

CAP COMMITTEE

Monday, May 1, 2017 | 2:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m.; Kennedy Union 312

Present: Brad Balsler, Lee Dixon, Serdar Durmusoglu, Heidi Gauder, Linda Hartley (*ex officio*), Keigo Hirakawa, Sawyer Hunley, Fred Jenkins (*ex officio*), Bill Trollinger, John White

Excused: John Goebel, Terence Lau (*ex officio*), Danielle Poe, Scott Segalewitz (*ex officio*), Shuang-Ye Wu

Guests: Connie Bowman, Rebecca Potter

- I. **Four-Year Course Reviews:** This was the second of four meetings the committee had this week to hold departmental conversations concerning a total of 24 CAP courses that have gone through the four-year review process over the course of the academic year. As part of the review process, departments were asked to provide responses for each course to the following questions (the responses were added in the Course Inventory Management, or CIM, system):
- A. What specific course learning objectives or experiences are linked to this UD student learning outcome (*Habits of Inquiry and Reflection*)?
 - B. What criteria are/will be used to judge the student evidence for each specific course learning objective? (You may attach an assessment rubric or list of criteria.)
 - C. What evidence (e.g., student artifact or performance) is/will be used to demonstrate level of achievement for each course learning objective?
 - D. What were the results of your student assessment for each course learning objective?
 - E. If you have decided this course should address different CAP components from when it was originally approved, what changes are you proposing and why?
 - F. If you have decided this course should address different UD student learning outcomes (HIR) from when it was originally approved, what changes are you proposing and why?

The committee can take the following actions with respect to four-year review courses: a) re-approve fully for four years; b) conditionally re-approve for two years (in cases where an assessment plan has been developed but not implemented); c) not re-approve.

Based on discussion during the first four-year review meeting earlier in the day, a handout was provided regarding recommended elements of a course assessment plan:

- A. System for administering assessment (e.g., rubric)
- B. Identify who will conduct the assessment
- C. Identify who will be assessed (i.e., sample or entire population)
- D. Frequency of assessment (if appropriate – depends on how often the course is offered)
- E. Metric for achievement
- F. Method for interpreting and using results from assessment

It was noted that the conversation about the course's four-year review will focus on responses to the six questions above, as well as what the assessment plan looks/will look like and what revisions to the proposal may be needed to reflect the conversation with the committee.

1) EDT 305: Philosophy & History of American Education

- A. Course Proposal Information:
 1. Representatives: Department chair Connie Bowman was present, as well as John White, who is teaching the course this semester.
 2. Components (as originally approved): Crossing Boundaries-Practical Ethical Action; Advanced Philosophical Studies
 3. Student Learning Outcome: Practical Wisdom (expanded)

B. Discussion:

1. Background information was provided that Dr. Joe Watras had originally developed the proposal. He was disappointed in the rubric results from the first year the course was taught and changed the text to make a better connection with Practical Wisdom. Dr. John White is teaching the course now and is working with the data to make further adjustments. The responses to the four-year review questions were prepared before he completed teaching the course this semester.
2. No changes are proposed for the CAP components or Student Learning Outcome for the course.
3. The following revisions were discussed:
 - a. Remove “for education and E-11 majors only” under the section about majors who are likely to take the course and replace it with an explanation about the course being open to all majors.
 - b. Remove the pre-requisites (EDT 110, EDT 110L, PHL 103). If PHL 103 is maintained as a pre-requisite, ASI 120 should be added.
 - c. The paragraph in the four-year review section beginning “Data from each semester from Fall, 2014 through Fall, 2016) should be moved from the heading “What evidence is/will be used to demonstrate level of achievement” to the heading “What were the results of your student assessment for each course learning objective?”
 - d. In response to the above list of recommended elements of a course assessment plan, the committee also discussed the addition of a metric for achievement. An example was provided: 70-80% of students perform at the competent level. The metric could be added in the four-year review question about results of student assessment for each course learning objective.

C. Committee’s Actions:

1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to re-approve the course fully for four years, with the understanding that the proposal will be revised along the lines noted above. There was no further discussion.
2. Vote: 8-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

D. Next Step: The proposal will be rolled back to the department chair level in CIM for revisions to be made. It was requested that revisions should be completed in CIM by August 1, 2017.

2) SEE 401: Sustainability Research I

3) SEE 402: Sustainability Research II

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Representative (for both courses): Sustainability program director Rebecca Potter was present.
2. Components (as originally approved):
 - a. SEE 401: Crossing Boundaries-Integrative; Advanced Philosophical Studies
 - b. SEE 402: Crossing Boundaries-Practical Ethical Action; Advanced Philosophical Studies
3. Student Learning Outcomes (as originally approved):
 - a. SEE 401: Scholarship (advanced); Practical Wisdom (advanced); Critical Evaluation of Our Times (advanced); Vocation (advanced)
 - b. SEE 402: Scholarship (advanced); Diversity (expanded); Community (advanced); Practical Wisdom (advanced); Critical Evaluation of Our Times (advanced); Vocation (advanced)

B. Discussion:

1. The committee discussed both courses together. The following revisions were discussed:
 - a. SLOs will be eliminated so that only Practical Wisdom and Critical Evaluation of Our Times remain for both courses. The Course Learning Objectives should be updated as needed in light of the changes to the SLOs and to reflect how the course will be taught going forward.

- b. The courses have a rubric for Practical Wisdom at this point. A rubric for Critical Evaluation of Our Times is needed to have a complete assessment plan in place for both courses.
 - c. As with EDT 305, it was recommended to add a metric for achievement (i.e., benchmark goal to determine level of student competency). It might be necessary to have some experience with assessment before setting a benchmark.
2. It was noted that it will take some time to develop the second rubric. Kelly Bohrer from the Fitz Center assisted with developing the Practical Wisdom rubric. It was noted that the HIR Fellows' white paper on Practical Wisdom was a useful resource and that it would be helpful to have a similar white paper for Critical Evaluation of Our Times.
 3. It was noted that learning outcomes have been developed for the SEE program and work is being done to map them to the courses. Assessment will be folded into those efforts.
 4. Instructors teaching the courses may be in flux over the next couple of years because the primary instructor who has taught SEE 401 and 402 is retiring.
- C. Committee's Actions:
1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to conditionally re-approve both SEE 401 and 402 for two years, with the understanding that the proposals will be revised in CIM along the lines noted above. There was no further discussion.
 2. Vote: 8-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).
- D. Next Steps:
1. The proposal will be rolled back to the department chair level in CIM for revisions to be made. It was requested that revisions should be completed in CIM by August 1, 2017.
 2. After that, the Executive Committee of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) in the College will review the proposal based on the outcome of the four-year review conversation with the CAPC. The AAC developed a "Changes Based on Assessment Policy" to determine how it will handle four-year review proposals.
 3. The assessment plans for the courses should be completed and begin implementation over the next two years. Adjustments can be made as needed.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen