

University of Dayton

eCommons

---

Common Academic Program Committee  
Minutes

Academic Senate Committees

---

2015

## 2015-09-01 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, "2015-09-01 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes" (2015). *Common Academic Program Committee Minutes*. 112.  
[https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc\\_mins/112](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins/112)

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

Tuesday, September 1, 2015 | 2:00 p.m.-4:00 p.m.; Kennedy Union 222

**Present:** Shauna Adams, Riad Alakkad (*ex officio*), Jennifer Creech, Lee Dixon, Jim Dunne, Heidi Gauder, Linda Hartley (*ex officio*), Sawyer Hunley, Terence Lau (*ex officio*), Danielle Poe, Brandon Rush, Juan Santamarina, Elias Toubia, Shuang-Ye Wu

**Excused:** Fred Jenkins (*ex officio*)

**Guests:** Donna Beran, Matthew Evans, Michelle Hayford

- I. **Introductions:** New committee members were introduced. Faculty members serving on the committee are appointed for three-year terms. The replacement cycle was postponed until this year so that the committee would have consistency during the initial years of implementing the Common Academic Program.
- II. **Committee Chair Election:** Juan Santamarina has served as chair for the past four years, since the CAP Committee was formed, and oversaw the work of developing the committee's procedures and the development of the course proposal form for the Course Inventory Management (CIM) system. He expressed a preference not to be nominated again if someone else is interested in serving as chair. The chair must be one of the seven faculty members on the committee. Lee Dixon was nominated to serve as chair. The committee voted to elect him as the 2015-16 chair by a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- III. **Review of Minutes:** The minutes of the April 27, 2015 meeting were accepted as revised to correct some item number references.
- IV. **Procedural Issues: Cross-Listed Courses**
  - A. Discussion
    1. The last time the committee discussed cross-listed courses, it was agreed that if cross-listed courses are not approved simultaneously, the Assistant Provost for CAP can approved the second course ("child" course) on the committee's behalf as long as there are no significant changes since the first course ("parent" course) was CAP approved. This would be similar to the procedure for courses approved pending minor revisions.
    2. The content is the same for cross-listed courses in CIM. Both appear under the course number for the parent course.
    3. Historically, cross-listed courses between divisions (e.g., College of Arts and Sciences and School of Education and Health Sciences) will have completed the workflow in both units before the CAPC's review.
    4. The committee noted the complexity of cross-listing courses for the Crossing-Boundaries-Inquiry component because they would fulfill requirements differently based on a student's major. DegreeWorks is based on a student's current major. Changes would be made retroactively if a student changes to a different major.
- V. **Agenda Items for the 2015-16 Academic Year (in addition to ongoing course reviews)**
  - A. Two-Year CAP Evaluation: The Academic Senate document that established the Common Academic Program, [DOC-10-04](#), states that a "thorough and systematic evaluation of the Program will be conducted two years after it has been implemented and every five years thereafter." The committee consulted with the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate last year to identify the scope of the evaluation that will take place this year. It was agreed that the evaluation

will include the elements listed below. A draft outline of the report will be submitted for the committee's review and updates will be discussed as work on the report continues over the course of the semester.

1. Development and deployment of CAP courses and experiences
  2. Assessment of the student learning outcomes
  3. Survey to address the general perspectives of faculty and administrators regarding CAP implementation issues
  4. Conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations for the continuing implementation and delivery of the Common Academic Program
- B. Catholic Intellectual Tradition (CIT): Many conversations have taken place over the past several years regarding the relationship between the CIT and the Common Academic Program. A subcommittee met once over the summer to develop suggestions for addressing the CIT through CAP. It was recommended that the committee discuss what the subcommittee prepared and determine how to proceed.
- C. Periodic Review of CAP Courses: DOC-10-04 calls for periodic review of CAP courses, which must occur at least every four years. The first courses approved for CAP in the 2012-13 academic year, including Humanities Commons courses, will need to be reviewed next year. The committee will need to develop a more detailed review process this year than what is currently outlined in the CAPC Procedures document.

## **VI. Course Reviews**

### **1) THR 425: Theatre Theory and History**

- A. Course Proposal Information:
1. Proposer and Program Director: Michelle Hayford was present for the committee's discussion.
  2. Component: Advanced Historical Studies
  3. Student Learning Outcome: Scholarship (expanded)
- B. Discussion:
1. Michelle Hayford provided a revised proposal (paper copies) to address feedback from a committee member that she received prior to the meeting. Course content and criteria for evaluation were expanded with respect to addressing the Catholic intellectual tradition. No changes have been made in CIM yet. The committee agreed with the proposed changes.
  2. An additional revision will be made to reference how the course will build upon the introductory History course in CAP.
- C. Committee's Actions:
1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal pending the minor revisions noted above. There was no further discussion.
  2. Vote: 11-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). The proposal will be rolled back in CIM. Once it has been revised, Assistant Provost Sawyer Hunley will review and approve it on behalf of the committee. Follow up: The revised proposal was approved 09/08/2015.

### **2) THR 105: Theatre Appreciation**

- A. Course Proposal Information:
1. Proposer and Program Director: Michelle Hayford was present for the committee's discussion, as well as co-proposer Donna Beran.
  2. Component: Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry
  3. Student Learning Outcomes: Diversity (introduced), Practical Wisdom (introduced)
- B. Discussion:
1. An issue was introduced that applies to THR 105, THR 304, THR/EGR 308, and THR 310. There was a misunderstanding about being able to combine courses under the Arts component with

other components. The Theatre Program would like to add the Arts component for these four courses, which are all currently proposed for Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry or Crossing Boundaries-Integrative. They also plan to add Arts for other proposals that will be coming forward to the CAPC. The proposals will need to be reviewed by the College's Academic Affairs Committee again to add the Arts component. It was determined that it would be better to withdraw the remaining four proposals on today's agenda, and the committee will review them again after the second component has been added, rather than reviewing them now for just one component.

2. However, it was agreed that the committee would provide informal feedback at this time. The following recommendations were made:
  - a. Clarify how the course differentiates requirements and evaluation criteria for majors versus non-majors. Majors will not be able to fulfill the Inquiry component with this course since it must be taken outside their division.
  - b. Remove reference to fees. Instead, the information could be added to notes in the composite.
  - c. Use language along the lines of "for example" or "subject to change" for the list of texts and readings.
  - d. Clarify course objectives in terms of how they will be evaluated. In further discussion, it was noted that the information is provided under criteria for evaluation and that how course objectives are phrased is not under the committee's purview.

C. Committee's Actions:

1. No actions were taken because the proposal was withdrawn, as noted above.

**3) THR/EGR 308: Engineering for the Performing Arts (cross-listed)**

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Proposer and Program Director: Michelle Hayford was present for the committee's discussion, as well as co-proposer Matthew Evans.
2. Component: Crossing Boundaries-Integrative
3. Student Learning Outcomes: Practical Wisdom (introduced), Vocation (introduced)

B. Discussion:

1. As noted previously, the proposal will be withdrawn to add Arts as a second component.
2. The committee did not have any informal feedback with respect to the current proposal.

C. Committee's Actions:

1. No actions were taken because the proposal was withdrawn, as noted above.

**4) THR 310: Acting for Everyone**

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Proposer and Program Director: Michelle Hayford was present for the committee's discussion, as well as co-proposer Donna Beran.
2. Component: Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry
3. Student Learning Outcomes: Community (introduced), Vocation (introduced)

B. Discussion:

1. As noted previously, the proposal will be withdrawn to add Arts as a second component.
2. The committee provided informal feedback. The following recommendations were made, similar to those for THR 105:
  - a. Clarify how the course differentiates requirements and evaluation criteria for majors versus non-majors. Majors will not be able to fulfill the Inquiry component with this course since it must be taken outside their division.
  - b. Remove reference to fees. Instead, the information could be added to notes in the composite.

- c. Use language along the lines of “for example” or “subject to change” for the list of texts and readings.
- C. Committee’s Actions:
  - 1. No actions were taken because the proposal was withdrawn, as noted above.

**5) THR 304: Movement for Everyone**

- A. Course Proposal Information:
  - 1. Proposer and Program Director: Michelle Hayford was present for the committee’s discussion.
  - 2. Component: Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry
  - 3. Student Learning Outcome: Vocation (expanded)
- B. Discussion:
  - 1. As noted previously, the proposal will be withdrawn to add Arts as a second component.
  - 2. The committee provided informal feedback. The following recommendations were made, similar to those for THR 105 and THR 310:
    - a. Clarify how the course differentiates requirements and evaluation criteria for majors versus non-majors. Majors will not be able to fulfill the Inquiry component with this course since it must be taken outside their division.
    - b. Remove reference to fees. Instead, the information could be added to notes in the composite.
    - c. Use language along the lines of “for example” or “subject to change” for the list of texts and readings.
- C. Committee’s Actions:
  - 1. No actions were taken because the proposal was withdrawn, as noted above.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.  
Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen