

CAPP Meeting Minutes

Monday, September 1, 2014

Present: John Caraher (chair), Danielle Kane, Kate Kondry, Mark McCoy, Larry Stimpert, Scott Thede, Steve Timm, Gesenia Viviescas,

CAPP discussed the proposed changes to various School of Music majors. Mark stated that currently ensembles and recitals are not grades and are not for credit, and do not appear on transcripts, even though they are required. Additionally, he stated that DePauw wants to address changes in the classical music world in the curriculum. The changes will move the credits required from 31-33 to 40 credits. About half of the increased credits are simply offering credits for things that are already being done. The other half are new 21st century musicianship courses. MAO has already approved all the course changes.

The motion to approve the changes in School of Music majors passed. It will be added to the faculty meeting agenda for this month.

We spent the rest of the meeting discussing meeting schedules (plan to meet on the second and fourth Mondays of the month) and agenda items for the upcoming year.

We discussed making changes to how RAS works, as there were some issues with staffing RAS, who is on RAS during the school year, and other procedural issues. We plan to review RAS rules this year. We are supposed to come to our next meeting with some models for getting faculty input into the hiring process.

We talked about needing to work on the Diversity and Equity Committee's request to review diversity/multicultural education requirements. This will be a big task, but we need to at least frame a discussion about the issue.

We said that it is probably timely to review the effects of the 2-2-2 general education distribution requirements. We should also assess the Extended Studies program and see how things are going. There are some issues with limits on how many credits students can take per semester before being charged extra, since some Winter Term and May Term classes are now being offered for credit and are "attached" to adjacent semesters.

Our next meeting is September 22.

CAPP Meeting Minutes for Monday, 9/22
Location: Julian 245

In attendance: John Caraher (chair), Francesca Seaman, Dave Guinee, Danielle Kane (notetaker), Larry Stimpert, Scott Thede, Steve Timm, Gesenia Viviescas, Katie Kondry

1. Dave Berque had two issues for CAPP to clarify. First, the new language on extended studies in the handbooks says that “all students must complete two extended studies courses;” Dave wanted to know whether this included transfer students, who in the past (when the WT requirement was 3) had a reduced requirement. The Committee said that the new language does apply to transfer studies (ie everyone must complete two) because these students should have enough time to meet this requirement.

Second, Dave wanted to know whether for-credit independent studies were permissible in the Extended Studies system. The Committee said that they were but said that this was an issue to monitor in coming years in terms of faculty time and compensation.

2. CAPP also considered ideas for reforming the RAS system. Several models from GLCA schools were discussed, and new ideas were raised. In one model, departments could use an external review to develop a baseline for how many and what kind of courses they should offer, and staffing would be based on these curriculum needs.

Also discussed were the possibilities of encouraging departments to frame their proposals in terms of the overall contribution the position could make to university-wide goals. In addition, the possibility of a RAS committee composed entirely of current CAPP members was considered; this group could potentially meet regularly or twice a year (ie with two deadlines for proposals from departments). Finally, it was agreed that a smaller committee may make it possible to exclude as members those faculty from departments submitting proposals.

Serious revisions of the RAS cannot be implemented this year; Dave Guinee agreed to draft a proposal that might resolve some issues (e.g. conflict of interest concerns) for this academic year’s RAS.

3. Larry updated CAPP on the Education Studies program, which this year and last requested additional TT lines and was denied both years. The Program has evolved significantly over the years, especially since the end of the teaching certification program, and the Program is doing a self-study; Larry has also recommended an external review. Two possible directions for the Program are (1) finding alternative routes to teacher certification (eg a 5th year certification with a school that partners with DePauw) and (2) serving as a clearinghouse for all DePauw outreach efforts with local schools.

CAPP Minutes
October 13, 2014

In attendance: In attendance: John Caraher (chair), Francesca Seaman (notetaker), Danielle Kane (notetaker), Larry Stimpert, Scott Thede, Steve Timm, Gesenia Viviescas, Katie Kondry

Constituting a committee in admission

Guest: Tim Good as member of the Committee on Admission in 2013-2014

Committee on Admission was dismantled because of redundancy
DEC is already working with admission
Make up of the group was not ideal in terms of getting things done: tough to find a time to meet

Goal: decide what we would like to see happen in terms of CAPP's job in supervising admission

The Committee on Admission had many volunteers.
Faculty voice is critical, even though it might seem redundant
It is our job to provide content: what is happening in admissions?
CAPP should attempt to balance membership of committee in terms of ranks and divisions

It was originally an Advising Committee, which had a really hard time finding a time to meet

Critically important to have a committee and put the language in front of the faculty to either eliminate or focus it.

There is a lot of faculty interest in establishing this committee but it is hard to get a committee together. The discourse on admission is connected with the discourse on budget.

Is the University admitting international students who do not have the skills to succeed? The advisory committee is but a voice, it does not take decisions. In fact the committee was not even able to offer a voice.

Dialog with admission office. Admission and faculty should be on the same team

Some years ago, admission used to report regularly to the faculty and the faculty was somewhat involved.

It would be good to have faculty be updated on the status of admission since there is an affect on our teaching experience.

The problem of admission is connected to governance.

Where do we go to have these conversations?

Who examines the borderline cases?

The subcommittee could recruit others to help.

CAPP should charge a subcommittee to be a liaison with admissions

Re-assessment of graduation requirements.

What is the philosophy of having requirements? It is time to re-assess our curriculum.

How do we want to assess our requirement?

What information do we think we should have before we open it to a broader discussion? Do we like the kind of changes we see?

What are some of the trends?

Drops in enrollment?

Do the present requirements satisfy the liberal arts mission?

With the change in requirements a lot of students take a bare minimum in the liberal arts, and take the rest of the courses in their disciplines.

We lost a literature requirement. Is it connected to the multicultural question?

What are the kinds of learning outcomes we get for students?

It matters less what the requirement here is and more what you do with the requirement. What do we want the students to get out of our science requirement, and what courses would help us reach that goal? A possibility is a 'big ideas' class where students would be exposed to powerful ideas. Or "Books I should read before I die."

What is the purpose of a liberal arts education?

We have requested some data: n. of students coming in with AP credits, n. of seniors who have satisfied 31 credit graduation requirement by fall of 4th year.

Intensive teaching approach: we potentially have it. What is taught best in an intensive format (January or May) and in a semester format?

What if we stretch WT to match a full credit? Students' credit for lab?
Potential questions to the curriculum might require a subcommittee?

Facilitating discussion on curriculum

Resource Allocation Subcommittee 2015

What are we trying to do with the academic program?
Is it a question of replacing lines?
How do we prioritize?
CAPP should offer clear guidelines on proposals and selections

January: Call for proposals for RAS
February: CAPP appoints RAS (provisional)
May 1: Proposals due
Early May: finalize membership of RAS (take away conflict of interest)

In parallel maybe we could develop a different model.

What should the process look like in the future? Should we change the way RAS operate?

CAPP Minutes for October 27, 2014

Members Present: Caraher (Chair), Thede, Seaman, Guinee, McCoy, Timm, Kondry

1. School of music proposal

We have the final proposed changes before us.

At DePauw a current applied lesson is a .5 credit class, but at universities around the country these range from a half-credit class to two full credits. The committee voted to pass the changes on the faculty as a whole.

2. Admissions subcommittee discussion

Caraher presented a first draft of a proposal for creation and duties of a Faculty Committee on Admission. A member of the committee felt that this committee should report as widely as possible. Seaman suggested various other committees should select representatives — someone from COA, someone from the Writing Committee, etc.

A member asked whether the committee should not instead ask the Admissions office for a report on particular data at regular intervals (twice per year?). We could also ask for faculty to submit questions and concerns that we could propose as topics of conversation to the Admissions office. CAPP would then report to the faculty on the data and the conversation.

There is a feeling that there needs to be some sort of faculty investment in the admissions process. In the past admissions reported each month to the faculty at the faculty meeting, and that was where the faculty asked questions.

A suggestion was made that maybe we should have a conversation with Cindy Babbington about what's the best way to share information. We will ask her to come to the next meeting (or soon) to talk about how to both involve the faculty as a whole and have CAPP fulfill its function. CAPP will also ask other committees about their concerns or questions for Admissions.

3. Extended studies issues

Issue — at least one ES credit must be completed through participation in either a January or May term course. A summer-long internship currently will not fulfill this requirement, but a 3-week long internship in January or May *will* fulfill the requirement. How can CAPP solve the apparent contradiction?

- Proposal 1: Redefine the language to say that one course must be a January term or May term course, travel experience, or service learning program.
- Proposal 2: also allows a semester long off-campus study or internship
- Proposal 3: remove the requirement for one J or May term experience.

The committee agreed that we prefer Proposal 1, with some language clarification that the experience should be with a DePauw group. Dave Guinee and John Caraher will

work on the language for this change.

Issue — How is credit/tuition interaction offering students' choices? Certain populations of students are getting into some situations where getting credit is difficult for them.

Seniors who need 9 credits. Some are taking 4.5 in Fall, taking a WT .5 credit to avoid having 4.5 in the Spring when they have seminar, etc.

The committee needs to speak to Dave Berque. Is there a real issue with federal financial aid requirements that prevents students from being able to simply take 9 courses during the year? John will ask Dave to join the committee to discuss these issues.

4. RAS Issues

Talking about the state of RAS.

We discussed suggestions that CAPP keep better records about what departments promised in previous proposals to RAS, how to generate data from OIR that would help with RAS deliberations, etc.

Caraher presented suggestions for how to constitute the committee for discussion. CAPP is united in feeling that departments with proposals should not sit on the committee, but is divided at this point on other issues.

5. Graduation Requirements

What are the data we would like to collect to look at how recent changes in curriculum have worked?

CAPP Minutes

11/10/14

Present: John Caraher (Chair), Dave Guinee, Francesca Seaman, Scott Thede, Danielle Kane, Mark McCoy. Dave Berque (for Larry Stimpert), Gesenia Viviescas, Katie Kondry, Maria Carriga (via Skype), Steve Timm

John announced that given the recent concerns on campus the planned agenda would be revised. The only topic on today's meeting is considering an M requirement. A lively discussion followed.

John identified previous charges to the faculty from DEC and Student Government (posted on Moodle).

1. Identify best practices to (DEC)
2. Student Government

John pointed out that student participation and voice was already built into the structure of CAPP.

The committee considered an overview of models of an M requirement from the University of San Diego, Oberlin, and St. Olaf. Clarification is needed from members of the community seeking an M requirement. Models were discussed with consideration given to curricular components, practical components, limitations on defining an M requirement to diversity of race, engaging and including the entire DePauw community in the conversation.

John reiterated the need to determine goals for an M requirement. He summarized the Friday and Sunday campus-wide meetings.

The following discussion identified the complexities of the challenge facing the DePauw community. Students don't want a band-aid response. Comments suggested including a diversity and multi-cultural discussions within the first year seminar, expanding the first year seminar to two semesters, creating a common course, increasing faculty awareness of diversity issues, educating faculty and staff about micro-aggressions, and including a multi-cultural aspect in more classes.

The committee noted that an M requirement had limited reach within the community, and that there's a perception among students that if they report a problem in class, they're getting no return. Broadening faculty development's role in orienting new faculty to multi-cultural and diversity issues, as well as structuring ongoing and regular conversations with all faculty, was suggested. Administrative support for FD funds to back course development is needed. Dave B. informed the committee that statistics were available on the percentage of students currently enrolled in courses identified as potential M courses.

CAPP then considered the need to comprehensively identify the problem before implanting solutions. Discussion of “design thinking” ensued. CAPP wants to ensure that all voices are represented in identifying the issue(s) on campus and in the attempts to resolve the issue(s).

Consideration was given to a CAPP statement issued to the DePauw community. The final version of the statement is included below:

Dear Colleagues,

DePauw’s course catalog states, “A DePauw education asserts that developing a global perspective and an appreciation and tolerance for a more diverse society are vital for living in an increasingly interdependent world.” Furthermore, the faculty-approved statement, “The Purpose and Aims of DePauw,” says, in part, that the DePauw curriculum is designed “to broaden (students’) perspectives on humanity and culture” and “to give them an understanding of the contemporary world and the human prospect for the next decades.” The Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (CAPP) fully endorses these goals. We acknowledge that progress has been made yet recognize that there is still much to do.

Therefore, in order better to fulfill these longstanding commitments regarding the aims of a DePauw education, CAPP resolves to work with the students, faculty and staff of DePauw University to propose, by the April 6, 2015 faculty meeting (ensuring a vote no later than the May 4, 2015 faculty meeting), changes to ensure that the DePauw experience prepares all graduates to engage problems of social inequality in a productive, ethical and informed manner. The DePauw education will include, as major objectives, providing knowledge, skills and opportunities required to attain a rich understanding of historical and contemporary stories of difference, particularly in the interactions between dominant and marginalized groups within a culture.

Submitted for your information on behalf of CAPP,

John Caraher
Chair, Committee on Academic Policy and Planning

CAPP will continue to discuss these issues at the next meeting, Nov. 17, 2014.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:30pm.

Email on syllabi:

Dear DePauw Faculty Members,

This afternoon, the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning met for a spirited discussion of a multicultural requirement for graduation. The committee felt it important to point out that there are also steps we can take right now to respond to student concerns and address pertinent issues in the classes we already teach (and of course, many faculty members already focus on such material).

As you order books and make your syllabi for next term, please consider whether there's something within the purview of your class that might address questions of social inequality and privilege, in whatever way is most consonant with the methods and substance of your discipline.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

The members of CAPP...

Gesenia Viviescas '17
Steve Timm
Scott Thede
Francesca Seaman
Mark McCoy
Katharine Kondry '16
Danielle Kane
David Guinee

John Caraher
Dave Berque (representing Larry Stimpert)

CAPP Meeting: Monday, November 24th in Julian 371

Attending: John Caraher (chair), Steve Timm, Gesenia Viviescas, Scott Thede, Dave Guinee, Maria Cari Garrigas, Larry Stimpert, Francesca Seaman, and Danielle Kane (notetaker)

1. John proposed that we approve the name change from Black Studies to Africana Studies.

Some concern was raised that this name (Africana Studies) seems to refer to a collection of things (e.g., 'Americana'); however, the written proposal lays out precedents for this naming at other universities. It was also agreed that the Program itself is best positioned to determine the best name.

The motion to change the name passed.

2. John reported on his meeting with DEC. A student's concern on DEC was that counting Extended Studies trips could devolve into viewing the M as charity work; however, the Committee agreed that this is an implementation issue and not insurmountable.

3. After a meeting with Bob Dewey and Raj Bellani, John suggested we wait until after the first January Extended Studies to decide whether we should continue to require at least one May or Winter Term experience, as is the current policy. Raj cautions us to wait to see what the enrollments are like after our first January in Extended Studies. CAPP agreed to renew its discussion at the beginning of the spring semester.

4. The Committee discussed materials provided by Cindy Babington, who will come to the December 8th meeting. From her memo we discussed the sentence "...try to maintain as much as possible the academic quality achieved with this year's entering class, while absolutely achieving the financial goals identified." Also, she asks, given the trade-offs, what kind of class would we like to see. Finally, she raised the possibility of test-optional admissions? CAPP members disagreed sharply about the merits of proposal for test-optional admissions.

There was a request for data from Cindy about what key markers matter most for increasing student yield, especially for the yield of high-achieving students. We'd also like to know what are the actual criteria are used for admissions and how they converge – or not – with faculty priorities in selection criteria. In particular, we'd like to know what the formula is – eg. What is the cutoff GPA for admission? What is our baseline, and what are we aiming for? We'd like her to walk us through specifically how these decisions are made, and by whom.

5. Regarding the M requirement, by the end of March we need to propose something to come before the Faculty meeting; therefore, we need to get community feedback by the end of February. John proposed articulating several broad models that we

could then get feedback on. The Committee eliminated the possibility of accomplishing M through a first-year seminar, as it would produce too many staffing issues.

Danielle moved that we adopt a two-course model, incorporating one domestic and one international component, totaling at least 1.5 credits, and including up to one Extended Studies experience. John seconded this motion.

Dave Guinee countered with an alternative: presenting 3 models to the faculty: (1) the 2-course model Danielle described; (2) a strong single course (to indicate it's specifically about diversity and difference and power); and (3) a 6- or 7- experience model, in which M would be slotted into the Society and Culture experience (6-experience version) or would be added as a 7th experience.

6. Larry passed out an approach to reforming RAS. This proposal entails a standing committee, potentially CAPP itself, which would vet proposals from departments. Departments would approach this committee at three points: (1) when retirements are anticipated or announced; (2) when a department needs additional staffing to meet current curricular needs; and (3) when a department would like to move in a new direction with its curriculum. Larry suggested that at least some of these proposals would be bolstered by external reviews.

This group would also and determine whether proposals from departments are high priority, low priority, or not a priority. This proposal would do away with RAS.

The Committee decided to discuss this at its next meeting on December 8th.

CAPP meeting, Dec. 8, 2014

In attendance: In attendance: John Caraher (chair), Francesca Seaman (notetaker), Danielle Kane (notetaker), Scott Thede, Steve Timm, Katie Kondry

1. Graduation requirement

The committee discussed the case for six experiences.

CAPP is working on presenting 4 different models for an “M” requirement to the faculty. It might be best to return next week with four documents on each model, documents that would all edit.

Students want to see some guidelines to implementation

Problem: how will the discussion of implementation of the “M” requirement be interwoven with the discussion of the “6 experiences” model?

We probably will not go back to the previous requirements, and the “no requirement” model is unlikely. The discussion of graduation requirements is connected to the “M” requirement.

Students are interested in seeing a discussion of possible revisions of the curriculum, but do not necessarily expect an immediate implementation. This conversation will take time.

It would be interesting to track some of the impact in enrollment in some of the humanities classes, for example. Do students focus on 3 or 4 departments? Are they well rounded? Do they follow their line of study?

What is the effect of double majors instead of a Liberal Arts education?
N. of students taking the minimum distribution?
Min. n. of courses for requirement is 6.

What is DePauw going to be? What is our identity? Why are we at a liberal arts college?

Our liberal arts education caters also toward people who worry about jobs. That’s why we have a Management Fellow Program, etc.

The committee would like to present some ideas to the faculty and have some discussion about different possibilities. We would also like to hear some ideas from the students, their visions for a liberal arts education.

2. Admission – Cindy Babington (guest)

Admission is very complex.

We had 2 application deadlines for early decision, which is binding. We have admitted more early decision students than we ever had.

We have more completed applications than ever before.

Counselors go out to recruit, and now are reading the applications from their own territory and will make their recommendations. We also have second readers, who agree or disagree with those recommendations.

Last year we did not admit anyone below a 3.2. But this year we know we have to admit more students and so the decisions have been more difficult as you have to decide whether the student is going to make it here, and whether he has affinities to DePauw.

Financial Aid based on need decisions are made in March, while merit-based decisions are calculated by the end of January. There is discretion in these decisions.

Tuition revenue per student goes up, but the total revenue depends on the number of students.

How does the academic interest get calculated? It is based on test scores, high school GPA's, and quality of high school.

We calculate an academic high school GPA. We take out the PE and non-academic courses, and we give points toward AP courses for each year of their high school career.

The quality of the high school is a small factor.

We need to consider moving toward test optional: what else would you bring into consideration for admission?

Holistic evaluation: activities, community service, application essay, and recommendations.

CAPP meeting, January 26, 2015

Present: Caraher (chair), Thede, Kondry, Stimpert, Timm, Seaman, Viviescas, Kane, Guinee (recorder)

Discussion of how to present/plan the "M" requirement.

(Seaman repeated the argument that "M" is not descriptive of what we are attempting to create. "M" will be used below only as a placeholder for whatever we eventually decide upon.)

John distributed a copy of the Google doc on options for the M requirement.

Plan to discuss the various plans/options with the departments in February. Committee hopes to gather this information before February. Would like to announce at the faculty meeting what the plan will be for moving forward.

We will need to prepare a document for Departments with issues we would like to discuss with them.

Hoping to have an open forum some time in February and have a post-faculty-meeting discussion in March.

Current plan is to have John present the basic plans and CAPP's questions to the Chairs' meeting and ask them whether they would like a CAPP member to attend a department meeting or whether they would like to gather feedback or questions from department members to report to CAPP.

How should we gather student opinions? February 8 (?) is the DSG assembly meeting. It would be useful to have more than one open meeting with students. Student representatives are working on finding times and reserving space.

It would be nice to have examples of courses that would clearly fit the requirements for the "M" course.

We need to check on seats for social science — will going to a 7 experiences model lead to a burden in an area where students already have difficulty getting seats.

Extended Studies:

Want to clarify that we did want to emphasize the importance of the one extended studies class being a part of a DePauw group experience, rather than an individual experience.

Feedback on WT — anecdotal information indicates that most students were positive about the Winter Term classes, although some (particularly juniors and seniors) felt that the 'sprit' of Winter Term has been diluted.

Question: Is it too soon to discuss a return to requiring 3 Winter terms? Last year we were, as a whole, down about 200 hundred students in Winter Term participation. How many trips and classes were cancelled? Real concerns about whether we can meet demand and supply.

Stimpert wants to take a comprehensive look at all off campus study. Currently students pay DPU tuition and get all of their financial aid and we pay the provider. We're paying providers \$400K more than our net tuition from those students. At lots of schools you pay directly to the provider; this, however, will disadvantage less affluent students.

We do have issues we would like to discuss with Dave Berque — John will try to schedule a meeting with him.

RAS Issues —

In February we will put out a call for RAS proposals. We need to draft the letter and talk about how to get better proposals. This would include asking departments to speak more holistically about what they department will look like after the hire and what changes this will make to overall curriculum.

Question — can there be proposals from individuals working across departments? At this point there is no real way for *individuals* to do this, but departments can.

Please submit any ideas for the RAS proposal to John. He may create a Google Doc for working on this.

The committee talked about many of the same issues as in previous meetings regarding the composition of the "M" requirement.

February 9, 2015 CAPP Meeting minutes

In attendance: John Caraher, Steve Timm, Francesa Seaman, Katie Condry, Yessie Viviescas, Larry Stimpert, Dave Guinee, Danielle Kane (notetaker)

M requirement

The committee first discussed the draft document to be presented to faculty on the distribution requirements, including the M requirement. The committee decided to collapse Plan A into “a one- or two-course requirement” (rather than breaking this into two separate options on the document).

The committee then debated presenting one option for Plan B and decided in favor of the Seven Experiences model because it might encourage faculty to develop courses specifically targeted at M.

The group agreed to the preamble John drafted; it was agreed that this background could give important context for future discussions, including guidelines for MAO.

The committee reviewed the questions John drafted about departmental preferences regarding the M requirement and agreed with posing these questions to departments.

RAS

The committee transitioned to discussing criteria for RAS membership. There was agreement that the ideal was tenured faculty; if not enough members could be identified, tenure-track members would be acceptable. CAPP also agreed that faculty in their last year of service ideally would not serve on RAS.

The committee discussed the need for a Division III rep, as the current representative is in a term position. We’ll need two current CAPP members as well as one representative each from Division I and Division III.

Extended Studies

The committee then discussed the need to clarify in the ES requirement that at least one experience should be with a group at DePauw. We also debated the merits of reinstating a three-winter-term requirement.

CAPP Meeting
February 16, 2015

Present: John Caraher, Katie Condry, Dave Guinee, Danielle Kane, Larry Stimpert, Scott Thede, Steve Timm,

Graduation Requirements Discussion:

We discussed graduation requirements and the proposed multi-cultural requirement. Two student forums were held, and relatively lightly attended. Students seemed interested in the option of having all first-year students taking the same class. They also discussed possibly requiring students to attend a certain number of swipe card events during their four years. Danielle gave feedback from her department (Sociology and Anthropology), which was skeptical of the six/seven experiences; most preferred a competency model. John reported that the English department was supportive of the seven experiences model. John has scheduled some open forums for faculty discussion prior to the March faculty meeting; after some discussion, we decided to continue with them. They are February 19, 11:30-12:30, Julian 159; and February 24, 4:00-5:00, Julian 147. There will be discussion at the faculty meeting, and other open meetings afterwards.

RAS Discussion:

We spent the rest of the meeting discussing RAS. We decided that departments should focus more on how the new position will have an overall impact on the department, instead of just listing what the new person would be doing. The RAS memo is on Google docs, everyone should feel free to edit it. The feeling seemed to be to making the memo simpler – getting rid of the bullet points in item #3, for example. We discussed possibly making RAS much more limited-scale this year, or eliminating it completely, because graduation requirements could be changing next year, but we are not planning that now. We are saying that members of departments submitting RAS proposals are not allowed to serve on RAS.

Other Discussion:

We wrapped up with a clarification of the ES statement that at least one ES credit must be earned in a DePauw-led Winter Term or May Term course, travel experience, or service learning program. This will be coming up for a vote at the faculty meeting. Finally, Larry passed out a flyer from the American Association of Colleges & Universities illustrating another possible approach to distribution requirements.

CAPP meeting, Feb. 23, 2015

In attendance: In attendance: John Caraher (chair), Francesca Seaman (notetaker), Danielle Kane, Scott Thede, Katie Kondry, Mark McCoy

Extended Studies

We discussed the Extended Studies requirement. John provided some clarifications for catalog changes.

RAS

There are challenges in filling membership in RAS. We need 4 more volunteers.

Dates: Wed, Thursday, Friday up to May 26.

We discussed a new model for RAS, its schedule, and the possibility of conflict of interest in the representation.

Should a proposal from the Education program depend on self study, outside review, and long term direction of the program?

Requests for RAS proposal documents.

We discussed proposed changes. It is good to convey the importance of an overall vision. Are we going to prioritize relatively conservative requests? Or are we going to move toward new directions?

Graduation Requirements / Curriculum

Discussion of the Four Pillars

Feedback from departments. English seems to be in favor of the 6 experiences. Some don't favor M requirements. Some think that the 6 experiences do not offer anything new.

Could we have a longer language requirement? Is proficiency a question of *seat time*? Could we set a bar for proficiency?

It is vital to have a discussion about the curriculum and to commit to a curriculum behind which we can stand. It would not be wise to propose something that is bound to be changed soon.

It is useful to articulate a rationale, instead of rushing into a new (or a new set of) requirement(s).

Should the curriculum be completely new?

Should the M requirement focus on power and privilege?

CAPP – minutes

3/9/15

Present: John Caraher, Francesca Seaman, Danielle Kane, Scott Thede, Katharine Kondry, Mark McCoy, David Guinee, Larry Stimpert, Steve Timm

1. World Literature minor. John explained issues with website. World literature is not a program and therefore has no steering committee or a director. It's presently an interdisciplinary minor housed in two departments. "Program" doesn't appear in proposal. CAPP is waiting to see if an administrative solution can be achieved through the registrar.

2. Environmental Biology proposal. CAPP reviewed concerns from Glen Kruecker. Questions were raised about an interdisciplinary committee for courses outside of bio department, the measure of environmental content outside of required courses, the number of anticipated majors, and the number of courses required for the major. Larry spoke in favor of the proposal, though questions of cohesion among all the parts remain. John is in contact with Jim Benedix about the administration of allied courses. CAPP anticipates a response to the proposal from GeoSciences.

3. Graduation Requirements

a. Meetings with departments report:

i. Political Science – Dave Guinee reported concerns about having all the rules in place prior to a vote, a rejection of the core curriculum component, and diverse opinions on components A and B.

ii. Psychology and Communication and Theatre – Steve Timm reported concerns about defining the purpose of each pillar or experience, a rejection of the M competency, and dissatisfaction with the current 2-2-2. More data on current system was requested.

iii. History – John Caraher reported on a concern for focusing on diversity and doing it well, that institutionally our competency programs work, considerations of M as faculty development, and there's little interest in changing the distribution requirements.

b. Report from open meetings:

1st meeting. Focus on details about how the M requirement would work.

2nd meeting: What data are we looking at? Role of languages. Concerns were raised about seeing a diversity requirement done well rather than done quickly. The language requirements were revisited. Again, more data on the current system is warranted.

CAPP continued the M discussion. There's no consensus among members of Modern Languages. The need to define "M" remains. Issue of inequality and gender are not necessarily covered in language training. There's some discussion about increasing the language requirement.

Larry provided a handout summarizing the current requirements, six experiences, seven experiences, four pillars, AAC&U model, and the requirements at Allegheny College. He'll share the Allegheny report via email.

John reported that Ken Kirkpatrick did provide statistics on double majors. This information is on Moodle. The data reveals that going to the 2-2-2 did not create a significant increase in double majors.

CAPP intends to clarify our data request to institutional research. CAPP considered overlaying a D requirement on existing courses, international and domestic requirements, requiring 2 courses, and using Extended Studies requirements to meet a D or M requirement. Carlton's point system was considered.

CAPP intends to clarify the purposes behind the seven experiences. Some discussion ensued about a time table and our proposal.

Next week: Updates on proposal for major in environmental biology. Nail down language for M requirement. Consider what will be sent to MAO in terms of the EB proposal.

Adjourned: 5:31

CAPP Meeting 3/16/15

In attendance: John Caraher (chair); Francesca Seaman, Katie Condry, Scott Thede, Kerri Garrigas, Steve Timm, Jesse Vivescas; Larry Stimpert; Dave Guinee; Danielle Kane (notetaker)

1. CAPP first discussed the proposal for an environmental biology major. Four issues were raised initially: (1) the possibility that there is internal (to the biology department) disagreement about this major; (2) that it is insufficiently different from what's currently possible in the biology department; (3) that it is unclear that a senior seminar devoted to environmental biology would be available; and (4) that the required courses (13.5) might exceed the acceptable number.

For #2, CAPP discussed how doing an environmental specialization under the current structure was predicated on using distribution requirements toward this concentration, and members felt this was an improper use of distribution requirements. For #4, CAPP found that the limit of required courses is 14, so this proposal does not exceed the limit.

2. However, the discussion shifted to a focus on whether this might be a good time to reconceive of how DePauw structures coursework for students interested in environmental studies. More specifically, it seemed to many members that the moment could be right for a single interdisciplinary Environmental Studies or Environmental Science major with several tracks as options (eg biology, geoscience, policy). Larry suggested that rather than responding to this proposal directly that CAPP contact Jim Benedix and Fred Soster to see if the two departments (or representatives of the two departments) would be willing to meet to discuss the possibility of a new interdisciplinary major; Larry agreed to chair this meeting.

3. It was decided that John will draft an email to Jim and Fred to set up a meeting about the possibility of an interdisciplinary major; John will first send a draft to CAPP members.

4. CAPP then discussed a proposal crafted by Dave Guinee to put forward to the faculty regarding distribution requirements, including a multicultural/intercultural/diversity requirement.

5. CAPP agreed that for the faculty to seriously consider any proposal, it must include a rationale for each of its components and detail how courses will or will not cross-count. (For instance, can one course satisfy more than one distribution requirement?) However, the specifics of which courses can be approved will await further discussion. CAPP agreed that each component should include a one-line (or more) rationale for why we think it belongs in a DePauw education; responsibility for each component was divvied up among members, and The Guinee Plan will be available on Google Docs for editing. The specific language must be in place for the next CAPP meeting (March 30th), so that we can vote on it for passing it on for a faculty vote.

CAPP Meeting Minutes

April 13, 2015

Present: Maria, David, Danielle, John, Francesca, Scott, Steve

RAS update:

John gave us an update on RAS. We still need one more at-large member for RAS. Larry needs to send out the request for RAS proposals to the faculty at large.

FYS section for Environmental Fellows:

The Environmental Fellows program would like all their incoming students placed into a single first-year seminar section, which would be just for Environmental Fellows students. After our discussions, we came to the conclusion that it is too late in the year for use to make a reasoned decision about this for next year. We did not want to open the door for all sorts of different groups requesting this sort of thing. We also believe that the program should probably have its own course, instead of using first-year seminars.

Distribution issues:

John filled us in on some comments and criticisms that the plan has received. Some issues were relatively minor, and easily addressed:

- The right hand side column should stay as it is. The others can be alphabetized.
- Creative writing will count as a creative expression class.
- We will need to make it clear what courses will count for what requirement.

We spent most of the rest of the meeting discussing issues regarding the science requirement, math/computational requirement, and Q. Some faculty members are wondering what the difference is between Q and the Math/Computational requirement. Others are wondering if the split between Natural Science and Math/Computational is fair, given that Natural Science has six departments and Math/Computation has two.

Our discussion basically led us to the fact that we cannot make really substantive changes to the proposal at this time. We should be prepared to discuss the issues mentioned above about science, math, and Q, and be prepared to deal with a possible proposed amendment from the sciences. We should probably revisit what Q means next year, particularly whether it should be a higher-level idea. There could be a parallel with the W program – a low-level course prepares the student, then the W/Q course would be a higher-level course. We should try to get some hard data about what courses people take to satisfy the current SM requirement, and help John craft a request to Bill or Ken to get appropriate data.

CAPP meeting, Feb. 23, 2015

In attendance: In attendance: John Caraher (chair), Francesca Seaman (notetaker), Steve Timm, Gesenia Viviescas,, Danielle Kane, Scott Thede, David Guinee, Katie Kondry, Larry Stimpert

CAPP discussed availability of courses for the requirements in the new proposed curriculum

1. Lab requirement
We should be able to have the data that would assure we have enough openings in labs in order to make lab a requirement
2. Arts & Literature.
Courses seem to be undersubscribed. There seem to be enough seats
3. Modern languages
Requirement has not changed
4. Power and Privilege
We need to make sure which courses will count
5. Artistic expression
Should it be connected to Arts & Literature?

Division 3: discussion of the math and science requirement. Top choices include a lab. Instead of taking one course in math and one in science, a different option would be to take two courses in either Math or Science, and let one of those two courses have a lab. We should decide this week whether we want to make a decision.

We should decide what counts for Math and Logic:. Do we have the seats for that requirement? If we do, we don't have to consider what other courses could count toward Math and Logic.

The question of "Q" is also connected. If our take is that Math is the foundational requirement, and "Q" is a refinement in the discipline, then that's a valuable experience but we need to make sure that the students who need a course can get it.

We should think about what counts as a "Q." "Q" might also overlap with a course that counts for Math and Logic.

If you teach a "Q" course you need to submit a syllabus and have it approved. Most "Q" courses are in Math and Science. "Q" should be a course at a higher level, but if we don't count it at a lower level of Math and Science, students will have to take multiple courses to satisfy the "Q" requirement. This might not help anyone other than majors in that field.

If you can't put a "Q" in you Math course, there are so many opportunities that it should not be a problem.

We will have further discussion on what "Q" is next year, and we will keep the proposal as it stands.

Would an Independent Studies on Old English count for the Foreign Language requirement? If it was a regular course, it could count just like Greek and Latin do. Independent Studies do not count for general requirements.

Emphasize that the society and culture requirement will possibly include courses in Political Sciences, History etc. (not just sociology).

It might be helpful to write down courses that count for each requirement.

RAS.

Guidelines for RAS proposals were released to chairs last week. We are still missing one member.

Educations Studies: External Review team could not understand why Rebecca Alexander's position was not converted to tenure track. Ed Studies seems to be putting together an opportunity-hire request. Last year, Ed Studies requested 2 positions, and they were ranked high.

Discussion of opportunity hires.