

University of Dayton

eCommons

---

Common Academic Program Committee  
Minutes

Academic Senate Committees

---

4-2015

## 2015-04-27 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes

University of Dayton. Common Academic Program Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc\\_mins](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Common Academic Program Committee, "2015-04-27 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes" (2015). *Common Academic Program Committee Minutes*. 97.  
[https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc\\_mins/97](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins/97)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Common Academic Program Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact [frice1@udayton.edu](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu), [mschlangen1@udayton.edu](mailto:mschlangen1@udayton.edu).

## CAP COMMITTEE

Monday, April 27, 2015 | 1:00-3:05 p.m.; Kennedy Union 310

**Present:** Riad Alakkad (*ex officio*), Jennifer Creech, Lee Dixon, Jim Dunne, Austin Hillman, Sawyer Hunley, Fred Jenkins (*ex officio*), Katie Kinnucan-Welsch (*ex officio*), Terence Lau (*ex officio*), Joe Mashburn, Don Pair, Juan Santamarina, Elias Toubia

**Excused:** Elizabeth Kelsch, Joan Plungis, John White

**Guests:** Phyllis Bergiel; Una Cadegan; Bro. Ray Fitz, S.M.; Heidi Gauder; Erin Holscher Almazan; Judith Huacuja; John Inglis; Andrew Slade; Daniel Thompson

### I. Catholic Intellectual Tradition

- A. Overview: The CAPC is seeking a better understanding of the Catholic intellectual tradition (CIT) as it relates to the goals of the Common Academic Program and in terms of course reviews, reasonable expectations of proposers for the Advanced Studies component (History, Philosophy, Religious Studies) to reflect the CIT. Several guests were invited for an open discussion with respect to the relation between CAP and the CIT. The following reflects highlights from the discussion.
- B. As an additional resource, Jim Dunne prepared a document that outlines the CAP components as students generally take them in their course of study and which components have reference to the CIT (Humanities Commons, Crossing Boundaries and Advanced Studies). The committee is seeking a better understanding primarily in relation to Advanced Studies courses.
- C. The course review guidelines for Advanced Studies courses state that the following must be addressed with respect to the CIT:
  1. "Further students' understanding of the resources that the Catholic intellectual tradition offers for personal, professional and civic lives and also for the just transformations of the social world."
  2. "Students draw upon the resources of the Catholic intellectual tradition as they consider how to lead wise and ethical lives of leadership and service."
- D. The committee's internal discussions have centered around whether CIT needs to be stated explicitly in course objectives/goals to demonstrate how items I-C-1 and I-C-2 (see above) will be accomplished. Through course reviews the committee has seen several facets through different disciplines and has had rich conversations. There are some views that understanding is enhanced through illuminating what the CIT means in context of a specific course and the CIT should not be fit into a narrow parameter.
- E. Is the intention that students should be able to distinguish what is CIT or not? Or could courses be developed around the CIT framework without students' explicitly identifying the CIT?
- F. THE CIT is complex because it is not an analytically defined concept and is more about a set of traditions defined over time. Reference was made to the document *Common Themes in the Mission and Identity of the University of Dayton*. The document provides a framework for understanding the CIT in a broad sense. The difficulty is that the document hasn't gone through the Academic Senate or another body to receive formal approval to allow it to be an interpretive document for these kinds of conversations about the CIT. It was suggested that the document should be reviewed and submitted for the Academic Senate's approval.
- G. It was also suggested that the committee might want to reconsider the use of the word "resources" in "resources of the Catholic intellectual tradition." The word "resources" is difficult to apply. It may be more helpful to use terminology such as "habits of the mind" (e.g., integrative approach to knowledge, dialogue between faith and reason) and "affirmations" or "themes" of the CIT (e.g., dignity of the human person).

- H. The CIT issue could be addressed through assessment and asking for specific ways in which students will be asked to demonstrate CIT-related items in the course review guidelines (see I-C-1 and I-C-2 above). It was suggested that the parameters should be wide enough for faculty to express themselves. The description of the CIT in the *Common Themes* document tries to incorporate academic freedom in a modern university and, as such, embraces a diversity of viewpoints.
- I. The group recognized the need for faculty development around the CIT and reenergizing the work that had previously been done through the Forum on the Catholic Intellectual Tradition Today. It is a long term initiative for faculty to become more comfortable talking about the CIT. The group also talked about the success of “Hiring for Mission” as a beginning step but, again, resources such as faculty seminars are needed for sustained study and conversation.
- J. The idea of a “consulting committee” was also raised. Such a committee would be able to provide input on proposals where articulation of the CIT isn’t clear.
- K. The issue was put into perspective related to the early stages of implementing CAP. The University community is still adjusting to the new approach focusing on the 7 Student Learning Outcomes. We should also be appreciative of how far the University has come to engage in challenging conversations like these.
- L. A further challenge is that proposers have experienced some inconsistency between the depth of conversation around the CIT between the AAC and the CAPC. The consulting committee idea could be useful for faculty development with a specific goal of influencing course proposals.
- M. It was suggested to post “model” proposals on a website – those that have demonstrated the relation to the CIT effectively. Furthermore, the Deans’ offices could be proactive in sharing model proposals beyond posting them on a website.
- N. It was suggested that further conversations could be held to develop multiple approaches/ strategies to determine whether or not the CIT is sufficiently addressed in course proposals:
  - 1. It is included in the course proposal content: explicitly addressing the CIT or including certain points (for the committee to determine that are in alignment with the CIT).
  - 2. Assessment of student performance is explicated in relation to the CIT.
  - 3. Forming a consulting committee.
- O. Action Items:
  - 1. The Provost’s Office and LTC are planning various faculty development opportunities for the fall. The CIT will be targeted as one of the major initiatives.
  - 2. The CAPC will need to commit some time to discuss various approaches strategies to determine whether or not the CIT is sufficiently addressed in course proposals (see N-1 through N-3 above). Since the committee already has over 30 proposals in its work flow for the fall, it was agreed to form a summer work group to begin working on this. An email will be sent to identify those who are willing to participate.
  - 3. Once the strategies are developed, the committee will commit to publicizing the information through faculty development sessions or other methods.
  - 4. The committee will consider revising the course review guidelines in the future.
  - 5. It was suggested that the committee “tread lightly” around the CIT issue until more resources are in place for faculty proposers.
  - 6. Department chairs were asked to inform the committee if they receive feedback about the CAPC.

## II. Course Review

### A. VAF 104: Foundation Drawing

1. Course Proposal Information:
  - a. Proposer: Erin Holscher Almazan was present for the committee's discussion, as well as Department Chair Judith Huacuja.
  - b. Component: Arts
  - c. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (introduced), Community (introduced)
2. Discussion:
  - a. VAF 104 was previously approved for CAP, for the component and SLOs listed above, on April 15, 2013. The course description and content are being revised to address course curriculum adjustments, as stated in the course proposal under statement of need/rationale.
  - b. The committee decided that it did not need to vote on the revisions since they are minor in scope and not related to CAP sections of the proposal.
  - c. Procedurally, the committee agreed that the AAC or equivalent in other units can make the determination in consultation with Sawyer Hunley whether or not revisions like this would need to come back to the CAPC in the future. It will be helpful in future cases to have something explicit in the statement of need/rationale about the scope of the revisions, as was done for VAF 104.

## III. Procedural Issues

- A. *Implementation of the CAP 2-year Review:* Revisions from earlier drafts of the proposal were reviewed. The option for a student survey was removed because it was determined it would not yield useful data at this stage of CAP implementation. The item regarding program mapping was also removed. The faculty survey instrument has been revised based on feedback from the committee and the APC. Richard Stock, director of the Business Research Group, will oversee the implementation. Based on the APC's feedback, the survey will be launched in the fall rather than over the summer and will be sent to all full-time faculty. Juan Santamarina and Sawyer Hunley gave a CAP progress report, including plans for the 2-year review, to the Academic Senate on April 17. Over the summer, work will proceed to gather data for the report that will be submitted in the fall after the faculty survey is completed. It was suggested to include review of the Catholic intellectual tradition as part of the report, as an example of an issue the committee is trying to understand better as CAP implementation continues.
- B. *Cross-listed Course Procedures:* The committee discussed an example where a course would be cross-listed with a course already approved for CAP and whether the cross-listed addition would need to come through the workflow to the CAPC or if it could go directly from the academic unit to the Registrar's office. It was suggested that the usual work flow could be followed and Sawyer Hunley could handle those cases administratively on behalf of the CAPC. However, the committee determined that the CAP Associate Deans Committee would be the appropriate group to review this issue further.
- C. *Four-year Departmental Review of CAP Courses:* The committee briefly discussed procedures for departmental review of CAP courses 4 years after approval. If courses are revised but revisions are not related to CAP (e.g., VAF 104), the original review date will hold. The CAPC procedures document outlines the process: "In order for a course to continue to satisfy one or more components of the Common Academic Program, the department that submitted the original course proposal must, at least once every four years, review the course and certify that the course continues to meet the CAP-requirements for those components. The initial departmental review

must take place within four years from the time the course is first listed in the catalogue as a CAP course. Subsequent departmental reviews must take place within four years from the last time that the course was certified.” See CAPC Procedures document for further details (pp. 5-6).

The committee discussed the possibility of delaying the start of the four-year reviews. It was decided to look at the number of courses that might be scheduled for the four-year review next year and make a determination about a possible delay based on the CAPC’s volume of work for the 2015-16 academic year.

- D. *Course Review Guidelines:* The committee decided to add items to the faculty survey that will be conducted in the fall asking whether faculty read the course review guidelines when preparing a CAP course proposal and also if they were helpful (why or why not). The committee is looking for concrete data before considering whether to revise the course review guidelines. If the survey responses highlight issues with the guidelines in developing course proposals, focus groups will be conducted to get more details. The committee decided that the course review guidelines will be addressed comprehensively in spring 2016, following the completion of the CAP 2-year review.
- E. *Proxy Vote for Quorum:* As a result of the discussion, the committee decided not to make any changes to allow proxy votes. The Academic Senate explicitly does not allow proxy voting and the CAPC is a standing subcommittee of the Academic Policies Committee. Therefore, it was felt that the CAPC should be consistent with the Academic Senate. Communication with CAPC members at the start of the new academic year will emphasize the need for advance notice if a member has to miss a meeting. Follow up communication will be sent if there is a possibility of not having a quorum.

**IV. Closing:** Appreciation was expressed for the committee’s work this year and all that was accomplished.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.  
Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen