I. Course Reviews

1) GEO 204: Geology for Teachers
   A. Course Proposal Information:
      1. Proposer: Michael Sandy was present for the committee’s discussion.
      2. Components: Natural Sciences, Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry
      3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (introduced), Practical Wisdom (introduced), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (introduced), Vocation (introduced)
   B. Discussion:
      1. The proposer clarified how students will address comparing methods of inquiry in their own discipline with the methods of this course. It will be addressed in the first assignment (i.e., reflecting on why they want to be a teacher). Course objective #1 will also address this aspect: “Demonstrate knowledge of the content required to teach earth science at the P-12 level. As such it will allow students to understand ways of knowing beyond their own academic discipline.” In addition, course objective #3 “…provides the opportunity to both contrast and synthesize inquiry in Education and the Sciences.”
   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: 8-0-1 (in favor-against-abstention).

2) REL 322: Latino/Latina Religious Experiences
   A. Course Proposal Information:
      1. Proposer: Neomi DeAnda was present for the committee’s discussion. Daniel Thompson, department chair, was also present.
      2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Integrative, Advanced Religious Studies, Diversity and Social Justice
      3. Student Learning Outcomes: Faith Traditions (advanced), Diversity (expanded)
   B. Discussion:
      1. The proposer clarified how course objective #4 will be accomplished: “connect in an experiential way significant elements of Latino/Latina religious experience to their own lives or studies in their own major.” Two assignments in particular will address this. Students will write an introductory paper about why they are taking the course and the outcomes they hope to achieve, and they will be asked to relate their major to the course. The final project is experiential and will ask students to “submit their own criteria for peer evaluation to teach one way in which the concept of subsidiarity works.”
   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: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).
3) **REL 323: History of Early Christianity**
   A. Course Proposal Information:
      1. Proposer: Meghan Henning was present for the committee’s discussion. Daniel Thompson, department chair, was also present.
      2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Integrative, Advanced Religious Studies
      3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (expanded), Faith Traditions (advanced)
   B. Discussion:
      1. The proposer clarified the “Interpretation lab” instructional method. Students will develop skills to read primary historical texts.
   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: 9-0-0 (for-against-abstention).

4) **ENG 340: US Prison Literature and Culture**
   A. Course Proposal Information:
      1. Proposer: Meredith Doench was present for the committee’s discussion. Andy Slade, department chair, was also present.
      2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Integrative, Diversity and Social Justice
      3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (expanded), Diversity (expanded), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (expanded)
   B. Discussion:
      1. The committee noted that the proposal was well developed and meets the criteria for the two components selected.
      2. The long term goal is to teach the course at a prison and UD students would take the course at the location.
   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: 9-0-0 (for-against-abstention).

5) **ENG 372: Business and Professional Writing**
   A. Course Proposal Information:
      1. Proposer: Patrick Thomas was present for the committee’s discussion. Department chair and co-proposer Andy Slade was also present.
      2. Component: Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry
      3. Student Learning Outcomes: Practical Wisdom (expanded), Vocation (advanced)
   B. Discussion:
      1. This is a critical course for School of Business Administration majors to fulfill the Inquiry component and also the business writing requirement for the SBA core.
   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: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

6) **ENG 349: Children’s Literature and Culture**
   A. Course Proposal Information:
      1. Proposer and Department Chair: Andy Slade was present for the committee’s discussion. Co-proposer Kara Getrost could not be present.
      2. Component: Crossing Boundaries-Integrative
3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (expanded), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (expanded)

B. Discussion:
   1. This course was funded through a Crossing Boundaries course development grant. It was team taught initially but proved to be unsustainable for the other department.

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: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

II. Announcements
   A. A template is being developed in the College of Arts and Sciences as a way for departments to handle capstones for dual degrees and dual majors. It will be introduced in a College Chairs and Program Directors (CCPD) meeting. The College is also considering developing a document to address how an Honors thesis could be used as a capstone experience.

   B. The Academic Policies Committee (APC) of the Academic Senate is currently reviewing the CAP Two-Year Evaluation Report that was submitted to the Academic Senate in December 2015. As a follow up to the faculty survey that was part of the CAP two-year evaluation, the APC plans to seek feedback from faculty who developed course proposals this year. The APC will provide a response to the two-year report once they conclude their review. The committee noted that feedback that CAP proposals receive at the unit level has aided the review process when they get to the CAPC level.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen