The University Libraries
Reported by Jack O’Gorman

The University Libraries faculty met several times to discuss the Common Academic Program draft report. We endorse this report in principle as a good direction for general education at the University of Dayton. The CAP report reflects what a Catholic and Marianist education aspires to be, as it is described in Habits of Inquiry and Reflection, Characteristics of a Marianist Universities, and other documents.

1. What in your domain (e.g., unit, department, or committee) is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or in part with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

Support for scholarship and curriculum through the collection (printed and virtual resources). Support for faith formation and the Marianist identity and tradition through the Marian Library, the U.S. Catholic Special Collection, and the University Archives. Additional resources that support student and faculty work include the Libraries’ many services and spaces.

2. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?

The focus on the learning outcomes articulated in Habits of Inquiry and Reflection is appropriate for a common curriculum and should remain. The integrative nature of the curriculum is an improvement on the current model.

3. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?

The vagueness of the Communication requirement is troublesome. Given that excellent communication skills are required in any position, and that the methods and technologies used to communicate are changing, it seems like there needs to be more thought done in this area to ascertain exactly what our students all need when they graduate. We question whether foreign language courses figure into Communication or some other aspect(s) of an integrative/interdisciplinary curriculum development? The service learning component is also vague.¹

4. What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?

The issue of diversity does not appear to be completely fleshed out. What are the mechanisms for

¹ For example, note the different directions available at BC in Communications, English, History, Philosophy, and Theology/Religious studies and how they fit together and in the direction of a student’s major and vocation: http://fmwww.bc.edu/core/largelist.php
Also note their language requirement. While not identical with ours, the BC goals for general education are carefully thought out and clear in regard to specific areas of study: http://fmwww.bc.edu/core/Task.doc.html
integrating diversity elements into the current curriculum? What is the process for approving a course that will fulfill the diversity requirement?

5. **What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?**

The content of the core curriculum could impact collection development policies in the library. The integrative-interdisciplinary approach to a topic challenges current models of collection building. The teaching faculty will need to consider the library faculty partners as curriculum is developed in order to ensure the collection is ready to handle the needs of students and faculty. The Libraries current model of course-integrated instruction may need to adjust depending on the course assignments that may be required.

6. **What resources and or changes would be needed to make that development possible?**

Unknown at this time.

7. **In particular, what if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?**

Unknown at this time.

8. **What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?**

The Libraries need a faculty member on the CAP implementation committee. Library faculty have served in this capacity in the past (competencies implementation), and on the CAP subcommittee of the Academic Policies Committee. There is also a library faculty member currently on the General Education committee.
The seven student outcomes, and the corresponding common academic experiences designed to support the outcomes, are consistent with the outcomes articulated in the mission of the Department of Teacher Education: “Grounded in the Marianist tradition, the mission of the Department of Teacher Education is to educate scholar practitioners who build community, engage in critical reflection, and embrace diversity for the promotion of social justice.”

The Department of Teacher Education faculty discussed the Common Academic Program proposal at our faculty meeting on November 19, 2008 and the following comments represent feedback from the four licensure program groups.

Diversity
The field experiences required of our students incorporate substantive interaction with p – 12 students and families who have cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds that are different from our students. These experiences begin in the first year, and continue throughout the program. We are collecting data as a department on the percentage of students each year who are placed in settings representing diverse populations, and will be reporting the data to our accreditation agency. Furthermore, some faculty members in our department have established a research agenda on this topic.

Our curriculum also emphasizes the importance for our graduates to be able to teach all students. One of the required courses in four of the five licensure programs, EDT 340, introduces students to a wide range of p-12 student characteristics that must be taken into account in the learning environment. We have had discussions, however, of the need to broaden the topics that are currently empathized in the curriculum. For example, we need to address more fully the needs of English Language Learners in our programs.

An alternative view that was proposed in the feedback is that the curriculum and field experiences in the licensure programs is dominated by accreditation (NCATE), academic content, and specialized program association perspectives. These perspectives focus on knowledge and skills, with little focus on dispositions and substantive change among our graduates. This potential tension is one that requires continued attention in our curriculum and candidate assessment.

Service Learning:
Service learning is prominent in the Department of Teacher Education. Students are introduced to the concept of service learning in the first year, and continue to participate in service activities throughout their four years. The student professional organizations all organize service-learning activities, and many of our students integrate service activities with professional knowledge and skills.

We recognize, however, that the service learning opportunities have been largely directed and monitored by the students, and the CAP proposal suggests a more planned and cohesive service learning experience. One suggested sequence for Teacher Education students is as follows:

- First year: Students are introduced to service learning, and make a potential list of service options based on specific objectives and provide a rationale for the choices.
- Second and third years: Service plan is completed
2. What areas of the CAP proposal could be considered strengths and worth pursuing?

Faculty commented that course work in the Department of Teacher Education complements the Marianist tradition of UD. Faculty members model curriculum integration and collaboration. A specific example of this occurs in the senior year. Faculty who teach the specific methods courses in the senior year meet regularly to ensure that common assignments, such as the lesson plan/unit, are designed to meet the common outcomes and are integrated across the courses. Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences and the Department of Teacher Education have frequent conversations about curriculum and pedagogy. Enhanced opportunities in this area would be worth pursuing.

More opportunities for our students to learn about different cultures and ways of life would also be worth pursuing, including learning a foreign language.

3. What areas of the CAP proposal could be considered weaknesses and should either be significantly rethought or even discarded?

No responses to this question.

4. What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?

A required religion class should clarify, Catholic dogma on issues related to Big Bang Theory and Evolution.

The need to communicate with people from different language groups.

5. What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

One group responded that one important area of discussion would address how to manage conflicts with Catholic social teaching and issues of cultural diversity.

6. What resources and or changes would be needed to make that development possible?

The common academic program is ambitious, and our faculty suggested that what curricular revisions are adopted must be supported by the capacity to offer & maintain it.

Extended foreign language instruction was also mentioned, and related to foreign language instruction would be expertise related to English Language Learners.

7. In particular, what if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?
The extension of present initiatives is worthwhile.

8. What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?

How will transfer students be incorporated into the CAP program? What aspects/courses can students bring with them?

Courses aligned with Ohio Academic Content Standards/SPA standards for pre-service teachers need to continue to be offered.

Need to have enough sections for all students.

Foreign language 2 hours

**Summary:**
Current curricula and field experiences in the Department of Teacher Education support the Diversity (Item #9), Service Learning (Item#10) and Disciplinary Capstone (Item#12) aspects of the CAP.

Elements of the CAP that were not addressed in the feedback generated at the November 19 Department meeting, and which warrant further discussion, include the CAP Inquiry Elective (Item#8) and the CAP Integrative Course (Item #11).

---

**College of Arts and Sciences**

**Biology Department**

Common Academic Program (CAP) Feedback, 10 December 2008

We recognize that the CAP Draft Proposal reflects much thought and hard work. While we applaud that the CAP was designed to address the seven student learning outcomes from *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection (HIR)* without weakening programs for majors, it falls short of its goal. We recommend not pursuing the CAP in its present form at this time for the following reasons.

The Biology Undergraduate Curriculum Committee generated this response with approval of the entire Biology faculty.
1. CAP places too many constraints on the major – too many courses are required and at specific times. With all the CAP-Core and 11 other requirements, there is little room for students to take all of their major’s courses and/or pursue a minor or to double major. This weakens the major. The point is that CAP is not credit hour neutral, as the CAP Committee believes it to be. For our majors it adds 3 credit hours plus it adds constraints.

2. The lack of science in the CAP-Core and other areas is appalling. Pages 15-16 of the CAP proposal claim that it desires a “multi-disciplinary approach” and “emphasis is on the unique and valuable perspectives that each area brings toward shared understanding of the dimensions of human endeavors and the world in which we live.” However, CAP-Core development (p. 19) is to occur with select departments, e.g., “English, History, Philosophy, Religions Studies and departments that make up the Arts and Social Sciences.” The CAP Integrative course (pp. 28-29) is another example – it states that “these problems must have a linkage to the Humanities, Arts and/or Social Sciences” Natural Sciences are excluded from the conversation. In his presidential address to the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), Nobel Prize winner and former president of the AAAS, Dr. David Baltimore gave a global perspective on Science and Technology {Science 322 (2008) 544-551, see attachment}. He related science to economic growth and development, institution building, education, and world challenges. For deep student understanding of major issues on a global scale, science must be included in the conversation.

3. Given the importance of science and technology in major world issues such as developing alternate fuel sources, allocation of resources, global warming etc., a minimum of only six credit hours (two courses) of Natural Science (p. 13) is unacceptable. We realize that currently some academic programs require only six credit hours of Natural Sciences; however, Natural Science should be part of the discussion in the CAP courses, in addition to the 6 credit hours of the Natural Science requirement. UD students require more Natural Science education so that they can be informative, competitive leaders in our global society. Is there a single global issue that doesn’t have ramifications of health and the environment affecting the quality of the human experience (see attached Science article)?

4. It is unclear how the six credit hour Natural Sciences requirement relates to the current Integrated Natural Science Sequence (INSS) on p. 24. Are students expected to enroll in two of the three INSS courses, or would other non-INSS courses suffice? The INSS expects students to take three 3-credit hour INSS courses plus two 1 credit hour INSS labs. If students take only two of the courses, they will not have the big picture. Like other universities, UD has a research emphasis on science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). Unlike other universities, however, the proposed activities in the CAP draft do not reflect this.

5. Implementation of the CAP program is a serious issue. For example, students are expected to attend 5-7 CAP addresses per semester throughout their program. With all of the other activities required by their major including other presentations/talks they need to attend, students will not be able to do this. Who will be keeping track of which students attend? If students don’t attend will they be prevented from graduating? For example, Biology majors must have a total of twelve 3-contact hour laboratory courses to graduate. It will be impossible for them to fit all of these addresses into their schedule if the courses were outside
of class time. Although not stated in the CAP draft, we heard that these addresses may be given during the CAP course class time. Wouldn’t this weaken the course if 5-7 time slots of the course were to be taken up by someone other than the instructor? In addition, it is unclear how the addresses will be discussed by the students. Presumably the addresses would be discussed in the next class period. Wouldn’t it further weaken the course to have an additional 5-7 class periods absorbed with discussing the addresses? For a class that meets only twice a week (e.g., Monday-Wednesday or Tuesday-Thursday), this represents almost half of the course! It is hard to see how there will be continuity in such a course arena. Clarification is needed as to how the addresses will be delivered without weakening the CAP course or enforcing additional constraints on students’ schedules.

6. There is a lack of freedom for students to take courses when they are forced to be locked into taking CAP electives (i.e., only CAP-approved courses). This is analogous to thematic clusters which are currently restrictive. Students need flexibility to take focused courses outside the discipline/major. Apparently, they will not have the opportunity/ flexibility for creative pursuits. Therefore, it appears that the structure of the CAP will defeat its own idealistic goals.

7. The 3-credit hour capstone course in the senior year will be taught by someone who most likely was not present or involved in the first two years of CAP courses. How will the senior CAP majors’ course relate to the first two years of the CAP program courses that are outside the major? Do we need to be careful here? This could add further constraints as there could be an added requirement that the departments add elements to the major’s capstone so that it integrates with the CAP courses in the first two years and leave us with less flexibility on how we wish to construct our capstone.

8. Requiring each major to have a 3-credit hour capstone course in the senior year intrudes on the functioning/operation of each major. This may require additional personnel and resources in addition to re-evaluation of each major by individual departments.

9. The CAP draft proposal needs to define service learning. In the Natural Sciences, student service learning is demonstrated by research conducted in the research laboratory (e.g., of a faculty member) or in field work (e.g., preparing and collecting data in a forest to be analyzed in the laboratory). Both of these research areas enhance the quality of the environment and quality of health, and help raise the standards of human living conditions and values. Recently, this type of service learning has not been recognized by Learn, Lead and Serve undergraduate awards which require a service component. We anticipate that laboratory research/field research will be an acceptable form of service if the CAP proposal is accepted. Even if laboratory/field research is acceptable, there are other serious issues with the service learning requirement that need to be addressed (Please see #10 and #11).

10. Service learning within the major is an issue for some departments that have many majors. It is another feasibility issue (see #11). A service learning project outside or inside the student’s major and of the student’s choice would alleviate some of the problem. How is the accountability of this project to be determined? If each department is to oversee whether students have performed this task, it would require additional, significant resources. Another
point is that service should be voluntary, not a requirement. Requiring service defeats its purpose.

11. On p. 30, the CAP draft requests that students have an undergraduate research experience and demonstrate scholarship unique to the major in the form of a three-credit hour Disciplinary Capstone course. The ideology of the CAP draft has tried to validate one of the highly acceptable facts among the academy, namely, that undergraduate research should be one of the important facets of education for UD students. The Boyer Commission states that research-based learning must become the standard for undergraduate education. “The experience of most undergraduates at many research universities is that of receiving what is served out to them. In one course after another they listen, transcribe, absorb, and repeat, essentially as undergraduates have done for centuries. The ideal embodied in this [Boyer Commission] report would turn the prevailing undergraduate culture of receivers into a culture of inquirers, a culture in which faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates share an adventure of discovery.” (Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University [1998] Reинventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America’s research universities. http://naples.cc.sunysb.edu/pres/boyer.nsf/ See also: Duderstadt, J.J. [2000] A university for the 21st century. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press; Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities [2000] Renewing the covenant: Learning, discovery, and engagement in a new age and different world. NASULGC, Washington, DC; Wheatley, M.J. [2002] Turning to one another: Simple conversations to restore hope to the future. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco).

This concept is already in practice at premier research institutions and universities for some of their undergraduates. In the sciences, institutional funding supplemented with funds from the National Science Foundation (NSF) and National Institute of Health (NIH) etc. supports active undergraduate research participation at these premier universities. Every discipline has its own research problems and methods. In many of the Natural Sciences, a real research problem cannot be solved with only library research or a virtual setup. Research in the Natural Sciences requires additional expenditures in terms of reagents, equipment and infrastructure, in addition to time. Time includes researching the background literature, setting up the experiment, conducting the experiment in triplicate, analyzing the results, performing additional experiments, generating conclusions, presenting the research, and publishing the research. This process can take several years for each research project.

There are several pitfalls with the ideology of the CAP draft. (1) Funding: The CAP draft does not identify a process whereby institutional funds are marked for undergraduate research experiences. (2) Personnel: A Natural Science department such as Biology has 15 faculty that serve 500 students (Biology and PreMed/PreDen majors) during their four years at UD. On average, a Biology faculty member would need to take care of at least 33 students at any time which is impossible in terms of quality research mentoring. Many additional faculty would need to be hired with appropriate research space, equipment and supplies to support the research expectations of the CAP draft. (3) Space & Infrastructure: Currently, it is an uphill battle for science departments to provide the required and elective laboratory courses to all students. There is not enough physical space, equipment, reagents and supplies to house all the UD students in our discipline, as the CAP proposal indicates.

One viable option would be to create an undergraduate research initiative at UD. The
initiative would allow some stipends for students and for their research expenses. This will help to develop research experience programs beyond the classroom, in which students may advance their research skills by assisting on faculty-initiated research. A summer undergraduate research program would allow many of the undergraduates to initiate their research projects during a time when they can dedicate 100% of their effort to research. This type of program typically involves a student staying on campus for 10 weeks, and intensely working in a faculty member’s research laboratory. Many universities nationwide have had summer undergraduate research programs in place for decades. Students interested in the program submit an application which is reviewed by a panel of faculty researchers. An example of expenses for students in the program would include: a student stipend of $3,000 per student ($7.50/hr for 40hr/week for 10 weeks), reagents and supplies of $1,200-$3,000, and faculty summer salary. Student housing and meal costs would be paid directly by the students. At the culmination of the program, students present their research in a public forum.

12. The CAP draft proposal does not address how students with AP credits or other credits fit into the CAP program. If students have credit for ENG 101, what will they take their first year, ENG 201? If so, they will not have been exposed to the ENG 101 CAP course – how will that impact their study? Will they be taking the Integrative course in their second year? While we understand that the Committee did not want to address this because they felt it was an “exception,” this is a serious matter for some majors, which have many students enter with significant AP credits. In addition, some majors have many transfer students – how will they fit in the CAP courses?

13. Who pays for the overseas trips and interdisciplinary conferences alluded to in the document (p. 29)? Many students don’t have the funding, and departments with large numbers of majors cannot afford to pay.

14. The CAP draft proposal does not link to the Stander Symposium activities (e.g., student presentations, etc.)? Are these to be dissolved?

15. Parts of the CAP draft proposal contradict others. For example, the Integrative Course is to be taken in the third year on p. 14, but p. 29 states that it is to be taken in the third or fourth year. Which is it? Moreover, this is another area where Sciences should be included, but are left out. Page 29 state, “Faculty in any department can offer courses fulfilling this requirement, but appropriate courses must have strong linkage to the Humanities, Arts, and/or Social Sciences.” Why are the Natural Sciences not considered here given the global importance of science and technology in today’s global world (see Science article)?

16. Team teaching and guest lecturing is suggested on p. 29. How will that be accounted for in faculty workload, and for faculty tenure and promotion documentation?

17. On p. 30 the Disciplinary Capstone course requires undergraduate research experiences and a public forum to showcase student scholarship. In the sciences, undergraduate research is done in the laboratory. We do not have enough faculty, research laboratories, and resources (e.g., for supplies, chemicals, equipment etc.) to accommodate our large numbers of majors. It also takes a 2-3 year commitment by the students to complete a meaningful project. The
research experience is not feasible for every student. This is a restatement of much of what is in #11 but I see the point of relating it to the capstone – maybe combine or move them to follow one another?

18. Who does the CAP Director report to in the Provost’s Office (the Provost directly, or an Associate Provost, if an Associate who and why?) (p. 31)?

19. The CAP Leadership Team needs to include academic deans or their representatives. It also needs someone who deals with publishing the Bulletin to be a member of the team.

20. On p. 33, faculty participation needs to be recognized and awarded at the tenure and promotion levels.

21. On p. 33, it implies that the CAP Director dictates redesign of classroom space and scheduling times for courses – these could interfere with majors’ course activities. Also the CAP Director does not know about specific space requirements for all majors (e.g., designing a science laboratory, an arts studio, or a music classroom), and thus should not be involved.

22. The CAP agenda is too aggressive. Fall 2011 is too soon for all of the proposed changes when this CAP draft proposal has not even been approved.

23. It is unclear whether the proposed changes in the CAP draft proposal will lead to a stronger, improved academic degree program for each major. In the proposal’s current state, we are not convinced.

24. The CAP could negatively impact recruitment and retention. For example, students in some majors are having difficulties with the current Living Learning Communities initiative. These communities should also be voluntary. It appears that the CAP will be worse. Another example is the lack of a language requirement in the CAP. Other universities with Phi Beta Kappa on campus, all have a language requirement, but there is not room in the CAP plan for this. Students seeking top universities may go elsewhere.

25. The CAP is profoundly deficient regarding STEM, and makes it appear as though STEM is unimportant to UD. Currently it is a challenge for science students to complete their majors with a minor or double major, and this would be impossible if CAP were to be implemented. UD has a national reputation for success of graduates going on to advanced degrees. Does UD want to retreat from such prestigious recognition? The CAP has the lofty goal of academic/interdisciplinary synthesis, but apparently reduces exposure of student choice and/or exposure to focused courses. We already have a societal problem of scientific literacy; the CAP would compound the problems for UD graduates. Further synthesis without substance (student choice of focused curricula and/or courses) would reduce literacy for the humanities. Is the CAP so diverse that students will have difficulty finding a focus? It appears as though the CAP will graduate students who are unprepared for the real world, instead of students who are trained for vocation and/or professional programs.

26. There is a serious disconnect of Catholic and Marianist traditions and the learning outcomes of the proposed CAP. As the CAP draft stands, it makes UD appear as a secular university. These universities also have practical wisdom. The student learning outcomes need to
connect to Catholic and Marianist tradition, especially with regards to faith and reason. Instead of “learning outcomes,” it should be stated as “learning outcomes of the Catholic and Marianist tradition” throughout the document. The seven learning outcomes need to connect back to the philosophy and principles of the Characteristics of Marianist Universities document. For REL 2XX, there needs to be dialogue between the religious issues, rather than a comparative description of each faith tradition.

27. The CAP needs to address how it will facilitate learning outside the classroom. How will it integrate learning and living in the community?

28. Accountability for all of the different CAP requirements for students will be a serious challenge for departments/Deans to keep track of, especially since some requirements may be met without a specific course component. One way to alleviate the issue is to have students answer how they have addressed each requirement, e.g., in a portfolio document. If the students don’t have a chance to have input, they may not understand the CAP and have no idea that all of these courses are supposed to be connect to the HIR learning outcomes.

29. While we understand that the Committee was reluctant to address other issues besides HIR, leadership training and development is blatantly absent from the document. Our students would benefit from leadership training which they will use throughout their lives. What additional skills (not present in the proposal) do our graduates need to cope with the global issues they will be facing throughout their lives?

30. The CAP allows courses/topics to be taught by non-experts in the field. For example, on p. 20 “ecological challenges of our times” would be addressed by the Social Science Course rather than a Natural Science Department such as Biology. Another example is the Communication requirement. In the CAP, it may be fulfilled according to the major’s department, without any formal training from the Communication Department faculty who are experts in this field. A third example is the Diversity requirement in which the student’s advisor (p. 27) together with the student decide on a diversity experience. The advisor most likely has not had appropriate faculty development and expertise in this area. A fourth area is the Ethics course on p. 25-26. This course can be taught by any faculty member, rather than someone who has been formally trained in the ethics field and in Catholic Social Teaching. This weakens the formal training our students receive, since non-experts usually have less knowledge in an area as compared to the experts. Further, good advising is crucial to a student’s success and ability to navigate their academic careers while at UD. This program would only heighten the need for better advising – which has big implications on faculty workload and a need for faculty development/support.

31. The Diversity requirement needs significant clarification and specific details. What is being asked of students and departments here? While this does not have to be a formal course, how could it be met, specifically? Who is the expert on diversity who will oversee the diversity requirement for each student in each major/academic program?

32. The proposed activities in the CAP require extensive and continuous faculty development. For example, the course in “Practical Ethical Action Informed by Catholic Social Teaching” can be taught by any faculty member according to the CAP draft. Each faculty member
teaching the course would require significant ethics training and thorough knowledge of Catholic Social Teaching in order for the requirement to be met.

33. The CAP requires a considerable budget to address all of the costs associated with it, e.g., more faculty lines (for faculty in specialty areas, and to replace part-time faculty who would have taught the CAP-level courses, but now do not have this expertise), more staff hires, additional facilities (i.e., in the sciences), additional equipment, additional office space, building renovations, more space to facilitate student learning outside the classroom and across disciplines etc. to name just a few. Given the tough economic times we are in now, and that they are not going to disappear soon, this is not a good time to develop the CAP draft. A complaint of the General Education program is that it was not adequately funded. Let’s not make the same mistake with the CAP.

In conclusion, the CAP draft document is too lock-step in its approach, there would be less freedom for many majors with a loss of flexibility to double major or minor. The CAP is fraught with so many serious problems and budgetary issues that we recommend the CAP program not be pursued any further. There are better ways to address the seven student learning outcomes to support HIR than the CAP.

Chemistry Department
Summarized by Mark B. Masthay, Chair of the Chemistry Department.

The Chemistry tenured and tenure-track faculty met to discuss the CAP document on Thursday, November 20, and Tuesday, December 4, 2008. The results of this discussion are detailed below.

1. Any acceptable CAP curriculum must allow for students to graduate in 4 years with a solid major in their chosen discipline, particularly in light of high tuition and the anticipated weakness of the financial markets.

2. The proposed CAP is prescriptive to the point that it precludes the accomplishment of our majors as currently designed. Though this problem may extend through all four years of the undergraduate curriculum, it is particularly glaring in the freshman year, as the requirement for two paired CAP CORE courses each semester raises the number of credit hours required for Biochemistry B.S. majors to a minimum of 18 hours during the fall. In short, the proposed CAP will make it difficult if not impossible for students to satisfy their B.S. major requirements if they are pursuing degrees in “tiered” disciplines such as the sciences – in which prerequisites are rigorously enforced in the freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior years.

3. How inviolable is the pairing of the CAP CORE courses? Will it be flexible for transfer students and students entering with AP credit? For example, how will the paired course requirement be enforced if a student has advanced placement for ENG101?

4. Can ENG201 be designed around majors? For example, could there be a Chemistry section of ENG201 generated via consultation between the Chemistry and English Departments?
5. How much consultation between the Chemistry Department and the Communication Department is envisioned in the current version of the CAP? We ask because the Chemistry faculty do not feel a need for outside help in designing the communication-related portion of its curriculum (CHM495, 496, 497, 498, and 499), as we have successfully trained students to develop oral and poster presentations and senior theses for many years.

6. Can foreign language count as a diversity requirement in the CAP?

7. The Brief Description of the CAP Integrative Course states (pp. 28f of the CAP):

“The CAP Integrative Course is thematically and/or problem-based, engaging students in a social/cultural problem from multiple perspectives. These problems must have a linkage to the Humanities, Arts, and/or Social Sciences, (italics mine) and must connect also to knowledge/practice outside of these disciplines. Interdisciplinary linkages with other units are desirable, although not necessary.”

Is there a reason that the CAP Integrative Course does not require a linkage to the Natural Sciences?

**Department of Communication**

**Summary**

Our department put a considerable amount of effort into offering feedback on the CAP proposal, as indicated by this lengthy response. The most crucial issue from our perspective was ensuring that UD students graduate with essential knowledge and skill in oral communication. We feel it would be irresponsible to remove an oral communication requirement or to expect that other departments could cover it sufficiently on their own. We also feel that a reduction in oral communication works against the ideals articulated in HIR. Our feedback includes a proposal for how to best achieve the communication-related learning objectives in a new Common Academic Program, through a new foundational course in communication that would be tailored to the goals outline in HIR.

1. **What in your domain is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or in part with the provisions of the CAP proposal?**

We approach this question in two ways. First, we discuss what we do in our department in relation to the 7 learning outcomes. Second, we focus on what we do that relates to the CAP cores.

1. **Relation to Seven Learning Outcomes**

The CAP design incorporates the seven student learning outcomes of the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection. Those seven student learning outcomes are also tightly woven into the curriculum of the Department of Communication in various ways. Most Communication courses address multiple student learning outcomes from that group of seven. Some of those outcomes are
addressed in a fundamental manner across the range of material in particular courses.

As one would hope would be the case for most academic units, the learning outcome of **Scholarship** is foundational to a majority of the courses offered within the Communication Department. Although there is a tendency on the part of some people outside the field to think of communication as a skill, it is instead an area of scholarly investigation with a strong theoretical and research basis. In particular, all of the classes in our Communication Management area are focused primarily on a scholarly understanding of the process of communication. The same is true of our media classes and our global and intercultural communication classes. None of these classes are skill-based—they are all based on scholarship. Areas of the field such as Public Relations, which (as evidenced by the growing number of PhDs in that area of study) were originally skill-based, have now become scholarly areas of inquiry. Students in Journalism and Electronic Media are perhaps most likely to be seen in programs that are solely skill-based, but before students can even consider taking professional courses in those areas, they must have satisfactorily completed such media research-based classes like *Foundations of Mass Communication* and *Fundamentals of Electronic Media*, both of which are solidly rooted in the scholarship of mass communication.

Additionally, the learning outcome of **Diversity** is thoroughly realized through the design of the courses *Global Communication* and *Intercultural Communication*. Each of those classes fosters student development of “an intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical understanding of the cultures, histories, times, and places of multiple others.” The course *Women and Communication* is fundamentally concerned with diversity issues, as are all gender studies classes. In that *The Rhetoric of Social Movements* focuses on a variety of diverse social movements, it, too, addresses the learning outcome of diversity. *Communication and Conflict* addresses not only diversity, but how to fruitfully handle the conflict that diversity sometimes produces. The basis of effective communication is adaptation to diverse audiences, so the majority of our classes fundamentally address this concern. In particular, attention should be drawn to four specific courses: *Public Speaking*, *Persuasion*, *Interpersonal Communication*, and *Small Group Communication*. Moreover, that same goal is also effectively achieved through the *Communication Abroad Program*, which gives students an immersion experience into another culture and its communication practices. Indeed, this program, now more than twenty years old, was one of the College’s first discipline-specific study abroad programs outside the Language Department, and has taken hundreds of students to London, Rome, and Shanghai.

The CAP proposal also recognizes the value of the learning outcome of **Community**. Community does not spring full-blown out of nowhere: human beings as communicators create it. Our classes focusing on such topics as *Interpersonal Communication*, *Small Group Communication*, *Organizational Communication*, *The Rhetoric of Social Movements*, *Communication and Conflict*, and *Intercultural Communication*, amongst others, fundamentally address how community is created through communication. **Service Learning** is also an important part of many of our courses, with notable examples being evident in our *Public Relations Writing* and *Public Relations Campaigns* courses as well as our *Internship* experiences. Almost all communication students participate in at least one internship, and all of our internships are service-learning opportunities. Additional examples may be seen in the media production and journalistic experiences in which our students engage, which provide intense
opportunities to serve the community through, for example, documentary work, writing and designing promotional materials for non-profit agencies, and similar activities.

Many courses within the Department of Communication provide students with an opportunity for service learning, community building as well as more traditional scholarship, integrating three of the learning objectives. For example in one course the instructor has students devise message strategies to persuade three individuals to make a ten dollar donation to the Second Harvest Food Bank (now Feeding America). In this paper they plan their message strategies based on the theories of social influence discussed in class, enact them with friends, family members and strangers, and discuss the effectiveness (and ineffectiveness) of their strategies. Students must learn about hunger and the food bank as part of the process – if for no other reason than to have donation specific information available to them in their persuasive efforts.

The learning outcome **Practical Wisdom** speaks directly to many of the strengths of the curriculum in the Department of Communication. Indeed, the elements of our basic course begin this process of students’ ability to “define and diagnose symptoms, relationships, and problems clearly and intelligently [and] construct and evaluate possible solutions...” Public Speaking, as taught in that class, places a premium on analysis and problem solving, and of the effective oral presentation of the results of that inquiry. The Group Decision Making part of the class equips students with effective strategies for working in a collaborative, task-oriented setting. The ability to evaluate in a realistic way the results of these course elements is a central outcome of each module. The skills students acquire in this class are of immediate and practical value to them regardless of major or anticipated profession.

This is far from the only academic experience which offers Practical Wisdom that is broadly applicable not only to our own majors but to the university community. While our **Media Writing** class teaches writing in the context of print and broadcast news dissemination, the core of the class is the clear, concise, accurate, and understandable presentation of factual information to a large audience. Although this class is required only of our own majors, it is recognized among students throughout the university as offering a critical and very practical experience. Indeed, more than 30 percent of the students who take this class (39 of 127 students in Fall 2008) are not Communication majors, and represent every school and CAS division at the university. Many other classes in our department offer profound opportunities to develop the sort of Practical Wisdom and analytical tools called for by the CAP document: **Propaganda Analysis, Persuasion, Rhetoric of Social Movements, Communication in the Information Age, Law and the News Media, Public Discourse and Criticism, Intercultural Communication, Political Campaign Communication**, and more all focus on the critical and evaluative elements of life in modern society. These are exactly the kinds of evaluative experiences that seem to be central to the CAP document and to HIR. They are important components of the education of our own majors and have much to offer students from throughout the university.

Similarly, **Critical Evaluation of Our Times** is a central learning outcome in certain communication courses, including **Political Campaign Communication, The Rhetoric of Social Movements, Family Communication, Women and Communication, and Global Communication**. Each of those courses helps “equip them [students] to evaluate critically and imaginatively the
ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, and ecological challenges of their
time.” The Development of Mass Media course examines the roles the media have played over
time in the development of societal values and in promoting social change. The “critical
evaluation of our times” concept is also a central element in Family Communication. For
instance, the instructor explains, “During our discussion of the ‘unpredictable stress and crisis’
topic, we discuss the impact of vertical stressors (i.e., unique family patterns transmitted across
generations), horizontal stressors (i.e., anxiety produced by stress within the family over time),
and systems level stressors (i.e., larger systems - including social, cultural, political, and
economic - within which the family operates) on family relationships and communication
patterns. That said, we have had interesting conversation surrounding the potential influences of
the current domestic and global economic crisis on family functioning.” Our Women and
Communication course, focusing on how communication constructs gender, also encourages
students to critically analyze the gendered nature of our culture. It is also worth noting that the
course Foundations of Mass Communication, which is taken by every one of our majors (and by
many other students at the university), focuses deeply on this learning outcome. The syllabus for
that course identifies several outcomes that students in the course can expect:

- reflect on the historical growth and pervasive nature of mass media in American society;
- appreciate the various theoretical perspectives that facilitate prediction and explanation of
  how audiences use media and how media messages influence individuals and the larger
  culture;
- identify and discuss the issues and controversies surrounding the mass media, thereby
  enabling you to become a more critical consumer of media content; and
- distinguish between the creative, technological, and social developments that occur in our
  multiple media environments.

The learning outcome Vocation involves much more than career-specific training. Much of the
upper-level curriculum of the Department of Communication is intended to contribute to our
students’ ability to compete successfully for entry into Communication-related fields. However,
since its inception in 1964, the Department of Communication has recognized that while a skill
base is important to a 22-year-old seeking his or her first post-college job, vocational skills are
only a part of an academic program, regardless of major. Indeed, it is his or her knowledge base,
not skill base, that is likely to create the foundation not only of any student’s long-term career,
but of his or her life. This is a department which has always demonstrated its commitment to the
education of the whole person, not just the aspiring Communication professional. None of the
areas of concentration in the Department of Communication is solely, or even principally, skill-
based. Students are limited in the number of hours they can take from their own concentration
area, and are even required to take a block of courses from another department or school as part
of their major programs. Only in this way, the department believes, can our students properly
integrate their understanding of human communication with their own place in the world.
Communication takes place only within community. The skills we teach in public speaking,
interpersonal and group communication, writing, editing, electronic media production, public
relations campaign development, and more are useful only insofar as they are used to enhance
the lives of the communicator and those who are part of his or her community. Classes like
Statistical Methods in Communication, Health Communication, Family Communication,
Interpersonal Communication, Organizational Communication, and others have little direct
applicability to specific jobs, but they enrich the vocational experience of our own majors and
students from other programs by providing them with both the scholarly and practical basis for meaningful and effective human interaction in a variety of contexts. A Vocation is not just a career, still less a specific job. It is an orientation toward life. The ability to exchange ideas on a sophisticated and subtle level is one of our most truly human attributes, and one our department takes most seriously.

II. Relation to CAP Cores

Another way to approach this question is to examine facets of the CAP Core to see how the Department of Communication fits into those requirements. Cap Core no. 6 is a communication requirement. The department currently offers a series of one-credit courses in a module format that satisfies the existing General Education communication requirement. The CAP Core calls for the “progressive development in the ability to communicate effectively.” The Department of Communication, whose faculty have a broad range of expertise in communication processes and practices, should continue to be the provider of coursework that addresses that need. No other faculty at the university have the expertise necessary to address this need. In terms of the stipulation that each unit must achieve the “progressive development of communication skills for their students,” the Department of Communication obviously meets that goal--and goes far beyond it--for our own majors as part of our emphasis on furthering students’ understanding of the art of communication.

Cap Core no. 9 is a diversity requirement. The Department of Communication already has in place, as indicated earlier, a number of courses that would by their essential nature help satisfy this requirement, particularly CMS 414: Global Communication and CMS 316: Intercultural Communication, as would participation in our Communication Abroad Program.

The introduction to the CAP proposal refers to the subcommittee “giving special attention to diversity, internationalization, and service learning with the recognition of the importance of integrating all three into every part of the CAP as well as the major.” While internationalization is not highlighted as prominently in the rest of the document as that statement might lead one to expect, the Department of Communication has been for many years a champion of the goal of internationalization and a leader at the college and university level. The department’s emphasis on internationalization has been reflected in course development, specifically CMS 414: Global Communication and CMS 316: Intercultural Communication, and in the development and expansion of our Communication Abroad Program, whose rotating sites now include Britain, Italy and China.

2. What elements of the CAP Proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursing?

Good ideals
It is consistent with the philosophy behind the program and encourages students to develop in a variety of different ways while studying at the university. Critical to this proposal is the recognition that scholarship is only one area of emphasis in the collegiate experience. In addition to becoming scholars of all sorts, our students are encouraged to
become representatives of their faith, builders of community, and social critics. Students are also expected to become working professionals, providers of service, and welcoming of diversity. These goals are more than laudable—they are at the very core of the University of Dayton experience.

**Some nice components**
The emphasis within the CAP Proposal is on a wide-based liberal arts education. In the spirit of a liberal arts education, the CAP Proposal allows students to fulfill the requirements in a variety of different ways. Efforts at integrating themes throughout courses undoubtedly will benefit the students in a variety of ways—not the least of which is the honing of their critical thinking skills. Similarly, the service learning component provides students with an opportunity to impact their community in a positive way as well as employ their knowledge and skills in a real world opportunity for application.

**Awareness of need for review and faculty support**
The integration of a faculty reward structure into the process is critical for faculty buy in and incorporating the CAP into the assessment process is also critical to the success of the new general education requirement program. Similarly, the quinquennial review of the program will strengthen the program proposal. Such a review allows for a righting of the ship in the event the program or some component of the program runs astray. Perhaps more importantly, this review motivates the overseers of the program to identify weaknesses and strengthen those weaknesses as part of the ongoing process. Repairing shortcomings is important but often times it is the unintended consequence of events that need the most attention and are least likely to receive it. The willingness and ability to adapt the program to the exigencies of the times and the changes within a department or area within a department will promote a positive educational experience for our students.

**3. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?**

**Fundamental concern: Is it needed, and will this plan do more harm than good?**
While the CAP proposal is impressive, departmental and faculty response must be, in large part, dictated by an essential question: Does CAP represent a necessary revisioning of general education or is it merely a different approach? This is a paramount consideration because the CAP proposal presumes some essential failing of the current gen ed program—at least, that is part of the subtext from which the CAP proposal seems to have emerged.

The rationale offered for CAP relies heavily on the idea that it springs from the HIR. While HIR is a laudable step, the adoption of those goals does not establish the necessity of reformulating general education. That is to say, it would also be possible to modify the current gen ed structure in ways that help it better achieve the goals set for in HIR. It requires a significant leap to go from HIR to the total reconfiguration of general education represented by CAP. If there are profound shortcomings with the current gen ed model, we think it would be helpful for the CAP proposal to spell out what those shortcomings are and how the CAP proposal remedies them, so faculty can more easily see how CAP represents an improvement that cannot be made to our current gen ed program.
The current general-education model has many adherents among faculty and students. Most agree that it lays the groundwork for a diversified liberal-arts education. Is it perfect? Obviously not (no educational model is) but should it be replaced, bearing in mind the expense and the tremendous ripple effects such radical change would cause academically? Would a revamp—big or small, depending on perceived need—of the current general-education plan not suffice? If not, then the CAP proposal should explain why. CAP represents a grand, ambitious overhaul of not just general education but the entire educational experience provided by the university. Is that justified? The CAP proposal fails to make such a case, which diminishes enthusiasm within our department, and will hurt faculty buy-in as well.

Shortcomings of “non-disciplinary” approach
Inherent within much of which is evident in the current CAP proposal is a lack of recognition of the value of expertise within a scholarly area of study. We certainly agree with the value of interdisciplinary study. Indeed, the field of communication embraces interdisciplinarity much more than do most academic areas. However, it is important to not sacrifice expertise in the interest of interdisciplinarity. A philosopher is able to discuss literature from a philosophical perspective, but will not bring to the classroom the same kind of expertise as will a literary scholar. Much of CAP is based on a discarding of the value of expertise within a particular area. This is evident throughout the document, but we would like to draw to the attention of the committee and others evaluating the proposal to the manner in which this is done in regard to CAP curricular vehicle #8—the Communication component. Although “The CAP recognizes the special importance of communication skill development in all students,” the document nowhere makes evident the fact that there is a knowledge and theory base on which effective communication must be built. The suggestion that those without that foundation of expertise are able to facilitate the development of effective communication within students is as ludicrous as suggesting that, because one has been collecting rocks all of one’s life, one can teach geology.

Falsely treating communication only as a skill
Also inherent within the conceptualization of the Communication component of the CAP is a characterization of communication as a skill. This simplistic conceptualization ignores the reality that one becomes an effective communicator by understanding how the process of communication works, not by learning certain behaviors. We will return to this issue later in our response to the CAP document, when we suggest an alternative approach to the Communication component of the proposal.

Impact on majors, rather than only on the common academic program
One element of the CAP that should be rethought or discarded is the extent to which it inevitably leads to a fundamental restructuring of majors. This, in a sense, is analogous to a federal vs. states’ rights issue. The overarching CAP design will force majors to undergo extensive redesign to conform to CAP dictates, for example through the creation of a disciplinary capstone course. It should be left to individual units to determine the best array of requirements to achieve the learning outcomes that it articulates for its students, rather than serving to extend CAP goals and outcomes. The previous General Education model did not intrude so dramatically into the design of majors.
Similarly, by dictating that majors MUST integrate requirements for diversity, service learning, etc., the CAP is laying out the template for each major. In this respect, the CAP committee seems to have gone beyond its mandate.

Just as we have done with general education requirements, too much of CAP focuses on all the accoutrements of education rather than on education itself. What matters is what happens in the classroom. What leads to that is good teaching, not more requirements that are even more difficult to enact than are our current requirements.

Need for more clarity within document
A fundamental drawback of the CAP proposal is its lack of specificity in delineating what the curriculum will look like. The document paints with a broad brush, which is reasonable and perhaps necessary, but one cannot properly evaluate a plan for general education without the details being spelled out. To endorse the approach is a leap of faith because only time will determine how the CAP is ultimately actualized.

4. What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?

Necessity of an oral communication course
We feel it is essential to include oral communication in the Common Academic Program. Our proposal for integrating such a course into the CAP is attached separately, so it is easy for the committee to see independent of the other feedback our department provides.

Why is oral communication such a critical element for all students?
Simply put, without strong oral communication skills, nothing else matters. People who lack the ability to work with others cannot take advantage of any other knowledge or skills they have. They will have difficulties finding a job if they cannot communicate effectively in a job interview, have troubled personal and family relationships if they cannot communicate well in intimate settings, and will be unsuccessful at work—no matter how good they are at their job tasks—if they cannot work effectively with coworkers and clients. And, they will represent UD poorly in the workplace and in the community.

Written and oral communication: Our department is fully supportive of retaining a required course in written communication as part of the curriculum. Effective writing is important. Our department teaches written communication for journalism and public relations students.

But, consider that most decisions are made within organizations with oral communication—in meetings, in conversations, and on the phone. Likewise, personal and family relationships exist primarily through oral communication. While written communication is important, oral communication is used more and to greater effect in the workplace and personal relationships.

Evidence of the importance of oral communication skills
1. Employers are continuously telling UD's career services that they need graduates with good communication skills.

When employers interview students at UD, they routinely tell our Career Services Center about
the importance of effective communication. Furthermore, they hire students with strong communication skills, and pass by those who are not strong enough in this area. Consider just a small sample of recent comments to the Career Center:

- Some of your students looking for co-ops positions need more interview training.
- Needs to relate experiences to questions better. Very hard to understand how some answers related to the questions asked. Mainly needs to practice to polish up interviewing skills.
- Needs to slow down the answers to questions. Feel free to elaborate more and practice interviewing.

On the other hand:

- Very poised, showed enthusiasm for her area of interest and showed application to our industry
- Very professional and knew a lot about the company and could relate previous experience to [company name]. Did very well with selling the value of her previous work experience.
- Very confident and interviewed very well. Asked very good questions and was very enthusiastic!! Professional appearance and communicated/smiled a lot.

2. Credible research--from other disciplines--points to communication as essential for success

Studies across all disciplines repeatedly show the critical role of oral communication for success in their fields. Miscommunication is a leading cause in medical malpractice suits. Lawyers cannot argue successfully in court without communication skills. Businesses cannot succeed without strong skills in persuasion, small group decision making, and interpersonal communication. Engineers cannot succeed without the ability to work in teams. The list goes on. Just as a sample, we highlight just a few recent and representative studies--almost none of which are from communication studies—indicating the necessity of oral communication skills:

Summary of just a few recent studies showing the importance of communication:
The constantly changing economic situations and work force suggest that the transition from higher education into the world of employment is not easy. It would be necessary for higher education to enrich students with not only their subject areas but also the generic and diverse skills that can be transferred to a wide range of employment. These employability skills included communication and presentation skills, both performance and content aspects (Fallows & Steven, 2000).

In a survey done with 372 employers in various sectors such as information communication technology, business services, legal & finances, public services, science & engineering, consumer services, and manufacturing; employers responded that verbal communication is the most important skill yet their level of satisfaction with graduates is low (Hesketh, 2000).

Similarly, in the National Employers Skills Survey (Learning, 2008) involving over 79,000 interviews with employers of different sizes across different sectors in England, oral communication skills ranked the second among 13 main skills lacking by occupation where skill-shortage vacancies existed.

According to the survey conducted with 280 business department chairs at four-year
institutions in the US, ‘making oral presentations’ was rated the highest among oral communication skills in business communication courses. This indicates a need for clarity in presenting information among business majors (Wardrope, 2002).

In a recent article by MBA-Business-Schools.com, a leading online business school directory, communication skills are found to be critical to a successful business career (Lawson, 2007). A survey by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business asked MBA respondents to rate the most important business skills and one-on-one communication skills was listed as the most crucial to success in today's business environment (Communication, 2007).

According to the survey conducted with over 300 accounting graduates of two Victorian universities regarding a deficiency in the emphasis on skills (i.e., they thought should have been given in their undergraduate courses), interpersonal skills and oral expressions found to be the top two that showed the biggest skill deficiency (De Lange, Jackling, & Gut, 2005). This clearly indicates the importance of the development of adequate and sufficient generic skills in academics.

Medical schools offer communication and interpersonal skills education within their curriculum, as communication is the essential aspect of medicine – communication with patients, families, colleagues and even with other health professionals (Makoul, 2003). These skills have been tested and the evidence clearly indicates that they have a positive impact on the field (Fallowfield, Jenkins, Farewell, & Solis-Trapala, 2003).

Washer (2007) has proposed key skills – integration of the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, the Dearing Report and European conceptions of key skills – that should be integrated into higher education across disciplines. Among many, communication skills such as ‘engage effectively in discussion in a professional manner,’ ‘evaluation and present outcomes using an oral presentation,’ and ‘communication information, ideas, problems and solutions to specialist and non-specialist audience’ were included.

The National Communication Association has identified several communication skills that are vital for undergraduate students to acquire at both basic and advanced levels; this list was developed by communication scholars, federal government agencies, and research centers. Among those, speaking competency was one of the key skills. More specifically, the review identified the following skills: the abilities to recognize when it is appropriate to speak; to speak clearly and expressively; to present ideas in an organizational pattern that allows others to understand them; to listen attentively; to select and use the most appropriate and effective medium for communication; to structure a message appropriately; to identify others’ level of receptivity to their message; and to give information and to support it with illustrations and examples (Dunbar, Brooks, & Kubicka-Miller, 2006). Development in communicative effectiveness needs not only be integrated across the curriculum, but to ensure the proper and adequate implementation, “communication departments can and should be at the forefront and should be teaching those in other fields about out standards for basic skills in general education curricula” (Dunbar, Brooks, & Kubicka-Miller, 2006, p.126).
References


See proposal re: revision of our basic course (attached as separate file)

5. What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

Areas our department would need to develop to fit with CAP

- We would need to develop disciplinary capstone courses
- We would need to develop a method to facilitate providing service learning opportunities to several hundred students annually.
- We would have to hire a full-time service learning coordinator, if that element of the proposal passed in its current format (recall that we have 600+ majors at any time).
We would need to work with other departments to develop curriculum for foundational courses, such as the interdisciplinary social science foundation course.

We would need to engage in further review of our upper division courses to explore how they fulfill the 7 HIR learning outcomes.

6. What resources and or changes would be needed to make that development possible?

Resources needed
- The resources that would be needed would vary according to the model that is ultimately adopted.
- To adapt to the philosophy expressed in HIR, we propose revising our basic course(s). Depending upon the nature of the communication requirements in the new CAP program (for the students’ sake, we hope that a redesigned introductory communication course will be required), we would require summer support for one or more faculty members to do extensive curriculum design work. We might also need to hire one or more faculty with special expertise to serve as a Basic Course Director for that course.

7. In particular, what if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

What we would lose
With as many revisions are likely to be made in the CAP proposal, it’s difficult for us to have a clear sense of what we would need to stop doing. The only thing we can say with certainty at this point is that if the current proposal passed, we would have to scale back much of our major, moving away from content-area courses to shift resources toward service learning and to create an array of capstone courses (one for each of our focal areas). Note that we already do more service learning than do most other departments, so such a change would be even more relevant to many other departments than it is to us. We, however, have more majors than any other department.

8. What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?

Disciplinary Capstone
While the department welcomes the CAP Disciplinary Capstone requirement, delivery and staffing of this course will require additional resources. The Communication major curricular structure and the large number of students served by the department have long been impediments to a capstone course. The department has attempted to address the need for such a learning experience by offering internship credit and, in some concentrations, practicum courses or upper level courses (4xx). Requiring all majors (approximately 100 graduating seniors each academic year) to participate in a capstone course would necessitate five distinct courses or highly directed learning experiences, as students majoring in communication declare one of five communication concentrations (public relations, communication management, journalism, theater and electronic media). Current staffing (full time and part time) levels in the department and in each of the concentrations are insufficient to deliver either a capstone course or some type of directed
learning experience that would meet the CAP learning outcomes. However, with adequate staffing in each concentration, the department would welcome the opportunity to develop and deliver a series of capstone learning experiences that demonstrate the range of communication scholarship and advance the CAP learning outcomes. Will the university provide funding for hiring additional faculty for any departments that need support for designing and implementing a capstone requirement?

Service Learning

Several questions must be addressed in regard to the incorporation of a service learning requirement.

1. About how many students would be going into the community each year for service learning and experiential learning projects to meet the new mandate? Merely counting total enrollment and dividing by four years (four years to graduate) will not reflect actual numbers. An unknown percentage of students will be “repeaters” --in two or more classes that are structured to meet the requirement. These repeaters will likely be taking such classes to meet their requirements for general education, a minor, or a double major. Or they might simply be taking a class out of curiosity. And, students who drop out or fail classes will have to enroll in additional service learning courses.

2. About how many organizations in the Miami Valley qualify for service learning projects under the rubric devised by CAP? Are there enough organizations to provide service learning opportunities for all the students who will require them? Will only 501(c)3 organizations qualify? Will government departments and agencies be allowed? Which organizations are to be excluded? Once a mandate is in effect, faculty needs to know which programs are permitted and which are not. In our department’s public relations courses, we work with only non-profits and government departments and agencies, as well as campus organizations. We do not work with any for-profit group because we don’t believe that it is ethical to have students work for free for a profit making company. (A company should pay but there is no workable way to pay students-- and the department--for the time and effort.) Nor do we work for Planned Parenthood, even though it qualifies, because it supports abortion rights and the Catholic Church prohibits abortion. Although the Dayton office does not perform abortions, we are concerned that our work with the local office might be seen as tacit endorsement of the organization, contrary to the Catholic mission of the university. Will, or should, the university set conditions on this and other situations?

3. Has there been a study to determine whether these organizations are willing, ready and able to handle the influx of students—who have a separate agenda--on a regular and continual basis? While no one would argue that service organizations need volunteers, an influx of thousands of volunteers continually can be counterproductive, and lead to a total lack of productivity. Too often--and despite all efforts to prevent such situations--students in service learning and experiential projects spend time doing nothing because organization leaders do not have the time or inclination to train, direct, plan or designate. Problems for both the organization and volunteers also can arise when those volunteers have a separate agenda—academic learning--in addition to the organization’s mission. If the organization’s mission and the volunteer’s separate agenda (learning objective) cannot mesh in
the time-frame allowed (a specific semester), then the volunteer student (or professor) must seek out another organization. That can lead to even more student volunteers seeking a limited number of organizations for experiences. Not all organizations will be ready and willing every semester to take on student volunteers, which will increase competition among departments and professors for available partnerships. Will such competition lead to better proposals academically? Or proposals that better suit the organization? Our experience with over 300 service learning projects leads us to offer a note of caution regarding the pressure by organizations to change the academic components of projects.

4. What would be the impact of an additional 2,000 students each year, for example, seeking experiences with nonprofit agencies? It’s possible that the new mandate would decrease service participation by other campus groups. Students now do a lot of service through clubs, Greek organizations, Campus Ministry and pre-professional courses. If they then must participate further in other department classes, it’s likely--simply for time sake--they will drop one of the other activities. The influx of students will increase competition for organizations. In recent years—since the university began advocating experiential learning in all departments—the pre-professional programs, such as ours, find it more difficult to get partners for our regular projects. Four years ago, organizations we had worked with before declined our offer to work with them because they “already had UD students.” To them, despite our previous relationship, “UD students” are “UD students”—and they can take on only so many. This issue will become relevant to all departments; it is not a concern facing only departments such as ours that have traditionally provided service learning opportunities for students. Our department does specific kinds of projects, which an organization will need only periodically. We cannot return to the same organization each semester, but must rotate among many organizations. That’s what we have done for nearly two decades. If other students from other departments flood the “marketplace,” all students’ opportunities for professional practice will be limited. Those students with particular expertise will be confused with those students without that expertise.

5. What kind of work would the other departments do and how would they impact existing programs? Pre-professional programs have long established service learning and experiential programs that make sense within the community. But what would English or philosophy majors do? Forced into the community to participate in such programs, some resort to work that is the purview of the pre-professional programs. Using an example that pertains to our department, those students are not trained in areas of public relations, journalism, communication. The consequences would likely include: (1) work that lacks professional standards, (2) a declining reputation of UD and our department, and (3) a lack of future opportunities to work with the organization.

6. How would students without transportation participation in service learning project? Would exceptions be made for non-traditional students? One of the proposals in the service-learning mandate is that the work be done in the community. In our department’s service learning and experiential projects, we always include at least one campus project to accommodate students who don’t drive or work too many hours to have time to leave campus. We often allow non-traditional students to engage in service learning experiences in organizations of which they are already members, either on campus, at church, or at work, recognizing the difficulty for such students to find time this “extra” work.
Resource concerns

1. What are the funding estimations and funding resources to implement course changes, course collaboration and coordination, and even team teaching? Many aspects of the proposal call for a complete revision of courses and course presentation. Time and effort will be needed to implement those changes. Will there be money available through grants, summer grants, course reduction, or other options to prepare for all of these changes?

Proposal for Revised Foundational Course in Oral Communication

Rationale

- Oral communication is an essential element of a college education – Communication is what “activates” all the other aspects of a college education. People who have great ideas but cannot clearly explain those ideas, persuade others of their good ideas, or work effectively with others, waste the potential of those great ideas. People who cannot listen effectively and evaluate what they hear are likewise at a significant disadvantage in life, in the workplace, and in fulfilling their civic responsibilities.

- Oral communication is crucial because the majority of our communication is oral--Listening and speaking are the two most common modes of communication (used more than reading and writing), and much information we receive is communicated orally through the electronic media.

- The current proposal describes the importance of “writing effective academic arguments” (p. 21). We support this goal, but add that students need to be able to articulate good effective arguments orally even more than in writing. We note that, in life and in the workplace, it is often the oral arguments that have the greatest impact (e.g., in meetings at work, when talking with a family member, etc.).

- A necessary foundation for all students -- The CAP is designed to include those courses that comprise the minimum expected knowledge and skill for all college students. We suggest that basic knowledge and skills in oral communication are essential for all students’ education, and should be retained as part of those minimum expectations.

History of the oral communication requirement at UD

- Gen ed in the early 1980s -- Com 101 (a hybrid course that included public speaking, group decision-making, and interpersonal communication) was part of the basic skills UD wanted all students to have. It was required for all students.

- Moving to a focus on competencies -- Com 101 was broken into modules focusing on specific competencies. The rationale for doing this was that students would take different competencies at the appropriate point in the college career (public speaking would be taken near the beginning of the academic program; group communication near the middle, when students are working on group projects; and interviewing would be taken near the time of graduation). This change came about primarily at the request of the Schools of Business and Engineering. Three modules were required for all students.

- Present -- As we now strive to be consistent with the philosophical foci of HIR, we suggest adapting the basic communication requirement to (a) fit the new standards for learning outcomes, and (b) equip students with the knowledge and skills necessary for success in life,
career, and civic duties.

The Department of Communication is excited about the opportunity to redesign the introductory communication course in innovative ways that can best contribute to UD’s changing curriculum needs. The proposal we suggest here is one idea, but we invite dialogue about what course content will best fit with the new curriculum and meet the needs of UD students.

PROPOSED CURRICULUM TO MEET HIR NEEDS
This proposal is based on two basic assumptions about teaching communication
1. Students need sufficient coursework to achieve mastery
   - If students are not strong enough in subject areas such as math, composition, or ethics, we judge that they need more coursework. The same is true for communication. If students do not seem to have strong enough knowledge and skills in oral communication, they need more coursework, not less.
   - Evidence from the modules showed that they did have a positive impact, but they were too limited. UD students needed more communication coursework to achieve better knowledge and mastery, not less.
2. Oral communication must be taught by communication professionals
   - The initial CAP proposal recognizes the importance of oral communication, but suggests leaving this education up to each department on campus. We respectfully but strongly disagree with this approach.
   - Even though most instructors can write and do math, the consensus is that professionals in those disciplines are better suited to teaching composition or algebra than the rest of us. The same is true for communication, where fundamental knowledge and skills are best taught by individuals who have expertise in this area--Communication faculty. Many people think that “because I communicate every day, I am as much of an expert as anyone else.” We disagree, and illustrate the importance of classroom instruction by faculty with expertise in this field with a sample quiz on some basic information necessary in helping guide students toward excellence in public speaking.
     Sample quiz on oral communication:
     a. T or F: 93% of communication is nonverbal.
     b. What 5 qualities are most important in establishing credibility as a speaker?
     c. What impact does a speaker’s immediacy have on the audience?
   We suggest that most faculty throughout the university would be unfamiliar with what would be very straightforward answers to questions like these if one had training in communication. This is just one small indication of the inappropriateness of suggesting that non-experts teach communication.

Foundational courses suggestions
* Because we want to remain open to dialogue as to how to best meet the CAP needs as the program evolves, we are suggesting several possible foundational courses that would fit with the values in HIR and would also meet the needs of students across the university. Each of these proposals are courses that would be designed by the Department of Communication with HIR deeply woven into its fabric. What we offer here are just topical suggestions, to allow us to work with the rest of the university as we redesign a foundational course in communication.
a. Public Communication for Citizenship and Career

- **Rationale:** This is a course on public speaking and critical listening. Excellence in public speaking and the ability to critically evaluate the messages of others are essential to responsible citizenship as well as to success in career and life.
- **Description:** This course would involve a significant element of informative and persuasive public speaking, but would also involve significant attention to listening and critical evaluation of oral arguments. This course would provide a substantive knowledge base as well as everyday skill development.
- **HIR learning outcomes emphasized:** Community, practical wisdom, critical evaluation of our times

b. Media literacy

- **Rationale:** In today’s society, the majority of information we receive is through the media. Students are typically unaware of the impact of the media on their lives, or how to evaluate the messages they get from the media.
- **Description:** Focus on how people process persuasive, informative, and normative messages in the media; legal and ethical aspects of media messages; etc.
- **HIR learning outcomes emphasized:** Diversity, community, practical wisdom, critical evaluation of our times. This course would be particularly important for helping prepare students for a global economy.

c. Interpersonal communication/conflict resolution

- **Rationale:** Success in life and in the workplace is strongly tied to the ability to work well with other people and resolve conflict. This course would be particularly helpful for students going into professions with a high emphasis on personal relationships, one-on-one interactions, and involving negotiation, such as counseling, social services, sales, law, and more. This course could be especially important because our students are facing the 21st century global economy and job market. A knowledge of and a sensitivity to cultural variations in creating and maintaining relationships (and conflict management) is essential for effective collaboration with business associates who will likely be scattered across the world.
- **Description:** Focus on theory and skills in dyadic communication, with special attention to dialogue and to conflict resolution
- **HIR learning outcomes emphasized:** Diversity, community, practical wisdom

d. Business and professional speaking

- **Rationale:** This is a course on public speaking in the business context. It would contain the traditional elements of a public speaking course, but focus them for corporate and non-profit applications. It would offer students better knowledge of speaking in the business world, and allow them to sharpen their strengths for speaking in those situations.
- **Description:** This course would involve a significant element of informative and persuasive public speaking, but would also involve significant attention to listening and critical evaluation of oral arguments. And, students would learn more about speaking in business, such as speaking about annual reports and promoting products, services, or causes. Group work would be a required component of the course.
HIR learning outcomes emphasized: Community, practical wisdom, critical evaluation of our times.

Course quality
Regrettably, some members of the UD community feel that the current communication modules are not as effective as they could be. This perception is unfortunate, and it is not shared by all. We believe that the modules do have a positive impact on students, but we feel that the best way to eliminate this image is to attend so strongly to instructional quality in a redesigned foundational course that there are no reasonable grounds for concern. Our current course director has taken a number of new steps this year to enhance quality of the modules. However, our department has also discussed many possibilities for seeking excellence in a redesigned foundational course. Among these possibilities under consideration are: increased training for the basic course instructors covering issues in both classroom instruction and methods of evaluation (the latter would include rigorous work on evaluation of speeches, interviews, and other communicative performances); including some standardized lectures given for all students by key experts from our department; increased use of FlyerTV for instructional purposes such as providing video course support materials and sample student speeches; and much more.

The underlying premise is that in order for the CAP program to be successful, resources need to be made available. We are already doing everything we can do with our currently available resources, but with some reasonable development resources, we can do much more.

**CORE Program**

1. What in your domain (e.g., unit, department, or committee) is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or in part with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

Much of the Core Program is already aligned with the provisions of the CAP proposal. We deliver an integrated first year humanities program using innovative teaching. Further, we offer integration in the second year between a course that satisfies the upper division humanities requirement, social science requirement. Finally, in the third year we offer a course which is an integrative experience.

2. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?

We commend the CAP team for their serious engagement with HIR. We also appreciate that CAP takes seriously the ways in which disciplines complement each other.

3. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?

