**COMMITTEE ON Academic Policy and Planning**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting Date:** December 2, 2015

**Location:** Hawaii Hall

**Attendance:** [P = Present; A = Absent; E = Excused]

| **MEMBERS** | | **MEMBERS** | | **MEMBERS** | | **GUESTS** | **TIME** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| BHATTACHARYA, Torsha | P | JOHNSON, Shannon | P | BUTLER, Marguerite  SEC liaison | P |  |  |
| COFFMAN, Makena | P | MCKIMMY, Paul | E | JUN, Soojin | P |  |  |
| DANIEL, Marcus | E | IRVINE (SORENSEN), Christine | E |  |  |  |  |
| ERICSON, David | E | STEPHENSON, Carolyn | P |  |  |  |  |
| GOSNELL, William | P | WARD, Cynthia | P |  |  |  |  |

| **SUBJECT** | **DISCUSSION / INFORMATION** | **ACTION / STRATEGY / RESPONSIBLE PERSON** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CALL TO ORDER**  **3:00 p.m.** | Chair Carolyn Stephenson opened meeting. |  |
| **MINUTES** | Review and Approval 10-28-15 Minutes. Unanimous 7-0 approval of minutes as amended.  Review of 11-4-15 “Informal” Minutes - do not need approval |  |
| SEC Liaison Update | Liaison Marguerite reported that there was a discussion regarding presentation to BOR on Resolution on Small Programs |  |
| **Issue 18.13**  **Quantitative Reasoning** | Issue of appropriate level. Foundations, Grad Req, etc. Agreed this issue makes most sense as foundations. This issue should not be raised.  Concern over QR Hallmarks not being college-level. Suggestion to change QR Hallmarks:  Instead of 4b, “Be able to articulate what the equations are trying to convey.” Suggestion to make this explicit in the hallmarks.  Concern around 30:1 ratio. Where did it come from? Need to follow up regarding question of resources. Generally smaller student teacher ratio makes sense, but only if resources are given to make it successful.  Conversation that the hallmarks are too vague. Do not give sufficient guidance as to what classes may meet the hallmarks.  Suggestion to replace first four bullet points with actual WASC definition of QR.  Hallmarks do not reflect “include the ability to recognize the limits of mathematical or statistical methods.” Hallmarks need to explicitly address this to bring up the level of critical thinking. 4d is too narrow, should be more general.  Concern over the 10% threshold for practical examples within courses will lead to a washing down of QR. More courses will “slip through” that use quantitative skills, but are not intended to teach QR. Or on other side, very quantitative courses like calculus may not fit. But could be tailored. But is this overreaching? Seems like the consultation has been done with the mathematics department. Want to see preliminary list of potential courses.  Conversation around QR is for foundations.  Concern raised by STEM: are STEM students going to be forced to go back and do an introductions level course. How can this be an issue if it’s a foundations requirement? | Soojin: Ask about resources regarding 30:1 ratio.  Cynthia: Find out how 30 came up as a good figure. Do they cite peer and benchmark institutions?  Shannon: Look into list of potential courses.  Carolyn: Will draft language into hallmarks that deals with limits of mathematical or statistical methods. As well as first bullet points with WASC requirements. Tying introduction better to each of the hallmarks.  William/Shannon: Look into STEM majors requirements and how it relates to foundations. Determine whether there is any conflict and, if so, write mitigating language. |
| Possible new issue | SEC liaison reported regarding classroom planning issue. If CAPP does not pick this up, SEC will. |  |
| Next meeting scheduled | Scheduled additional meeting for December 9 from 3 to 4:30 in Hawaii Hall 208 to complete business, esp. on QR. |  |
| Next semester’s meeting dates | All present agreed that second Wednesdays from 2 p.m. to 3:30 in HI Hall would be best. Need to survey all again, including those absent. | Carolyn will tentatively reserve HI Hall for second Tuesdays 2-3:30.  Marguerite will send doodle asking about dates Jan. 13, Feb. 10, March 9, April 13, and asking whether 2-3:30 or 3-4:30. |
| **ADJOURNMENT** | Adjourn at 4:35pm |  |

Respectfully submitted by Name.

Approved on Date with X votes in favor of approval and X against.