

University of Dayton

eCommons

---

Common Academic Program Committee  
Minutes

Academic Senate Committees

---

2015

## 2015-03-16 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, "2015-03-16 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes" (2015). *Common Academic Program Committee Minutes*. 120.  
[https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc\\_mins/120](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins/120)

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, March 16, 2015 | 2:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m.; Kennedy Union 310**

**Present:** Riad Alakkad (*ex officio*), Jennifer Creech, Jim Dunne, Austin Hillman, Sawyer Hunley, Fred Jenkins (*ex officio*), Elizabeth Kelsch, Katie Kinnucan-Welsch (*ex officio*), Terence Lau (*ex officio*), Joe Mashburn, Joan Plungis, Juan Santamarina, Elias Toubia, John White

**Excused:** Lee Dixon, Don Pair

**Guests:** Nancy Mohan, Ting Zhang

### **I. Course Reviews**

#### **1) FIN 401: Finance Capstone: Advanced Financial Analysis**

##### **A. Course Proposal Information:**

1. Proposer: Nancy Mohan was present for the committee's discussion.
2. Component: Major Capstone
3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (Advanced), Practical Wisdom (advanced), Vocation (advanced)

##### **B. Discussion:**

1. The committee had positive feedback about the proposal overall. It did a good job of describing how the selected SLOs will be addressed. In particular, the reflection paper assignment for the Vocation SLO will be important in the course.

##### **C. Committee's Actions:**

1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written.
2. Follow up: It was noted that the pre-requisites will likely need to be changed when the course information is entered in Banner. Banner only recognizes course numbers so any text (i.e., minimum grade of C for FIN 301) should be added to the course description.
3. Vote: 10-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

#### **2) FIN 460: Finance Capstone: Portfolio Management & Security Analysis**

##### **A. Course Proposal Information:**

1. Proposer: Ting Zhang was present for the committee's discussion.
2. Component: Major Capstone
3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (Advanced), Practical Wisdom (advanced), Vocation (advanced)

##### **B. Discussion:**

1. The difference between the two FIN capstones was explained. There are two different tracks – one for corporate finance (FIN 401) and the other for investments (FIN 460). Students will enroll based on previous courses they've taken.
2. The same procedural issue about pre-requisites was noted for FIN 460 that was raised for FIN 401.

##### **C. Committee's Actions:**

1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
2. Vote: 10-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

### 3) HST 332: History of Modern East Asia

#### A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Proposer: Chris Agnew could not attend. Department chair Juan Santamarina was present.
2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry, Advanced Historical Studies
3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (expanded), Diversity (expanded), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (expanded)

#### B. Discussion:

1. Background: The committee previously reviewed the proposal on March 2, 2015 and approved it as written. However, it was determined that a procedural re-vote was needed because an *ex officio* member had made the motion to approve. Motions must be made by voting members. It was also noted that the committee went directly to the vote after the motion was made and seconded. There should have been opportunity for further discussion. The re-vote was scheduled for March 9, but the meeting was cancelled and rescheduled to today.
2. Summary of Previous Discussion (from March 2 minutes): "A key aspect of Advanced Studies courses is that they will further students' "understanding of the resources that the Catholic intellectual tradition offers for their own personal, professional and civic lives and also for the just transformation of the social world." The committee noted that the proposal wasn't explicit in addressing the CIT with respect to the Advanced Historical Studies component. The proposer explained his interpretation of the CAP Document is that the Advanced Studies requirement as a whole (History, Philosophy, and Religious Studies) needs to draw upon the CIT. He also explained the Department of History's perspective that the CIT is rooted in the discipline of history itself. Further, he clarified that students in the course discuss the difficulty of translating ideas between Christian and Chinese traditions, but the term CIT is not dealt with explicitly."
3. The committee revisited the CIT issue in relation to this course. It was noted that most Advanced Studies courses – from Religious Studies, Philosophy, and History – make explicit reference to the CIT. Some concern was expressed about going in the direction of not having explicit reference to the CIT in Advanced Studies proposals, and it was suggested (without a motion) to table the proposal until the committee has further discussion to reach some agreement how to handle the CIT for Advanced Studies course. It was noted, however, that the proposer left the March 2 meeting with the impression that HST 332 had been approved.
4. A committee member consulted Bro. Ray Fitz about the issues the committee has been struggling with regarding the CIT. He had been involved in the process of developing the Common Academic Program. He provided a memo in response to the consultation. It was suggested that the committee discuss the memo further and invite others as part of a consultation process.
5. With respect to HST 332, it was noted that it would be difficult to address the CIT in a Southeast Asian history course. The Catholic experience in Southeast Asia is different from the CIT.

#### C. Committee's Actions:

1. Motion: A motion was made to table the proposal, but was not seconded. Discussion continued and the suggestion to schedule a separate conversation about the CIT and invite additional guests was raised again. The committee agreed that such a discussion should be scheduled. It was also agreed that the committee would not revisit previously approved Advanced Studies courses if more explicit parameters are developed as a result of the conversation. It was noted that the CAP Senate Document (DOC-10-04) is more ambiguous about Advanced Studies courses from History than courses from Religious Studies and Philosophy.

2. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
3. Vote: 9-1-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

**II. Follow Up: Catholic Intellectual Tradition:** Planning will begin to schedule the follow-up discussion about the CIT as noted above. If committee members have recommendations for documents that should be included in the discussion, they should send them to Sawyer Hunley. She will coordinate distribution to the entire committee and guests who will be part of the discussion.

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