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I. Course Reviews

1) ACC 200: Introduction to Accounting

A. Course Proposal Information:
   1. Proposer: Sarah Webber was present for the committee’s discussion. Co-proposer Deborah Archambeault could not be present.
   2. Component: Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry
   3. Student Learning Outcomes: Practical Wisdom (introduced), Vocation (introduced)

B. Discussion:
   1. The committee discussed a minor revision to the course description (noted with strikethrough): “Introduction to primarily financial and secondarily managerial accounting concepts, terminology, purposes, and applications for the nonbusiness student. Not open to students in the School of Business Administration or to those with credit in ACC 207.”
   2. The committee noted that this course is a benefit to students across the University. There are no pre-requisites or co-requisites and it was noted that students could take the course any time in the sophomore, junior, or senior year. It is generally taken by juniors and seniors. As an Inquiry course, it would be good for students to take it when they are further along in their degrees, for the sake of comparing and contrasting methodologies.
   3. It is not open to SBA majors, who are required to take ACC 207 and 208. Non-business students could take ACC 207; that is why it is listed as a restriction in the course description for ACC 200.

C. Committee’s Actions:
   1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal pending the minor revision noted above. There was no further discussion.
   2. Vote: 7-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). The revision will be made in CIM on the proposers’ behalf.

2) HSS 275: History of Physical Education and Sport

A. Course Proposal Information:
   1. Proposer: George DeMarco was present for the committee’s discussion. Corinne Daprano, department chair, was also present. Others attended as resources: Carolyn Benz, Victoria Bordfeld, Josh Schrank, and Pam Young.
   2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Integrative, Advanced Historical Studies, Diversity and Social Justice
   3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (expanded), Diversity (expanded)

B. Discussion:
   1. The committee noted that the proposal was well developed and is particularly clear how it will satisfy the Integrative and Advanced Historical Studies components.

C. Committee’s Actions:
   1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course as written. There was no further discussion.
   2. Vote: 7-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).
II. **New Business: Natural Sciences Component**

A. The Department of Health and Sport Sciences is in the process of developing a new course and would like to submit it for the Natural Sciences component. The course would address three of the five disciplines under the Natural Sciences: biology, chemistry, and physics. Pre-requisites would include courses from Natural Science departments. The committee discussed the issue of whether or not a course outside of the Natural Science disciplines could fulfill the component. The departments were consulted informally about the development of the course. They didn’t have any doubts about the integrity and value of the course but did not endorse the course because they feel the component should only be delivered through the Natural Science disciplines based on their interpretation of the CAP Senate Document (DOC-10-04: [http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_docs/4/](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_docs/4/)).

B. The CAPC’s perspective is that they evaluate proposals based on whether courses meet requirements based on the CAP Senate Document. Procedural issues about “domains” of the CAP components would be for the Academic Senate to address.

C. The committee advised that the Natural Science departments should be consulted again about the development of the HSS course and asked to provide some documentation for the proposal. If the consultation response indicates that the course content doesn’t adequately introduce the Natural Sciences disciplines, the CAPC would take that into consideration when reviewing the proposal.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen