office if the course has not been offered since it was CAP approved.


1-E. CAP Component(s) the course fulfills:

Check all that apply. This information can be found in CIM and the CAP Office’s letter notifying the department of courses up for review.

| First-Year Humanities | Crossing Boundaries-Practical Ethical Action | |
| Second-Year Writing Seminar | Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry | |
| Oral Communication | Crossing Boundaries-Integrative | |
| Mathematics | Advanced Religious Studies | |
| Social Sciences | Advanced Philosophical Studies | |
| Arts | Advanced Historical Studies | |
| Natural Sciences | Diversity and Social Justice | |
| Crossing Boundaries-Faith Traditions | Major Capstone | |
1. F. UD Habits of Inquiry and Reflection (HIR) Institutional Learning Goals (ILGs)* the course fulfills:

Check all that apply. This information can be found in CIM and the CAP Office’s letter notifying the department of courses up for review.

*Habits of Inquiry and Reflection used the terminology of “Student Learning Outcomes” (SLOs). While the seven areas remain the same, the terminology has changed to “Institutional Learning Goals” (ILGs), effective with the 2017-18 academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILG</th>
<th>Introductory</th>
<th>Expanded</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Traditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Wisdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Evaluation of Our Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2: Learning Outcomes
For each question in this section, please provide a response of no more than 250 words per question.

2.A. What are the course learning objectives (CLOs) from when the course received CAP designation? (Refer to CIM.)
2-B. How do those CLOs connect to the UD Institutional Learning Goals (ILGs) and CAP Component(s)? Or, put differently, which ILGs and CAP Components connect to which CLOs? (Mapping CLOs to ILGs is sufficient.)

2-C. What do you do to determine if each CLO is being achieved? How do you determine if each CLO is being achieved each semester? What student artifacts are used to make those determinations?

Please be specific in your responses and you are encouraged to attach supplemental information, such as review plans, rubrics, assignment instructions, etc.
**Section 3: Tracking Learning**

For each question in this section, please provide a response of no more than 250 words per question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-A. How do you use the information gleaned from student artifacts to determine student learning?</td>
<td>Please attach any relevant documents, such as rubrics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-B. What conclusions can you draw from your review of student learning regarding overall student learning in this course over the last four years?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4: Future Course Offerings

For each question in this section, please provide a response of no more than 250 words per question.

4-A. What changes, if any, regarding CAP Components, ILGs, and/or CLOs and their relationship to ILGs do you plan on making in the future and why?

4-B. Looking ahead to future offerings of this course, what would you like to do with this course? What changes do you want to make and why? What do you need to make those aspirations a reality?