

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.

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

Respectfully submitted,

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.

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 need

Question: do we want/need a SoM person? How will

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.

Respectfully submitted by
Joe Heithaus, December 4, 2009

Committee on Academic Policy and Planning
1 February 2010

Present:

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-

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 HuV&X

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**

David Harvey joined the meeting to discuss the need to reconstitute the Resource Allocation Subcommittee (RAS).

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

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.

- 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 enr × o p ; â .G

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

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