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CAP COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, October 17, 2017 | 11:00 a.m.-12:15 p.m.; Forum (044) of the Learning Teaching Center

Present: Brad Balser, Lee Dixon, Chuck Edmonson, Heidi Gauder, Peter Hansen, Michelle Pautz, Danielle Poe, Scott Segalewitz (ex officio), Randy Sparks (ex officio), Bill Trollinger, John White  
Excused: Serdar Durmusoglu, Linda Hartley (ex officio), Fred Jenkins (ex officio), Shuang-Ye Wu  
Guests: Janet Bednarek, David Johnson

I. Course Reviews  
1) CHM 123: General Chemistry
   A. Course Proposal Information:  
      1. Proposer and Chair: David Johnson was present.  
      2. Component: Natural Sciences  
      3. Institutional Learning Goals: Scholarship (introduced), Practical Wisdom (introduced), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (introduced)  
   B. Discussion:  
      1. A question was raised concerning how the pre-requisite – one year of high school chemistry or equivalent – is evaluated. It was explained that students are placed in the course based on their high school transcript. First-year students who don’t have the necessary chemistry background and math skills (placement in the calculus sequence) generally will not be placed in the course in the first semester; rather, they will need to obtain the necessary math background before they can register for CHM 123. It was noted that the Chemistry Department has an online summer prep course that students are asked to complete.  
      2. Students who earn an AP credit score of 4 or 5 in Chemistry will place out of CHM 123 and CHM 123L and will fulfill part of the 7-credit hour requirement for the CAP Natural Sciences component.  
      3. The accompanying lab, CHM 123L, will also be submitted for CAP designation under the Natural Sciences component.  
      4. CAP designation for CHM 123 will be helpful for many majors. As noted in the proposal, the course is required in many degree programs in the College of Arts and Sciences, School of Engineering, and School of Education and Allied Professions.  
      5. The committee discussed one minor revision for CHM 123:  
         a. The final sentence under Statement of Need/Rationale will be revised as follows: “We believe that this course addresses the Scholarship, Practical Wisdom and Critical Evaluation of Our Times components of CAP institutional learning goals.”  
   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: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). The CAP office will make the revision in CIM on the proposer’s behalf.

2) HST 377: Contemporary American History
   A. Course Proposal Information:  
      1. Proposer: Janet Bednarek was present.  
      2. Components: Advanced Historical Studies, Diversity and Social Justice  
      3. Institutional Learning Goal: Diversity (expanded)  
   B. Discussion:  
      1. As an Advanced Studies course, students who take HST 377 will be expected to “further their understanding of the resources that the Catholic intellectual tradition offers for their own personal, professional, and civic lives and also for the just transformation of the social world.” (CAP Senate Doc 10-04) It was recognized that the course will address the Catholic intellectual tradition (CIT), but a question was raised whether students explicitly will be made aware of the
CIT during the course. The proposer indicated that it will be in the syllabus and that the CIT will be mentioned when Catholic social teaching is addressed in the course.

2. The proposer is also a member and chair of the College’s Academic Affairs Committee (AAC). In that capacity, she mentioned that the AAC has asked for clarification about the CAPC’s course review guidelines for the Advanced Studies component (Historical, Philosophical, and Religious). A meeting has been scheduled for the AAC chair, vice chair, and Humanities subcommittee chair to discuss this issue with the CAPC chair, CAP office, and Associate Dean from the College of Arts and Sciences (who also sits on the AAC). It was noted that the CAPC developed “Guidelines for Addressing the Catholic Intellectual Tradition in Advanced Study CAP Course Proposals” in spring 2016 as a resource for course proposers. The guidelines were created separately because modifying the course review guidelines is limited due to the fact that language comes directly from the CAP Senate Document.

3. The committee discussed two minor revisions for HST 377:
   a. In light of the discussion about how the CIT will be addressed in the course, Course Learning Objective #1 will be revised as follows (addition in bold): “OUTCOME: Students will be able to compare and contrast the program and outcomes of the various rights movements and, in the process, taking into account the Catholic intellectual tradition.”
   b. It will be indicated that the University Libraries’ resources are adequate to support the course. Responding to that item was overlooked in the proposal.

C. Committee’s Actions:
   1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal pending the minor revisions noted above. There was no further discussion.
   2. Vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). The CAP office will make the revision in CIM on the proposer’s behalf.

II. Resource for CAP Course Proposers: what to expect during CAPC proposal review process
   A. Document: What to expect at a CAPC meeting when proposing a course for CAP designation (Draft 1 – 10/13/2017)
   B. Discussion: The committee reviewed the draft that was prepared based on discussion at the last meeting.
      1. A question was raised about additional assistance that might be needed beyond the “what to expect” document for faculty who haven’t had any experience with the CAP course proposal process. In response, some committee members provided explanations about feedback proposers receive within their unit before course proposals reach CAPC review. The committee noted the importance of the department chair’s role in the course development process. It was also noted that the CAP office is a resource to assist faculty with anything related to CAP, and the CAPC chair is also a resource for CAP course proposals. It was agreed that a statement will be added to the document about the availability of the CAP office as a resource. In addition, the CAP office will add a statement under the Developing CAP Courses section of the CAP website about working with the department chair and CAP office during the proposal development process. The office will also review the CAP website to see if there are other places to call attention to the office being available as a resource. Committee members were encouraged to provide suggestions for the CAP website.
      2. A statement will be added to the document to explain that the committee may request clarification in a proposal for the sake of posterity and record keeping since the proposal serves as a record of how the course is intended to be delivered.
      3. The committee revisited the suggestion to have proposers introduce themselves and their course at the beginning of a CAPC meeting. Reservations were expressed previously related to time considerations. Nothing will be added to the document, though the CAPC chair will begin asking for brief introductions from course proposers at the beginning of meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.
Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen