Common Academic Program Committee Minutes   Academic Senate Committees

11-2014

2014-11-17 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes

University of Dayton, Common Academic Program Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins

Date: November 17, 2014
Location: KU 310

Present: Juan Santamarina (Chair)   Joan Plungis
           Sawyer Hunley   Elias Toubia
           Lee Dixon   Jennifer Creech
           John White   Don Pair
           Joe Mashburn   Kathryn Kinnucan-Welsch (ex-officio)
           Fred Jenkins (ex-officio)   Riad Alakkad (ex-officio)
           Jim Dunne   Terence Lau (ex-officio)

Guests: Donald Chase, CEE

A. <u>Review of CEE 450: Civil Engineering Design</u>
1. Proposal details:
   a. Dr. Donald Chase, chair of the Civil Engineering department, presented this revised course for the following CAP component: Major Capstone.
   b. The course is designed to achieve the following UD SLOs: Scholarship and Vocation.
2. Discussion/comments:
   a. Dr. Chase was asked to expand on the aspects of vocation related to interaction with professionals.
      - Students complete a broad-based project that touches numerous elements of their chosen vocation. Each project involves groups of students who work with professional mentors to guide their activities.
   b. Follow-up question about how students "integrate the knowledge acquired in the undergraduate career, both within the major and in the Common Academic Program.…"
      - Students interact with numerous professionals in regard to, for example, transportation, water, and the environment, among others.
      - Students also study design in these other fields before taking the Capstone course.
      - Additional discussion satisfied the Committee's concern about integrating knowledge.
   c. Comment offered that the proposal connects course content to Vocation very well in terms of outcomes.
   d. The course syllabus was reviewed and found to adequately address the course goals as articulated in the proposal.
3. Vote:
   a. Motion and second motion made to approve CEE 450 as proposed.
   b. 10-0-0 (for, against, abstained)

B. <u>Faculty Feedback on CAP Proposals and Processes</u>
1. Last Thursday approximately 30-40 faculty met with the Provost and several members of the CAPC to share experiences of the CAP course proposal process and discuss future CAPC activity.
2. Concerns voiced by faculty include:
   a. The workload involved with developing and presenting a CAP course proposal
   b. The intimidation factor felt by faculty who present proposals to the CAPC
   c. The form itself is intimidating
   d. Redundancy in the proposal form
   e. Confusion over expectations surrounding Catholic Intellectual Tradition content
   f. Not enough courses have been approved for the Crossing Boundaries-Faith Traditions component. After the daylight period has expired, will students have difficulty satisfying this requirement?

3. Discussion/comments by the Committee:
   a. Sawyer attended this meeting and shared that no details were voiced about exactly how the CAP process was intimidating to proposers.
   b. The form used to propose a course remained unchanged from 1969 until 2012, when the present form was adopted.
      o The new form requires details about assessment measurements and outcomes, both of which can be complex components to address.
      o Suggestion were made to revisit the help buttons and links to resources that can be embedded in the form.
   c. Committee members acknowledged that reworking a course that one has taught for many years so that it satisfies the CAP requirements can also be difficult.
   d. CAP review has been compared to peer review for scholarship, but the stakes and rewards for each are quite dissimilar.
      o The CAP process should be more collegial, exuding more support for developmental activity.
   e. There is evidence supporting the view that the primary pressure point may be found not at the CAPC review level, but at the department and/or unit levels.
      o Before the substantial backlog of courses comes before the CAPC for review, perhaps a review of the current process is needed.

   Elements of the CAPC process that the Committee can review:
      o Proposal form
      o Resources designed to help faculty understand the process and the expectations that surround specific components of CAP requirements
      o Faculty can be told that the proposal should be written for people who aren't necessarily familiar with the course's discipline
      o Possibly create brief videos explaining each CAP component and each SLO
      o Address the topic of Catholic Intellectual Tradition (CIT) as related to CAP components and SLOs
   Catholic Intellectual Tradition discussion:
      o Should the Committee articulate expectations to the faculty in terms of explicit text that is required in a course proposal with content related to CIT?
      o Some CAPC members feel that CIT is understood to be pervasive in all course content at UD, and so should not require explicit mention; others feel that if CIT is listed in the course review guidelines, it should also be mentioned in the proposal. Complicating this decision is the fact that CIT is continuing to evolve; it may mean different things to different people, or may be related in different ways to different disciplines.
      o Consensus of the CAPC was reached:
         1. There is no need to define Catholic Intellectual Tradition as it relates to a course submitted for CAPC review.
         2. If the course is proposed for CAP components and/or SLOs that include a requirement related to CIT, then CIT must be referenced in the proposal.

         3. Conversations about this requirement, and other elements of a well-written course proposal, are best held at the department level, before the proposal is submitted for review.
         4. The Committee will strive to make clear that its intent is not to judge a course as good or bad, but rather to ascertain its compliance with the CAP requirements.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Jeanne Zeek