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I. Committee Membership: Committee members introduced themselves. David Watkins is a new member representing the social sciences. The CAP Office recently notified the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate that a nomination for the natural sciences faculty representative hasn’t been identified yet. The College of Arts and Sciences Dean’s Office has reached out to several faculty members since last spring and all have declined. The Student Government Association is working on identifying a nomination for a second student representative. All nominations go to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for approval.

II. Chairperson Election: A motion was made and seconded for Bill Trollinger to serve as chair for the 2018-19 academic year; it was approved by unanimous vote.

III. Four-Year Review of CAP Courses: Updates and Planning
   A. 2017-18 Review Cycle: started with 34 courses
      1. Deferred for two years: one course
      2. Withdrawn from CAP and deactivated: one course (faculty member who developed it retired; department has no plans to have anyone else teach it)
      3. CAP designation removed: one course (department didn’t submit a 4-Year Review report)
      4. Of the 31 courses that submitted reports, nine were reapproved for four years and 22 were reapproved for two years. Departments were notified about the decisions and any additional feedback from the committee last spring (mid-April) and that responses and updates in CIM were to be completed by September 1, 2018. All of the courses are accounted for and most have completed the updates. The CAP Office met with several chairs or faculty to clarify what was needed for the updates or inconsistencies between the 4-Year Review reports and updates made in CIM. The CAP Office is still working with eleven courses from five departments to complete the updates.
      5. The CAP Office provided an update to the APC yesterday about the 4-Year Review process – the status of last year’s review cycle and plans for this year.
   B. 2018-19 Review Cycle: starting with 107 courses, with every academic unit participating this year
      1. Deferral requests so far: seven courses
      2. Reports submitted so far: two (Reports are due January 28, 2019.)
      3. Michelle Pautz attended several departmental and unit meetings over the summer to talk about CAP and the 4-Year Review process and will continue to have these types of conversations, as well as meet with faculty individually.
      4. The next 4-Year Review workshop will be held on Friday, September 14 (9:00-11:00 a.m. in KU 310). CAP committee members are welcome to attend and were asked to encourage others from their units to attend. The workshop will provide an overview of the process and presentations from a few faculty about their experience with the process and assessment: Wiebke Diestelkamp (Mathematics), Lee Dixon (Psychology), and Steve Wilhoit (English).
      5. Over the course of the semester, the committee will need to discuss logistics for reviewing reports this year (e.g., whether to continue the subcommittee structure and, if so, the appropriate size).
IV. CAP Events and Plans: Fall Semester

Documents: 1) Post-Year Review Grants RFP; 2) CAP with Friends Schedule: Fall 2018

A. CAP Course Improvement and Innovation Grants: Post 4-Year Review

1. The Provost’s Office, Learning Teaching Center, and CAP Office are providing support for this new grant program, and the CAP Leadership Team (CAPL) will manage the process. Courses that have already gone through the 4-Year Review process and received two- or four-year reapproval are eligible. The CAP Office sent emails to chairs and faculty earlier this week about the grant RFP to implement course improvements and innovations to address issues raised during the review process. The grants will be awarded to CAP courses; faculty members can apply individually for a course or as a group for a multi-section course. Grant proposals will articulate a project/plan to pursue ongoing improvement and innovative efforts with the course. As a means of building a community or practice, recipients will commit to sharing an appropriate compilation of the project/plan’s efforts (e.g., video or PowerPoint). The grant program is described in greater detail in the RFP document.

B. CAP Lunch Discussions: CAP 101 and CAP Headaches

1. The Provost’s Office sent a campus-wide announcement earlier in the week about the CAP discussion opportunities this semester. Two dates have been scheduled for each type of session; more will be added, if needed. These sessions were organized as follow-up to CAP focus groups conducted last spring by the Business Research Group.
   a. CAP 101: Intended for members of the campus community who regularly interact with students, including faculty (including department chairs, adjuncts, lecturers, tenure-track, and tenured) and staff (including advisors, departmental administrative assistants, and Student Development staff). The session will provide an overview of CAP, explain its structure, and answer questions about CAP.
   b. CAP Headaches: Opportunity for faculty and staff to come together and discuss challenges and frustrations they have with CAP. After identifying challenges, participants, through group activities, will be asked to brainstorm possible solutions for the issues they identify, as well as prioritize the challenges.

2. CAPC members were asked to sign up to attend as their schedules allow – to demonstrate that CAP is a campus-wide effort and also so they can hear from participants about areas where more information about CAP is needed and where there are challenges. CAPL members were also asked to attend sessions.

3. It was suggested to reach out to department chairs to have them encourage new faculty to attend the CAP 101 sessions. Michelle Pautz noted that she worked with the Provost’s Office and College of Arts and Sciences CAS Dean’s Office last year to present information about CAP during their new faculty orientation programs. She has been in contact with them about doing so again this year.

C. CAP with Friends Workshops

1. The CAP Office is continuing this workshop series that was first offered last spring. The series includes several one-hour workshops over the course of the semester to provide semi-structured and unstructured opportunities for faculty to work on CAP course design/redesign and 4-Year Review.

V. Agenda Planning: Fall Semester

A. The committee discussed canceling the next two meeting dates (September 14 and 21) since the workload has been lighter in the fall the past couple of years and committee members have been asked to participate in other programming (4-Year Review workshop, CAP 101/CAP Headaches lunches).

B. 4-Year Review: As previously mentioned, the committee will need to work out logistics for reviewing this year’s reports. In addition, the committee will need to determine expectations for the 14 courses
that received 2-year reapprovals in the first cycle (2016-17). Those courses are scheduled to provide updates next year.

C. Course Reviews: The number of new course proposals for CAP approval has slowed down considerably over the past couple of years. It’s anticipated that this year will be similar to last year.

D. Catholic Intellectual Tradition: Sandra Yocum, University Professor of Faith and Culture and Associate Professor of Religious Studies, has offered to have a conversation with the committee about the CIT in relation to CAP. The committee was in favor of scheduling the discussion this semester.

VI. Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry Data


A. Overview and Discussion

1. Questions were raised last year about how students are completing the Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry requirement [e.g., whether students are completing the requirement too early (while undeclared or before having sufficient exposure to their major) and, therefore, aren’t achieving the intended learning goals). The CAP Office worked with UDit to compile completion data for this component. The CAP Associate and Assistant Deans Committee reviewed the data over the summer. Following the CAPC’s review, the data will be presented to the Executive Committee of the College’s Academic Affairs Committee because the AAC had raised questions about the Inquiry component last year.

2. The handout outlines the following:
   a. Number of CAP courses approved for Inquiry (as of Spring 2018)
   b. Courses most commonly used to fulfill the requirement
   c. Breakdown of the most common Inquiry courses taken in each academic unit
   d. Trends over time for the most common Inquiry courses
   e. Extent to which students complete the Inquiry component using transfer credit
   f. When students are completing the Inquiry component (breakdown by Catalog Year)
   g. Extent to which students take multiple Inquiry courses over their college career

3. Highlights:
   a. Of the 73 Inquiry courses, 14 have seen more than 100 students take the course for Inquiry credit. Four of the 14 are courses that had been daylighted for Inquiry and were not subsequently CAP-approved for the component or not CAP-approved at all.
   b. MTH 207 has been the most common Inquiry course. However, it is also approved for the Mathematics component and a number of majors require the course or strongly encourage that students take it.
   c. Less than 10% of students in the dataset (across multiple academic years) have fulfilled the Inquiry component with transfer credit.
   d. 67% of students in the dataset have completed two or more Inquiry courses, which is encouraging from a pedagogical standpoint that students are getting more than a single exposure.
   e. The committee’s perspective is that it is useful to have and continue to monitor this type of data and that no specific action needs to be taken at this time.

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.
Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen, CAP Office