

## CAPP Minutes

9/7/09

Present: Joe Heithaus, Pam Propsom, Kevin Kinney, Scott Spiegelberg, Pedar Foss, Bruce Sanders, Laura Pearce, Julia Bruggemann (secretary)

The meeting was called to order at 4:20.

- Organizational Matters:

After a short welcome, the committee reviewed the procedure for taking minutes as well as CAPP's committee structure and responsibilities.

- Prindle Institute Representative:

Bruce Sanders was unanimously appointed as CAPP representative for the Prindle Institute Ethics Faculty Advisory Committee.

- Faculty Committee on Admissions:

There will be a more permanent committee structure than in previous years. There will likely be 5 members. Pam will put out a call for divisions to nominate members, CAPP will then select one rep from each division, 5th member will be from CAPP (Joe Heithaus).

Kate Knaul is going to represent Academic Affairs

- CAPP Subcommittees

Subcommittees that report to CAPP usually do so every spring. CAPP should contact them sooner (in the fall) to keep updated on their progress.

The First Year Seminar Subcommittee completed a self-study last year. It will be interesting to see the results. IEC has asked if CAPP wants a report. International education is in the middle of a self-study. CAPP hopes that IEC can play an important role in that process.

A report from the Winter Term Subcommittee may be less urgent in light of the ongoing Intellectual Life Discussions.

The RAS process is on hold and will be convened as needed. There was some discussion about what to do about opportunity hires. Maybe the presidential super committee should deal with this once it has been assembled? Questions remained as to how this new committee will connect to CAPP and RAS? Will this allow giving faculty more long-term oversight over staffing and planning?

- The Intellectual Life Discussions

This will be our main task this year.

FGCS has been meeting trying to address the SWG document to figure out a process for going forward. Most items emerging from the discussions will be CAPP issues. Some ideas on how to plan for/think about how to respond to what may happen at the faculty meeting: CAPP will have to delegate some of the work. Some existing committees (W, S for example) as well as some new ad hoc committees may help CAPP work out details.

Could there be a coordinator to help oversee the process? Maybe bring this up with Dave Guinee and Kerry Pannell in the future.

Pedar reported that there are \$4000 from Mellon to work on the senior capstone experience. The money is available until Oct. 2010.

CAPP considered some ways to have more productive discussions among the whole faculty:

just one topic for faculty meetings?

Small groups in faculty meetings?

People responsible for pros and cons?

Pedar explained that the administration is ready to help in moving forward on section 6 of the SWG report (e.g. more integrated advising); CAPP will be asked to give advice on how the administration may be most helpful.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10.

**Committee on Academic Policy and Planning  
September 21, 2009**

Minutes

Present: Tyler Archer, Julia Brugemann, Nancy Davis, Pedar Foss, Joe Heithaus, Kevin Kinney, Laura Pearce, Pam Propsom (Chair), Bruce Sanders, Scott Spiegelberg.

The meeting was called to order at 4:20.

The previous meeting's minutes were approved without amendment.

It was announced that there would be no opportunity hires this year so there is no need at this time to appoint members to a Resource Allocation Subcommittee.

Nominees for the Faculty Committee on Admissions were considered. Tim Good from Division 1, Sandro Barros from Division 2, and Hilary Eppley from Division 3 were appointed. There were no nominees from Division 4. CAPP will make one more attempt to solicit nominees from Division 4, otherwise another nominee from one of the other Divisions will be appointed to the committee.

Discussion turned to intellectual life and the SWG report. CAPP was assigned by FGSC to work on the 3-seminar sequence. The Winter Term subcommittee of CAPP in conjunction with MAO or CAPP was assigned to work on Winter Term. There was some concern expressed about the appropriateness of the subcommittee working on Winter Term. There was a fear that it might be too close to the issue and that its composition might not be broad enough. It was noted for example, that there was no music school representation on the subcommittee and that changes in Winter Term would be a major concern of the school. After some deliberation, it was decided that, with music school representation, the subcommittee was the appropriate committee to deal with the issue. Scott Spiegelberg, CAPP member from the School of Music, volunteered to work with the committee on the SWG suggestions for Winter Term.

We then began to consider how best to proceed with regards to addressing issues related to the 3-seminar sequence. A fair amount of time was spent getting clear about the details and rationale for the sequence and some of its ramifications. There was extended discussion on the role of the sophomore seminar in the curriculum and the effect of the 3-seminar sequence on class size. It was suggested that it might make sense to start by implementing the two-course sequence of first-year seminars, and then subsequently consider whether or not to add a sophomore seminar. We also discussed how best to obtain student and staff input, and a timeline for addressing these issues. It was agreed that student and staff input need to be obtained early in the process with later opportunities for input as logistical information becomes available. Many set times need to be provided so that everyone has a chance to give input. It is doubtful that anything other than pilot projects for the 3-seminar sequence could be implemented for next fall, but the lead time for implementation of the sequence is such that the faculty needs to vote on the sequence sometime in the spring.

It was decided to break the committee into three subgroups. One subgroup would draft a questionnaire for the Chairs to discuss with their departments. The questionnaire would ask how much writing and speaking already occurs throughout their major, how they might be able to envision a sophomore seminar in their department, and to what extent individual disciplines can commit to the 3-seminar sequence. A second subgroup would come up with a questionnaire for and meet with the W, S, and FYS committees to discuss issues such as optimal class size, what the curriculum might entail, and how this might be implemented. A third subgroup would draft questions that relate to the institution as a whole. This subgroup would also be eliciting information from institutional research. Committee members were encouraged to submit ideas for questions across subgroups. Drafts of the questionnaires are to be completed by the next meeting.

Pedar Foss passed out a draft of "A Guide for Students and Advisors in the Asbury College of Liberal Arts" and asked that we provide feedback. The meeting adjourned at 5:57.

Respectfully submitted,  
Bruce Sanders

**Committee on Academic Policy and Planning**  
**October 12, 2009**

Present: Tyler Archer, Julia Bruggemann, Nancy Davis, Pedar Foss, Joe Heithaus, Kevin Kinney, Laura Pearce, Pam Propsom (Chair), Bruce Sanders, Scott Spiegelberg.

The meeting was called to order at 4:15.

The previous meeting's minutes were approved.

PP asked if the Conflict Studies program report was received by CAPP last year, consensus that it had not. PP will send out the report, including the self-study and the external reviewers' report.

PP met with Doug Harms, chair of the Winter Term subcommittee, to discuss that committee's charge, including questions on how hard each committee should be pushing the SWG plan (or pushing at all). The Winter Term subcommittee will start meeting soon to begin work on gathering opinions and facts regarding the proposed changes. Each division will be responsible for determining their representative department chair to the Senior Capstone subcommittee. Volunteers have already been identified for Divisions 1, 2, and 3, with three volunteers from the Programs of Distinction chairs. KK and JB have volunteered to be the CAPP representative, final decisions on the POD and CAPP representatives will be made when the division representatives are known, to attempt the maximal balance of disciplines represented.

The subcommittee working on the survey for departments and programs met and made a rough draft, which was distributed to CAPP members before this meeting. There were concerns that the survey might be too long, with one suggestion to use a starting framework and general request for departmental feedback instead. Another suggestion was made to have Bill Tobin help create a series of surveys that would result in analyzable data.

Discussion turned to efforts to describe each of the seminars, especially how to distinguish FYS and FYP.

Suggested: FYS is an introduction to college work and rhetorical skills in an interdisciplinary or disciplinary context. FYP is intensive rhetorical skill development based on a particular content, allowing students to choose between many disciplinary or interdisciplinary topics as the basis for their skill development. Next we discussed what questions we really want to know from the departments and programs. "What kind of writing skills/rhetorical skills/quantitative reasoning skills do each department want their students to be able to have by the time they get to upper-level courses?" "Is the sophomore seminar a place they can develop these skills?" "Assuming load isn't an issue, how many faculty in your department would be interested in teaching in the seminar sequence?" "What is needed for your department to be able to embrace the seminar model to some degree?" "What is your vision of how the seminar sequence would work in your department?"

The subcommittee working on getting the FYS, W, and S committees together to discuss best pedagogical practices has to reschedule the planned meeting, due to conflict with the Karin Ahlm remembrance. A suggestion was made to involve Q as well, or at least another scientist. Terri Bonebright was recommended.

The subcommittee working with administration on data collection has met with Bill Tobin and received one draft of the data. The final draft has been delayed do to Bill Tobin's necessary work for the MAO proposal.

The final discussion of the day was on how to structure the open meetings on the seminar sequence, and how best to get students involved in the process. There were requests for more diverse meeting times, especially an evening meeting for students, and for better visual representations of the proposed plans and/or benefits/costs. The students want the faculty to be at the meetings, but to also provide enough opportunities for the students to speak. To combat student apathy, there was a suggestion to pitch the meetings to the students as if they are already alumni, to envision what they want their alma mater to be doing.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35.

Respectfully submitted, Scott Spiegelberg

**Committee on Academic Planning and Policy**  
**October 26, 2009**

Present: Julia Bruggemann, Nancy Davis, Pedar Foss, Joe Heithaus, Kevin Kinney, Laura Pearce, Pam Propsom (Chair), Bruce Sanders, Scott Spiegelberg

The meeting was called to order at 4:17pm

The minutes from the last meeting were approved.

The interdisciplinary programs, programs of distinction and CAPP members of the Senior Capstone Subcommittee were appointed. They are respectively: Meryl Altman, Kevin Moore and Kevin Kinney; they will join members chosen by the four divisions: Steve Timm (Division 1), Bob Hershberger (Division 2), Jim Mills (Division 3) and Barbara Whitehead (Division 4).

Pam Propsom (PP) asked Pedar Foss (PF) to review the data that he, Kevin Kinney and Bruce Sanders had assembled with the help of Bill Tobin and Ken Kirkpatrick on the impact of the proposed 3-seminar sequence on other courses at DePauw, particularly on course sizes at the 100- and 200-level. Assuming a seminar size of 14, an entering class of 640, and persistence rates of 96%, 94%, and 98% to 2nd, 3rd and 4th semesters, PF stated that 46 FYS and 21 sophomore seminars would be needed in the fall and 44 FYP and 20 sophomore seminars in the spring. PF noted that sophomore seminars would most likely come out of existing 200-300 level courses and possibly 100-level ones; existing W-courses might be possibilities for conversion to sophomore seminars. He stated that on average other courses in the university (mainly at the 100-200 level) would need to increase by about 2 students if the three seminar sequence was in place.

The point was made that using average university course sizes to compute the number of extra students that might be in non-seminar courses conceals the differential impact that the change to a 3-seminar model would have by department. The increases in class sizes might, in fact, be considerably more in departments with higher-than-average numbers of students in 100- and 200-level courses. If these departments replace existing 100-200 level courses with FYS, FYP and sophomore seminars that have considerably fewer students in them, either class sizes in the non-seminar courses will have to rise considerably or students will not get into courses in their major, intended major or area of interest.

There was discussion about the number of seniors taking 100-level courses and a suggestion that if departments offered fewer 100-level courses, perhaps seniors would be pushed into (more appropriate) higher-level courses. It was pointed out, however, that in a fair number of disciplines with a vertical curriculum this is not possible if one has not had the 100-level gateway course. We agreed to add to the survey for departments/programs a question about whether a 100-level or other gateway course(s) is required in order to take higher level courses in the discipline.

Discussion moved to questions about what the sophomore seminar was intended to be and who its audience was (potential majors? already declared majors? others?). There was consensus that this needed to be clarified, including the skill sets that the seminar was to provide to students. Potential pedagogical benefits of teaching writing, speaking and research skills to sophomores in a small seminar setting were noted, as well as a counterview that mixing sophomores with juniors and seniors might be more pedagogically productive in that junior and senior students can model good discussion, research and writing skills for sophomores. Also discussed was the issue of whether departments with limited faculty and high demand from majors could afford to offer a sophomore seminar and a non-sophomore seminar version of the same course. This might be necessary to provide majors the opportunity to take courses in important substantive areas of their discipline, but not be feasible with existing staff.

PF noted university concerns about sophomore retention and suggested that the sophomore seminar was a way to keep such students engaged and at DePauw. A discussion ensued about why some students leave DePauw and whether a sophomore seminar was likely to prevent this. PF stated that the FYS had helped first-year retention. He also noted that non-Greek men and men of color had especially high attrition rates in the sophomore year. Not everyone felt that the sophomore seminar would fill the social void that some students, particularly those who leave the university, may feel. There was discussion of whether an off-campus sophomore Winter Term (and perhaps one that was tied to a course) might provide more of a bonding experience for sophomores than the sophomore seminar;

a suggestion was made that that the university ought to guarantee an off-campus Winter Term for all students. There seemed to be agreement that academic life and student services branches of the university needed to work together more closely to address the needs of all students and that we needed to understand more fully why some students leave DePauw.

Discussion turned again to staffing issues for the 3 seminar sequence, particularly to departments that might want to participate in the 3-seminar sequence, but be unable to because of staffing pressures and high demand from majors and other students. A question was raised about whether this would mean that the seminars wouldn't be evenly spread throughout the curriculum as envisioned and that English, which already has a larger faculty size in order to handle all the Eng 130 sections, would again be doing most of the FYS, FYP and sophomore seminars. A related concern centered on whether term faculty would disproportionately be teaching the FYS, FYP and sophomore seminars, as seems to be the case now with FYS. It was agreed that tenure-track faculty needed to be "sold" on the 3-seminar program and willing/able to participate in it for it to be successful. A suggestion was made to add term positions to understaffed, high-demand departments so that tenure-track faculty in those departments might be able to participate in the 3-seminar program. PF agreed to raise the issue with Brian Casey of hiring 4 term faculty members to "jump start" the 3-seminar sequence in disciplines where this would currently be difficult. PP solicited revisions to the department/program survey on curricular reform. It was agreed that the projected size of the seminars could now be noted at 14, as well as the projected impact of the 3-seminar sequence on the sizes of other courses; that the seminars needed to be described more clearly, especially the sophomore seminar; that departments/programs should be asked if they have a gateway course or courses required before students can take higher-level courses; that each department/ program should be asked how many FYS, FYP and sophomore seminars they could offer on a regular basis; and that departments/programs should be asked what issues, if any, might be unique to their department/program. Music, Modern Languages and Sciences were mentioned as among the areas that may have such issues.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Nancy Davis

**Committee on Academic Planning and Policy**  
**November 9, 2009**

Present: PPropsom (Chair), NDavis, PFoss, SSpiegelberg, JHeithaus, LPearce, TArcher, BSanders, JBruggemann, KKinney

The meeting was called to order at 4:17pm. The minutes from the last meeting were approved. KKinney agreed to take minutes for this meeting.

PPropsom will contact the FYS Committee, WT Subcommittee, and Senior Capstone Subcommittee asking them to report on their progress. The FYSC is posting minutes on Moodle, and has asked if CAPP needs them to be doing anything different than their usual procedures at this point in the year. As of this meeting, there were only 11 FYS proposals under consideration.

For further discussion: plans for addressing "Additional SWG Recommendations" (document circulated at the November Faculty Meeting). Issue: University-wide coordination of the curriculum. Lead groups: CAPP and FGSC with input from department chairs. Notes: This discussion will be coordinated with the consideration of a reorganization of faculty committee structure. As part of this consideration, we will look at ways to form a group that can better coordinate curricular offerings across the university. We expect this work to start in Spring 2010. Discussion moved to reports from the subcommittees addressing intellectual life issues. Need to establish how often we want to receive reports from the subcommittees.

Question: should there be an administrator on the Senior Capstone Experience Committee?  
Might be a good idea, if someone has time. DHarvey is the logical choice.

Question: do we want/need a SoM person? How will the Senior Capstone affect them? SOM has separate degree requirements so it's probably not necessary.

Report on subgroups' progress (FYS/W/S/Q/Eng 130 group, department and program discussion questions/survey group)

Survey discussion questions have gone out. This is intended as information-gathering, feedback wanted. We need to come up with a timeline for completion of the departmental/program surveys. We decided the end of the semester. After Thanksgiving, PPropsom will send a reminder to departments/programs to discuss the questions and complete the brief online survey by the end of fall semester. Proposed FGSC timeline for three-seminar sequence  
November—discussion (open meetings, Moodle, involve students, staff and department chairs)  
December—continued work by CAPP and Chairs  
February—open meetings, whatever  
March—motion appears on March agenda for April vote  
April—vote on motion

The first meeting of FYS/W/S/Q/Eng 130 group was surprisingly well-attended. CAPP members concentrated more on getting an overall picture of the issues related to student writing at DePauw, rather than taking detailed notes. In general, the meeting served as an opportunity for the representatives of the programs to voice concerns about the process. CAPP members felt this was very useful, and are confident that subsequent meetings will move on to working out details of how to proceed. Since the meeting, there have been several beneficial threads under discussion via e-mail. There was a general sense that 2-3 more solid meetings should produce something concrete. In general, the meeting resulted in a greater sense of clarity about the possibilities of the First-Year Practicum. There was a sense that we may not be far from consensus about the FYS and FYP. The Sophomore Seminar remains a little more unclear- there are a lot of different goals for the Sophomore Seminar. Maybe SophS would be better within a major, teaching writing more like what the W was originally supposed to be (I thought W was intended to be Writing Across the Curriculum and not Writing in the Discipline?). Some concerns about getting rid of W and S program and replacing them with three seminar sequence completed in the sophomore year: W is in middle of a 4-year study, and W is embedded in Soph and Junior (or that's the impression), while S in senior year.

Sharing a "common language" for writing and speaking is essential. Different instructors use different terms for the same thing. Is there a way to standardize the terms?

Some conversation about how to oversee/reinforce the goals of the program (whatever its final form) with the faculty involved. Since the inception of the FYS and "W" programs (among others), there has been some mission drift. One issue is the current concept of "lifetime" certification for faculty in the competencies. Several CAPP members agreed that a process of continuing faculty education may be more useful. The Subcommittee will meet again on Nov. 17th, to work on outcomes, to bring back to CAPP. The product may be quite different from what SWG came up with.

General impression is that a lot of programs/depts. are willing to teach FYS, FYP, SophS, if they had the resources. Suggestion of possible additional members for the subcommittee- including Kelley Hall and a representative from the Library. The CAPP representatives were encouraged to urge the committee to come up with alternative models if possible. CAPP recognizes that, in coming up with alternatives, it is important to have *viable* options, not "straw men."

Some discussion of what, eventually, will be the working group that crafts the product? This group, CAPP? Other? Consensus was that it will ultimately be CAPP with input from others.

--Discussion of PFoss' most recent document regarding the 3-seminar sequence and class size (i.e., "All the Marbles, Sliding Scale, Makeover"). The sliding scale and makeover versions are not too different from what we do now, and put less strain on resources. . PFoss' documents (both the original, more detailed analysis and this more recent "three model" analysis) will be revised and posted to Moodle.

Faculty development will be critical in making the whole process happen. One suggestion was to move W, Q, and S workshops and certification from a single week in summer to regular meetings during the school year, though this

was not universally agreed upon. One idea is for some sort of “in-service day” similar to in public schools- have the students doing some other activity while faculty are working on development.

A side-goal of some of this work, particularly the Soph Seminar, is improving retention, especially of Sophomores. While we’re not sure improving academic challenges will improve retention, it is still important to think of the curriculum independent from the retention goal.

Still need to work on getting student input.

--Discussion of our next step. What process(es) do we want to use to facilitate the study and discussion of the 3-seminar sequence? Suggestions were presentations and debates, perhaps after a Faculty Meeting. Not excited about using a lot of “Open Meetings” like in the first-round and as MAO did, although we might use this mechanism to get input from students.

At close of meeting, our goal is to present something for the February Faculty Meeting, possibly framing the discussion as some sort of debate. CAPP members who are here over Winter Term may need to meet at least once during January to discuss feedback from departments/programs and plan for a potential presentation or debate at the February Faculty Meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:39 PM

Respectfully Submitted,  
Kevin Kinney

**Committee on Academic Planning and Policy**  
**November 23, 2009**

Present: Pam Propsom (chair), Nancy Davis, Kelley Hall, Scott Spiegelberg, Kevin Kinney, Laura Pearce, Tyler Archer, Bruce Sanders, Julia Bruggemann, and Joe Heithaus

Minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

Reports from Committees:

Kevin Kinney – Senior Capstone

There are many forms of departmental senior experiences across the curriculum, “no real uniformity” -- much diversity of terminology (For example, “Thesis,” “Research Paper,” etc.) The committee is forming a survey for chairs regarding the senior capstone experience. Open meetings in the week after Thanksgiving Break.

Also they want to survey current seniors who are taking senior seminar in the spring and also students who aren’t yet seniors.

A question came from J.B. about what constitutes departmental honors, specifically “Latin Honors.” The subcommittee has decided not to try to deal with departmental honors. K.H. reminded the committee that many departments have completed self-studies and there is a large body of information about each department’s discussions of the senior seminar and senior experience. The group is trying to sort through the range of expectations.

They’ve been talking a great deal about a senior capstone day, but there are a number of concerns regarding the number of students who could do this. Some students aren’t given the opportunity to produce a product (nor is there a desire to necessarily mandate a senior project). For instance, in Chemistry the product is an exam. In Biology the senior seminar is an in depth reading group where students discuss primary and secondary sources about a particular issue in biology.

The university statement on “senior comprehensives” is rather lackluster. So the language about senior comprehensives across departments could be better communicated.

Finally, the sub-committee wants to try to standardize some of the terms used for the senior experience.

Asked about the intent of the summer working group discussion, BS said that some of the intention of the SWG was to find ways to give opportunities for exceptional seniors to do more comprehensive theses. **Julia Bruggemann and**

Joe Heithaus – Three Seminar Sequence

JB and JH reported on the subcommittee on the three seminar sequence. While the group has various pockets of skepticism about sequencing three classes, they have managed to begin the discussion of what the faculty's general expectations are for the first year. They described the following:

**By the End of their First Year.** The DePauw Faculty expects students to be able to: Read Carefully and Critically; Speak and Listen Effectively; Write Critically and Carefully; Understand Expectations of Scholarly Work; Understand Academic Integrity; and Develop Intellectual Curiosity. This list will be expanded upon in some detail in their next meeting.

The idea is that deliberate attention will be paid to these outcomes and the committee will work out a sense of what might be covered in various courses offered to first year students. It was pointed out that these things are already supposed to happen so conversation turned toward questions such as: How do we get people to buy into these issues and/or enforce these issues? How do we create a situation where there is “buy in” for the first year seminar, first year practicum, and a possible sophomore seminar? Suggestions included: competition? money? learning communities?

SS was asked about the way the school of music shares responsibilities for their first year seminar – four sections, with rotations among four faculty. This could be a potential model of collaboration for the first year practicum, though it probably remains important that an individual faculty member teach the course.

Brainstorming Strategies – Pam Propsom

PP then initiated a conversation about the spring and our sense of a timeline for creating a proposal for the March faculty meeting. We'll probably meet on Mondays at 3:30? PP led a brainstorming session where we tried to figure out the best strategies for getting input on the three seminar sequence and how we are to put these ideas before the faculty for a vote. We wondered about how to organize and use feedback from departments regarding the 3 seminar sequence. We considered the possibility of offering different models.

One possibility involves creating several models that may involve

- reinvigorating or reorganizing the status quo or
- clearly articulating the three course sequence or
- rethinking or organizing a university wide discussion of what we mean by a 100 level course? 200 level course? and there are certain ways that we can make sure that writing, quantitative reasoning, and speaking happen there
- keeping the W,Q,S, as a kind of literacy check or competence in the sophomore year.

Conversation turned to the way the Q is not yet integrated into the SWG proposal. We would like to include it somehow in the three course sequence. Clearly Q, as we now understand it, needs to be continued and better articulated. It is important that it be spread across the curriculum; that students learn to understand and interpret visual data; that students know how to construct a logical argument based on numerical data; and that they need to learn how to manipulate data.

Back to the process of creating a proposal acceptable to the majority of faculty, given the complexity of this task, should we be doing this at the faculty meeting? How do we present these “models” to students?

There is general agreement that it would be good to present three models at an open meeting after faculty meeting and then get a set of votes following that meeting. We'd possibly present models to Student Congress as well. Is there a way for students and faculty to get together to follow up at an open meeting?

Back to the proposal itself, we agreed that for WQS, faculty development can no longer lead to “life time” certification. And “teeth” need to be created to ensure the programs are “fed” by departments across the curriculum, and that syllabi can be reviewed to ensure that particular “skill sets” or pedagogies are covered.

We agreed that a reenergized faculty development program is probably one of the more central issues. We need to have faculty development become imbedded in the culture of the faculty, we need to become energized and deepened by conversations about pedagogy.

Respectfully submitted by  
Joe Heithaus, December 4, 2009

**Committee on Academic Policy and Planning  
1 February 2010**

Present: Pam Propsom (chair), Kevin Kinney (recording minutes), Julia Bruggemann, Scott Spiegelberg, Tyler Archer, Bruce Sanders, Laura Pearce, Joe Heithaus, Nancy Davis, Pedar Foss

The Meeting was called to order at 4:04. (Minutes from the previous meeting had already been approved and posted on the Faculty Governance website.) KKinney agreed to take minutes for this meeting.

There was no formal agenda for this meeting, but PP provided an overview. The main order of business was to review, summarize, and discuss the results of the deliberations of the subcommittee dealing with the proposed 3-seminar sequence. Ideally, have public discussion of options in March, motion before the Faculty in April, and vote in May.

JB and JH summarized the “Supercommittee” process and their work. In response to a question, they noted that there was no formal “Q” representative on the committee, but several “Q-aware” people were present.

The Supercommittee came to agreement on the following:

We can do a better job of integrating and sequencing what we do, even without making changes to the FYS and College Writing programs. The teaching should be intentionally taught- all skills (Writing, Speaking, Quantitative reasoning) each year.

Quantitative reasoning needs to be a part of any coherent proposed change.

Across-the board “buy-in” from most/all departments and programs is critical. This may be ensured best by having some administrative overview.

JH will soon be presenting a document outlining proposed expectations for students at different levels in their college careers.

Five models emerged from the discussions. The remainder of this meeting was dedicated to summarizing and discussing the models.

SWG Model

3-stage competency model

Making meaning model

FYE model

“Bard” model

Members of CAPP described each of these models.

CAPP decided to postpone deliberation on the Bard model until Mike Sinowitz could provide more information. However, CAPP recognized that it could be costly, and one way to minimize this would be to have the session in Winter Term rather than before the fall semester.

The Summer Working Group model was left aside for now as essentially the same as that in the SWG report.

The 3-stage competency model is closest to our current system. Little change to FYS, ENG 130- just some re-focusing. The new component was to have students demonstrate the competencies within their disciplines. The First Year Experience- model attempts to create a “comprehensive FY experience” which would include all students. The FYS would be enhanced with a resource team to assist with general college skills (library use, W consultant, IT, etc). The FYS would meet within a restricted set of time banks to allow collaboration. Some members of CAPP noted that this aspect could be useful regardless of which model (if any) was adopted.

The “Making Meaning” model arguably got the most traction within the “Supercommittee”. This model is considered the most holistic of the models. Emphasis is on the first two years, with a subsequent handoff to departments and programs. Emphasis is on skills for first years, disciplinary rhetoric. There was some concern about

the ability of small departments and interdisciplinary programs to participate- it may be that there will have to be some different expectations for different groups.

General discussion:

Student/Academic life discussions- how to move students from guidance to independence.

Idea is for advising to be a common activity in 1st 2 years, then let the experts take over.

PF provided a handout- "Essential Learning outcomes". It appears we're doing what others are looking into as well.

There was some concern that the models were not different enough, and thus the appearance of choice was illusory.

SS suggested a completely different approach, describing the expectations from a generic 100-level, 200-level, 300-level, and 400-level course.

There was general agreement that in order for any of this to work, students need skills that are transferable from one class to another. CAPP also recognized that we need some way to do longer range planning, and to get away from scrambling for faculty to teach these seminars each year. There was some discussion of whether the 3-seminar sequence would be mainly staffed by term faculty and the role of term vs. tenure track faculty more generally. Would term people be best suited for introductory/general courses or for upper level specialized courses? Arguments can be made for both. CAPP recognized that we must also keep in mind what impact seminars would have on upper level class sizes. This impact is tied in with admissions and yearly class size.

CAPP agreed on a general method for proceeding with these models. CAPP will perform minimal editing, to preserve the differences in the models, but will re-phrase things to resemble catalog language as closely as possible. "Making Meaning" appears to be closest to this goal- CAPP members agreed to use this as the "master model." CAPP will also come up with some sort of abstract/table to summarize the key differences among the models.

Assignments for working on the models:

Bard- Mike Sinowitz

SWG- Bruce, Laura

Making Meaning- Joe, Nancy

3-Stage- Pam, KK

FY Experience- Julia, Tyler

CAPP recognized the importance of coordinating with MAO and the Senior Capstone and WT subcommittees about all of this.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 5:45 PM

Respectfully submitted

Kevin Kinney

### **CAPP Minutes**

**Feb 15, 2010**

Present: Pam Propsom (chair), Kevin Kinney, Tyler Archer, Laura Pearce, Bruce Sanders, Nancy Davis, Joe Heithaus, Pedar Foss, Julia Bruggemann (secretary)

Meeting called to order at 4:00 p.m.

Mike Sinowitz visited the meeting to discuss the Bard model for possible adaptation to the DePauw curriculum (a three week intensive writing class/workshop to take place before the beginning of the school year for incoming First Year Students to be followed by 2 first year seminars in the first year). Mike had talked to the director of the Bard Program and reported his findings to CAPP: Bard has been running this program for 30 years. They have a strong reputation in the community of teaching composition. Bard uses lots of outside people, but there have been moves lately to use more internal people. Outside people can be more enthusiastic. There is not that much turnover; high retention among temporary faculty. They don't need to advertise. But you have to select people well. Mike reported that the Bard director would be willing to come and explain more details.

Mike had also met with David Harvey to talk about costs and shared DH's responses: The costs are high, but there is a range depending on how you staff it. \$175,000-215,000 for summer. We would need a large gift. We could run it as a pilot program. He's encouraged us to keep it on the table. This could exist independently of other changes being considered.

There ensued a lively discussion of the "Bard Model" including some suggestions to run the 3-week writing workshop during Winter Term. Mike does not recommend doing this. He argued that by requiring the course in the summer, it sends the message that it's the first (most important) thing you do at Bard. It represents an intensive intro to liberal arts. He offered that the experience might be too intense for WT? If offered in the summer, the FYS can build off the program rather than the other way around. Others offered that a faculty member could trade a WT for teaching in this program. Details would have to be worked out later. Some reminded that if there's no first year WT, we have to worry about retention of students from first semester to second semester. The question was raised how we would we integrate international (non-native English speaking) students? An additional week or so of orientation might cost \$20,000. International students could take the intensive writing experience in the summer before their sophomore year. We discussed what difference this program might make to the English department. Resources would be more flexible. Most importantly, CAPP agreed that there has to be cohesion in what we want students to do. There has to be an administrative/enforcement mechanism. Director.

Advantages of Bard model: shared curriculum, shared languages, share skills, etc. There will still be some variance in experience depending on the instructor. There should be faculty development associated with all this. Bard trains new faculty and they have a mentoring program.

After Mike left, CAPP resumed its regular business:

Minutes from previous meeting were discussed, some changes were offered, and they will be circulated again via email for approval.

Discussion about which proposals to bring to the faculty and how to organize the process:

There was some concern raised (by student newspaper editorial) and among CAPP members as to how to sequence all these changes.

How will we structure the discussion at the March meeting? Dave Berque said there is a way to suspend Robert's Rules to discuss the models during the faculty meeting. CAPP decided this method was favorable to a meeting after the regular faculty meeting.

Goals for the discussion at the faculty meeting in March: We have to frame the discussion for people at the faculty meeting. We need feedback/ get a straw poll.

CAPP agreed to prepare:

Handouts/presentations/Cheat sheets highlighting characteristics to showcase 3 different models. Preference for discussion in whole group, not breakout sessions.

In addition to the 3 models, CAPP agreed that some issues/ideas that can be used for all models should be shared with the faculty:

- Faculty Development
- Pods
- Director
- Timebanks
- Course Levels

Discussion of different models:

(1) Making Meaning

CAPP considered that there might be a problem with creating a quantitative disciplinary seminar in some departments. We discussed whether it could be offered in a different major, but there might be hidden prerequisites. We were also concerned that it might require some departments to do work for others. There was some discussion about how a quantitative course could be vertically integrated, or whether it should remain a separate/gen ed piece. In some departments this Q/L (logic) course could be more about L than Q. Members of CAPP were divided on

whether there should be one or two disciplinary rhetoric seminars. Departments decide on their own which role Q plays in their disciplinary rhetoric. Also, we reminded ourselves, that in this model, Q is included in the first 2 classes as 'making meaning' can include a lot of different skills including quantitative ones. We also hope that as more people teach the lower level classes (which include Q), some of that emphasis will trickle into other classes.

#### (2) Bard Model

We have to come up with a new name.

We decided to take out Bard's specifics (esp. the reading list) in order to present the summer session plus 2 unified text seminars to follow. This model does not offer anything on the upper level.

#### (3) Three Stage Competency Model

We decided to choose Option A from the options on the previous version.

CAPP decided against including the original proposal developed by the 2009 Summer Working Group, because it had not gotten any real traction on CAPP, the surveys, or the supercommittee. CAPP did affirm that it launched the process that generated 3 distinct proposals to be presented to the faculty.

There was some discussion about how to interpret the conversations at the faculty meeting. We asked how we would know if a specific "winner" would emerge? We decided on taking a straw poll at the meeting (with room for written specific feedback). We will see this meeting as feedback. We are committed to sharing data with the faculty? David has to do the analysis for all models so they're comparable. All the proposals with data and survey results will go up Moodle in advance of the faculty meeting. We decided against offering pros and cons of each model as these will likely emerge in the discussion.

There was some agreement that ultimately the discussion about Winter Term will have to follow whatever gets decided about these proposals.

CAPP agreed to meet again next Monday at 4pm. (Feb 22). We will use the meeting to develop cheat sheets and the full final texts of the proposals. Once we have detailed texts, we will pass them along to David Harvey to run the numbers before the faculty meeting.

In preparation for the meeting we agreed to work on the following texts:

Pam: Three-Stage Competency

Joe: Making Meaning

Nancy: Separate suggestions/commonalities

Bruce: Bard Model

Announcements:

There will be a new ad hoc committee formed to discuss the SWG suggestions for Winter Term. (see agenda) Julia and Tyler volunteered to serve on this new committee, but not for work in the summer of 2010.

The admissions committee will meet as a group to put together questions with new director.

The senior capstone group meets again Wednesday. There will likely be some revisions of catalogue language about the senior capstone, but no radical change. All seniors should have the option to do synthetic work. Capstone day is taking shape.

Meeting concluded at 6:00 p.m.

### **Committee on Academic Policy and Planning March 8, 2010**

Present: Tyler Archer, Julia Bruggemann, Nancy Davis, Pedar Foss, Joe Heithaus, Laura Pearce, Pam Propsom (chair), Bruce Sanders, Scott Spiegelberg.

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 pm.

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

David Harvey joined the meeting to discuss the need to reconstitute the Resource Allocation Subcommittee (RAS). He plans to send a call for tenure track position requests to departments right away. The deadline for submitting proposals will be April 26th. He would like departments to submit separate opportunity hire proposals at the same time. Due to the short notice there will be no time for CAPP to include instructions to departments concerning specific issues that need to be addressed in their proposals.

However, David wants CAPP to think long and hard about what sort of instructions CAPP should send to RAS and what kind of information should be made available to RAS. In the recent past instructions from CAPP have been so extensive that some RAS members felt they were intrusive, that is, that they interfered with the RAS process. In the more distant past, CAPP instructions to RAS were minimal to the point that the RAS process was unable to take long term and cross-department considerations into their decision making process.

One question that needs to be addressed is how RAS should consider opportunity hires relative to usual RAS tenure track position recommendations. They could be considered simultaneously, or one before the other. It was suggested that considering opportunity hires only after the tenure track requests were evaluated first might be the best way to go. Regardless of how it is done, in a period in which the faculty is not expanding the opportunity hires and the tenure track hires come out of the same pot of money.

Another question to be addressed is whether or not CAPP should advise RAS to go slow in recommending the filling of positions this year? Three tenure track positions end this year, four end next year, but two of those have been prefilled, and one of the prefilled people is resigning. Thus, there are up to six fillable openings this year. However, there is currently only one known retirement at the end of the 2011/12 academic year. Given that we don't know precisely how curricular changes are going to affect the demand for courses, might it be better to defer some potential searches this year until next year?

Our discussion with David Harvey concluded with him pointing out that since RAS did not meet last year, a combination of term expirations and sabbaticals has resulted in only one person, Julia Bruggemann, currently on RAS. The rest of RAS will have to be appointed by CAPP this semester.

Next, CAPP met with Rich Martoglio to discuss the Q competency. He began by giving us some definitions of Q. Some definitions (e.g., the definition in the three stage competencies and proficiency model) use the term "critical thinking" as part of the Q definition. A CAPP member noted and there was general agreement that "critical thinking" is too broad and vague a term to apply to the competency and should be dropped. Rich went on to argue that Q is a large skill set, some skills being transferable from one course to another, but others that are specific to a particular course or situation. For example, statistics is different from calculus but the way you approach solving problems in both courses is similar and transferable. The underlying cognitive process is the same. It was also mentioned that there is a problem of Q anxiety and Q avoidance on the part of many students.

The discussion moved to talking about the specific Q skill set and the differences between, numeracy, quantitative analysis and logical reasoning. One CAPP member broke the skills down this way:

- Basic facility with the legibility of numbers and their syntactic operands
- Being able to recognize, assess, and interpret patterns and presentations of data
- Making persuasive arguments using deductive and inductive logical strategies

It was agreed that in the best of all possible worlds all of these skills would be covered in every Q course, but in reality many Q courses did not comprehensively cover all the skills. There were worries expressed about this, but also some acceptance that this might be unavoidable.

The discussion then began to consider ways faculty development might be used to guarantee that all of these skills are covered in every Q course. There was a suggestion that faculty development might create modules that cover logic, numeracy and quantitative analysis.

It was also pointed out that students that enter DePauw with low verbal skills are pointed toward first-year seminars where writing is emphasized. It was suggested that a similar process could occur for students that enter DePauw with low quantitative skills, that is, they might be directed toward first-year seminars that will emphasize developing those skills. At this point the Q discussion concluded.

Due to a lack of time CAPP was unable to pursue the seminar sequence discussion and the straw poll that occurred at the last faculty meeting. Hence, CAPP will meet again next week to work on the proposal we will bring to the next faculty meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Bruce Sanders

**Committee on Academic Policy and Planning**  
**March 29, 2010**

Present: Julia Bruggemann, Nancy Davis, David Harvey (VPAA), Joe Heithaus, Kevin Kinney, Laura Pearce, Pam Propsom (Chair), Bruce Sanders, and Scott Spiegelberg

The meeting was called to order at 4:03pm. The minutes from the last meeting were approved with one revision. Barbara Steinson's resignation as Division IV representative on the Admissions sub-committee was received along with two nominations from Division IV for a replacement. CAPP chose Tom Dickinson in Education Studies to replace Barbara. Ophelia Goma in Economics was approved to fill a vacancy on the Winter Term subcommittee. CAPP then turned to a discussion of this year's Resource Allocations Subcommittee (RAS). Julia Bruggemann, a continuing Division IV representative on RAS, stated her interest in serving as a CAPP representative on this year's RAS. Kevin Kinney and Pam Propsom are also available and willing to serve as CAPP representatives on RAS this May. A discussion ensued of the instructions that CAPP should give to RAS, including whether requests from interdisciplinary programs would be given the same weight and consideration as departmental requests and whether special instructions needed to be given to interdisciplinary programs requesting positions or to RAS in evaluating such requests. It was agreed that since the Handbook now allows interdisciplinary programs to request positions and to hire candidates with tenure in an interdisciplinary program, that such requests need to be given full consideration by RAS, though they may be more complex to deal with. David Harvey noted that it was easier to evaluate a RAS request from an interdisciplinary program when it was for a full-time position in the program or for a position shared with one other discipline, rather than with part of the position being open to candidates from a variety of disciplines. This seemed to be the direction CAPP members were leaning toward in giving instructions to interdisciplinary programs, though the counter view was expressed that if an interdisciplinary program could not justify a full-time position for its program, it might get a stronger candidate for a shared position by opening its search to a variety of disciplines, as has been done in the past. Pam Propsom agreed to work on instructions to RAS, including directing RAS to provide interdisciplinary programs requesting positions with the same type of feedback--strengths and weaknesses of a proposal—that departments receive, rather than comments about the difficulty of evaluating interdisciplinary requests, a response that discourages interdisciplinary programs from submitting RAS requests. CAPP members also expressed a desire to be less restrictive in directions to RAS than was the case last year. Some members of last year's RAS reported feeling hamstrung by last year's instructions from CAPP.

Pam Propsom noted a perception on campus that departments who have members serving on RAS are more likely to have their positions approved than departments without a member on RAS. A number of CAPP members expressed concern about the practice of allowing RAS members to rank their own department's request. David Harvey pointed out that a voting system weighted by number of voters could correct this seeming conflict of interest. The chair agreed to examine RAS rules and to see if the practice might be changed so that RAS members do not vote on their own departmental/program requests. There was also discussion of the importance of departments/programs selecting a person who can effectively speak for a requested position; this person need not be the department chair or program coordinator. It was agreed that departments/programs should be made aware of this.

The discussion next turned to curricular reform and the document that will be put on the faculty agenda this week outlining the proposed changes in the core competencies program. A number of issues were discussed, including whether the Foundational Discourse course should require intensive training in all three of the competencies: 1) writing, 2) listening & speaking, and 3) quantitative & logical reasoning, and whether the third competency should be "quantitative and logical reasoning" or "quantitative or logical reasoning." There was some concern expressed about whether requiring too much of faculty members in the Foundational Discourse course would result in the

proposal being voted down by the faculty, though in the end it was decided that all three competencies needed to be taught in each Foundational Discourse course and that both quantitative analysis and logical reasoning needed to be covered.

A suggestion was made to create brief summaries of a few sample Foundational Discourse courses that might be offered in order to show faculty how intensive training in writing, speaking & listening and quantitative & logical reasoning might be done in one course.

CAPP decided it was important to emphasize that the First-Year Seminar is a content-rich course to clearly distinguish it from the Foundational Discourse course that is focused around a more intensive development of skills, rather than content.

Also discussed was the need of the VPAA to review the contracts and redefine the work duties of the W, S and Q directors if the new curricular changes in the core competencies program are approved. Workloads will need to be appropriate. The continued need for W, Q, and S programs was noted.

Discussion turned to Faculty Development programs needed to support the new curricular program, if passed. David Harvey noted that there is a small budget available now, but that more funds may need to be allocated, perhaps from the Strategic Initiative funds. The initial need for Faculty Development workshops will be greater than subsequently. Finishing editorial touches and corrections were made to the document describing the proposed curricular changes. We agreed that the Preface of the document needed to stress the multiple models that CAPP considered and the multiple voices heard. We decided that CAPP should endorse the new program, rather than just present it to the faculty, and that we would not discuss potential cons to it since what is a con to one person may be an advantage to another; moreover, reactions against this proposal will certainly emerge in the faculty debate. We also agreed to point out to faculty that the alternative 3-stage model, while similar to the existing system, has some differences. Also discussed was the possibility of bringing forth parts of the new curricular package for a vote next year if the complete package is not approved by the faculty in May—e.g., the Disciplinary Discourse seminar. David Harvey noted that if the curricular reforms endorsed by CAPP are approved by the faculty at its May meeting, there will still need to be English 130, W, Q, and S courses and other parts of the existing curriculum available to students matriculating next year. Students will not be able to opt in or out of the new curricular program. If approved by the faculty in May, the new program will begin in the 2011-12 academic year with the entering class of 2015.

The open forum with students to discuss these curricular reforms will be held on Wednesday March 31 with Tyler Archer, Laura Pearce and Pam Propsom attending from CAPP.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:57pm.

Respectfully submitted by  
Nancy Davis

**Committee on Academic Policy and Planning  
Meeting Minutes 4/12/10**

Present: Tyler Archer, Julia Bruggemann, Nancy Davis, Pedar Foss, Joe Heithaus, Kevin Kinney, Laura Pearce, Pam Propsom, Bruce Sanders, Scott Spiegelberg

1. Minutes. Minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2. RAS. Our first criterion in selecting members for this year's Resource Allocation Subcommittee was to avoid having two people from any one department on the committee. We started with the three required members from CAPP and made selections from there, striving for balance.

CAPP representatives

Julia Bruggemann (History)

Kevin Kinney (Biology)

Pam Propsom (Psychology)

- Div. 1 Lori Miles (Art)
- Div. 2 Inge Aures (Modern Languages)
- Div. 3 Jackie Roberts (Chemistry and Biochemistry)
- Div. 4 Rich Cameron (Philosophy)

At large representatives

- Susan Anthony (Communication & Theater)
- Mark Kannowski (Mathematics)

David Harvey will be serving on RAS as the VPAA. We discussed whether there were any concerns about having two chemists on the committee, but there were no significant issues raised.

3. Kinesiology. Pat Babington wrote with an inquiry regarding whether CAPP had any recommendation about its maintaining two tracks in the department or whether they should move to one major in Kinesiology. We didn't know if this was an urgent concern related to a potential RAS proposal or if it could wait. Pam will talk with Pat to find out. If it is not pressing we will invite Pat to either our May meeting to get more information and discuss the issue or we will put it on the agenda for the fall.

4. Italian Studies minor proposal. Because a potential motion related to this would have to sit on the table for a month before it could be voted on, it would be impossible to vote this year anyway. In addition, we would want the same people on CAPP considering the proposal as putting it forward any motion so it would be better to have the entire process take place during an academic year. This will go on the agenda for next year's CAPP. Pam will communicate this to Francesca Seaman.

5. Core Competencies Program. Discussion ensued regarding CAPP's Core Competencies proposal. Staffing concerns—CAPP's proposal would seem to put a lot of pressure on English in terms of staffing. If English ends up offering most of the Foundational Discourse classes in the spring, will it allow them to offer *any* courses for their majors and seminars in the spring? English would contribute the same number of courses to the first-year program (FYS and Foundational Discourse) that they currently offer, but will be flip-flopping when they do this (i.e., currently English offers the majority of the FYS and English 130's in the fall and under the new proposal they would offer more of these in the spring semester instead).

Pedagogy/Quality—Will teaching of writing suffer by having people outside of English teach it? No one in English has a degree in writing pedagogy, although people in English certainly have more experience teaching writing. Although there are guidelines for what should occur in English 130 and W courses (to assure consistency and quality control), the new Core Competencies Committee would establish comparable guidelines for the Foundational Discourse class. There are concerns about having people teach the Foundational Discourse class so sporadically that they wouldn't develop the same level of skill as English faculty, but ideally we would have people committed to teach this longer term. This proposal calls for re-envisioning the Competencies and how we do Faculty Development (making this more on-going rather than lifetime certification).

Rewriting the document—Given Roberts Rules, can we still rewrite our proposal and vote on it in the May Faculty Meeting? The answer appears to be “yes”; Roberts Rules stipulate that we can't change the *scope* of the motion and that will remain the same (i.e., the first-year experience and the competencies). We would like to revise the document to make it more compelling.

What about Q?—Keep it? Pedar wrote an alternative proposal that would remove Q from the Foundational Discourse class and Disciplinary Discourse. From the feedback that people have been getting, the current motion is not going to pass as is because people feel very uncomfortable about the Q element. We had a vigorous discussion about the issue. There were concerns about “ghettoizing” Q if we separate it out from W and S in Foundational Discourse. This is the same problem encountered in the Summer Working Group. There was consensus that we probably have to change the proposal to get it to pass, although there was not unanimous agreement on this being a good idea.

There was a passionate plea to change what we do in the first-year writing course given the changes that the university has made to First-Year Seminar, which now does some of the things Eng 130 did. The argument was

made that we need to revise writing to make the first-year experience more integrated. May have to keep Q where it is for now (i.e., a separate Q course), but work towards infusing Q more completely into the curriculum. We discussed piloting some courses that would integrate W, S, and Q into a Foundational Discourse class. If we propose pilots, we would need to specify the duration of the pilot and how to assess its effectiveness.

The most exciting part of the discussion and proposal has been changing how we conceive of faculty development and seeing it as a more continual process rather than a one-time workshop a faculty member attends and is set for life. There is money out there that the university can apply for so that we can do the faculty development portion necessary for this proposal. Can we get a commitment from the President to find money for whatever proposal we think is central to our educational mission?

Questions from Student Forum. Would AP English credit no longer be available to students (because everyone will be required to take Foundational Discourse) and will that lead prospective students to dismiss DePauw as a college option? Will other colleges recognize what "Foundational Discourse" is? The proposal currently states that if one fails Foundational Discourse the individual does not have to retake. Why? It was a practicality issue because there's no fallback course for students who don't pass, but we could create one (Eng 120 and rename it). Is trying to offer all three competencies in one course watering them down? There was the perception among many committee members that they are watered down already (i.e., programs often have to scramble for competency courses and are glad to have *any* course that might count so how much quality control is there currently?).

Goal for the next meeting? Joe will work with Pedar's revisions to try to write a passionate, convincing Intro. We agreed that we should put David Harvey's analysis of staffing implications on Moodle.

Next meeting. Our next meeting was scheduled for April 26, but that's now the date of the Senior Showcase. We changed the next meeting to next week, Monday, April 19 at 4:00.

Submitted by Pam Propsom

### **CAPP Minutes 4/19/10**

Attendance: Bruce Sanders, Scott Spiegelberg, Joe Heithaus, Pedar Foss, Pam Propsom, Julia Bruggemann (secretary), Tyler Archer, Laura Pearce  
Starting Time: 4:05

Approval of previous minutes with some minor changes.

We discussed if a RAS chair should be appointed before the committee starts meeting. CAPP decided to wait to appoint a chair until the first RAS meeting. Pam will serve as interim point person.

Francesca Seaman was notified that the Italian Studies proposal will be considered in the next academic year. Pat Babington will visit the May CAPP meeting to discuss questions raised in the Kinesiology department. President Casey was asked to report whether there would be funds raised for faculty development if the new Core Competencies program passed. He indicated that it would be easier for him to raise money if DPU did something new. Should the proposal pass, we will need lots of faculty development for 90 sections of new courses (new FYS, new Foundational Discourse).

Pedar reported that the Teaching/Learning Centers are being worked on, but they want to wait to see what's happening with the proposal.

We then discussed the status of the Core Competencies Proposal:

We tried to get a sense of the atmosphere in the English department.

We discussed what to do about students who need more help in writing in their first semester. There could be more sections of English 120, some First Year Seminars could be targeted towards students who need more help with writing or more help with quantitative reasoning.

We discussed questions about staffing; some smaller departments may have a tough time, but the new system would allow longer-term planning for everyone.

After consulting the W, Q, S and FYS external reports, it became clear that the proposal is addressing exactly those things that were recommended by the external reviewers and local opinions: connecting and making the competencies more parallel. The new committee would oversee all of this; again enhancing the ability for long-term planning. We thanked Joe for his work on the revised proposal this last weekend.

We then edited Joe's revised proposal. His revisions were mainly additions of rationale, background. The only substantive changes are the removal of Q from the Foundational Discourse Seminar and the fact that students will have to pass the Foundational Discourse Seminar. Q is still a compromise that we hope may be addressed in subsequent revisions of this program or pilot programs.

We decided to make a cheat-sheet to indicate how the new document is different from the original motion (both will be up on Moodle).

Pedar and Dave Berque will go through the new language with a fine-tooth comb so that we will be sure it's appropriate catalogue language.

David Harvey's new document on writing programs at other GLCA schools will go up on Moodle.

It was decided that the chair of CAPP should send the final revision @ faculty so everyone has access well before the faculty meeting.

It would be great if we could all be thinking about creating examples of courses for Foundational Seminar and Disciplinary Discourse.

There will be a different proposal offered by a group of faculty that's meeting to draft something.  
Meeting concluded at 5:25 pm

### **Committee on Academic Policy and Planning May 10, 2010 Meeting**

Present: Tyler Archer, Macy Ayers, Julia Bruggemann, Hiroko Chiba, Nancy Davis, David Harvey, Joe Heithaus, Kevin Kinney, Marnie McInnes, Laura Pearce, Pam Propsom (chair), Bruce Sanders, Fred Soster, Scott Spiegelberg.

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. Committee members for next year were in attendance and welcomed to the committee.

The previous meeting's minutes were approved.

Bruce Sanders was elected chair for next year.

Pam went through issues the committee would have to deal with next year. These included a proposed Italian Studies minor, the core competencies, Conflict Studies Self-Study, considering an environmental studies report authored by Jeanne Pope, and an interdisciplinary studies report authored by Brett O'Bannon. Also the usual coordination with committees that report to CAPP: FYS, WTS (and the new Winter Term Working Group), IEC, RAS, and Admissions Advisory Committee.

The Winter Term advisory committee will need a CAPP member next year. Hiroko Chiba agreed to consider being on that committee. The Admissions Advisory Committee will need a CAPP member as well.

At this point most of the new CAPP members for next year left the meeting.

A list of this year's RAS and opportunity hires proposals was passed out. "CAPP's General Guidelines to RAS for Consideration of Its Proposals" was also passed out. The guidelines were discussed and some minor changes made. These will be forwarded to RAS before it meets in the summer.

Next, a list of typical RAS questions was passed out. These too were discussed with some minor changes made to the list. They too will be forwarded to RAS. It was agreed that it might be useful for RAS to elect its chair before the

committee meets this summer. Pam (who will also be on RAS this summer) agreed to be the point person for trying to make that happen.

At 5:05 Pat Babington joined the meeting to discuss whether or not Kinesiology's Sports & Exercise Science and the Sports Medicine emphases should merge or remain separate now that the Athletic Training emphasis is being phased out. Some years ago CAPP had recommended that the tracks be kept separate, but that was in a context that also included the Athletic Training emphasis. Pat wanted to know if CAPP still believed keeping the tracks separate was important. Discussion of the pros and cons of keeping the emphases separate ensued. CAPP concluded that from their point of view there were no compelling reasons to keep the tracks separate, but that it was up to the Kinesiology Department to determine if that was the best course of action for their curriculum.

The meeting adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Bruce Sanders