1. Page 18 (sec. III B.1.c.) CAP- Core addresses: This proposal contradicts the spirit of the seven student learning outcomes. Bringing 800-900 students together for a common lecture emphasizes a teaching outcome much more so than a student learning outcome.
The Core Program currently uses a common lecture model to deliver much of our material, but the spirit of our common lectures differs from the proposed model. The faculty who give the lectures are closely connected to the students who receive the lecture. For every lecture that the students attend, the following seminar engages the lecture. Frequently, the classes meet together as a large group to participate in exercises that further develop the topics in the lecture. We are able to accommodate block scheduling and various ways of teaching our students through our access to Marianist Hall. Unfortunately, this space is at a premium at UD, and integrating lectures into every first year humanities class will be hindered by the available classroom space.

The faculty who primarily give the lectures continuously work together in order to decide how to give the lectures, how to integrate them in class, and to plan a syllabus that we all use. This model works for us because we have a talented group of faculty committed to the program, committed to the extra effort it involves, and appreciate the ways in which it challenges and expands our teaching. Having to do this much work for more than one class would not be possible. Finding faculty who are willing to work in interdisciplinary classroom and to plan a syllabus together will likely hinder the effectiveness of the common lectures.

As the Core faculty work together to develop the lectures and syllabi, we do so by beginning with the content that we intend to deliver. The content provides structure for each of the disciplines and the material that the students receive. Without content as the primary organizing structure, we are concerned that interdisciplinarity will be less effective pedagogically than courses that are independent.

The Core Program has internal support that allows us to function effectively, which the CAP-Core addresses do not have. We have two graduate assistants from Religious Studies, an administrative assistant, and Core fellows (second year students who tutor and support the first year students).

The document itself is unclear as to the size of CAP-Core addresses: p. 18 the number is 800-900, and p. 35 the number is 150-300.

II. Page 27 (Section III B.9), Diversity Learning Requirement: Transforming HIR student learning outcome 3 into a stand alone Diversity Learning Requirement risks marginalizing the importance of diversity in every discipline. By having one course that fulfills this requirement, only some departments have to concern themselves with diverse content and even those departments can marginalize the courses that they teach for this requirement. If we are serious about this outcome as part of a student-learning outcome, we could have a campus wide conversation led by Jack Ling to find an effective way to inject diversity into every part of campus life.

III. An overall concern for the Catholic Intellectual Tradition (CIT): As the document currently reads, the CIT seems reducible to the Catholic Social Teaching (CST). The CIT is a long tradition in which faith is supported by reason. In particular, the respect for reason goes so far as to cultivate diverse ways of questioning and understanding the world. Because of the Catholic emphasis on reason, Catholic universities in this country have long been the last place to preserve truly diverse philosophy departments even when we do not have a graduate program.
The diversity in these departments means that we welcome and seek scholar-teachers from a variety of international, religious, and philosophical backgrounds. Catholic, philosophy departments have also been the places in which medieval (largely Catholic, Jewish, and Islamic) philosophy has been preserved in this country.

As the document is currently listed, we see very little support for the CIT. Without support for the CIT broadly understood, the CST loses its import and impact. In order for students to achieve practical wisdom and critical evaluation of our times, students must be given opportunities to hone their skills in reason.

4. What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?

We would like to see a deeper assessment of programs that are already in place (Core, See, Learning-Living Cohorts).

We would like to see an assessment of faculty interest in pairing courses.

5. What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

[no reply]

6. What resources and or changes would be needed to make that development possible?

[no reply]

7. In particular, what if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

[no reply]

8. What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?

As the proposal is currently written, the future of Core is unclear. Calling the CAP, CAP-Core confuses the distinction between CAP and Core. Core has long been a space in which innovation has been nurtured and supported. We would like to see Core remain a distinct program with a distinct name at the university.

Department of English

SUMMARY

Strengths:
1. The inclusion of the proposed ENG 100-200 sequence (referred to as 101-201 in the CAP document)
2. The view of general education as stretching into at least the third year
3. The centralization of diversity as a key learning outcome
4. The promotion of undergraduate scholarship beyond the major and across the curriculum

Weaknesses:
1. The proposed first-year curriculum is untenable due to problems with class size, staffing, scheduling, and course content.
2. There should be a required course on diversity AND structures of support, assessment, and accountability for diversification of the common academic program across all four years of study.
3. CAP sets schedule of requirements that would make college transfer, study abroad, and other individualized innovations very difficult.
4. Arts & Social Sciences courses need re-thinking by those in the disciplines. The Arts course ought also to include creative writing IF it is to fulfill its currently defined mission.
5. The ethical action course raises many concerns.
6. The shift away from a comparative religion option in REL 103 and the loss of the upper level PHL option are problematic.
7. Literary studies—in English or a “foreign” language—should be retained in the common curriculum.
8. The Communication Department ought to be given leadership in shaping oral communication outcomes and their delivery.
9. Writing competencies need to be infused throughout the curriculum—beyond the ENG 200 course.
10. The first-year experience course/seminar needs to be addressed
11. HIR calls for a common academic program to facilitate multidisciplinary minors and self-declared or occasional clusters, but CAP seems to be designed to work against this.

Overarching Concerns and Recommendation:
1. More foundational consultation is needed. The departments, multi-disciplinary units (domains) and offices with relevant expertise and involvement in general education both current and imagined) should play a more active role in shaping the proposed curriculum.
2. The timeline for reviewing and approving the proposal is much too short; we propose extending Senate review to spring 2011 at the soonest.
3. A more clearly reasoned proposal, which explains and demonstrates the weaknesses in the current system of general education, argues for why major change is needed, and shows how specific proposed changes will improve the system should be submitted before we are asked to weigh in again on any specific changes.
4. The revised proposal needs to better situate CAP and HIR in conversation with current research and trends in general education
5. The identity and role of the humanities—as individual disciplines and as a set of related disciplines—needs more careful attention in any reiteration of this proposal. Broader representation from the humanities should be instituted on the working committee to achieve this goal.
6. The proposed curricular change is huge and would take a massive dedication of resources and
energy to attempt to implement. We are not at all confident this would be a feasible, effective, or worthy investment. We are opposed to its adoption in either principle or specifics, in its current form.

Common Academic Program Feedback Form--Department of English

1. What in your domain (e.g., unit, department, or committee) is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or in part with the provisions of the CAP proposal?
   1) We are in the midst of review of the curriculum for the undergraduate major in English. One major focus of this is diversity, or universal inclusion.
   2) A capstone seminar (ENG 490: Senior Seminar) has long been a required part of the English major.
   3) Some of our current course offerings (e.g. some cluster courses, for instance) would likely meet the expectations for the CAP Inquiry Elective course.
   4) Some of our course offerings incorporate service learning.

2. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?
   1) The inclusion of the proposed ENG 100-200 course sequence, which has been well-researched, is being carefully piloted and assessed, and it has broad support across the University.
   2) The developmental view of general education which stretches into at least the third year. Inviting students to engage in interdisciplinary coursework or other study at this point in their academic careers makes sense to us (and more sense than requiring it in the first year).
   3) The centralization of diversity as a key learning outcome – including making it an articulated learning outcome for more current and future courses.
   4) The promotion of undergraduate scholarship beyond the major and across the curriculum.

3. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?

   These are our most pressing practical and specific concerns. See our response to question 8 for a list of our overarching, larger-scale concerns.

   1) The proposed first-year curriculum is untenable. Significant problems include the following:
      a. Class Size: First-year composition (FYC) courses are typically capped at 20-22 students; this does not mesh with first-year courses in HST, PHL, and REL, making “linked courses” problematic.
      b. Staffing:
         i. The kind of team-teaching proposed works well on a small scale (as with Core and the LLCs) because of the high level of faculty buy-in but cannot be effectively mandated or implemented across the entire curriculum and faculty.
         ii. Despite the fact that almost all full-time faculty teach first-year students in our department, a good portion of FYC courses at UD are still taught by part-time instructors and graduate TAs. The challenges of curricular continuity in terms of content and quality and the high turnover of such instructional staff make the
ambitious interdisciplinary proposed here unfeasible in terms of professional development, support, investment of instructor time, etc.

c. Scheduling:
   i. Existing LLCs appear to do a good job of such matching, but the matches are varied and highly particularized. This presents a logistics nightmare to do so for every section of every first-year course.
   ii. The proposed linking would make it difficult, if not impossible, to adopt other kinds of innovation. In particular, it would impinge upon our plan to develop some sections of “stretch” ENG 100 courses, which would run for a full year (possibly for 4 credit hours) better to meet the needs of students who require supplemental instruction (currently in ENG 101-T or “SI” sections) in the new 100-200 sequence.

d. Course Content:
   i. We have adopted the theme of literacy for ENG 100 as most appropriate to the reading, writing, and research focus of the course (note, FYC courses have never been imagined as a “standard introduction to the discipline”). We don’t see this content focus as easily meshing with other disciplines whose foci are quite different.
   ii. We believe the CAP addresses, as proposed, to be pedagogically misguided and impractical as an attempt meaningfully to link all first-year humanities courses.

2) The proposed means of integrating diversity into the CAP curriculum are both too diffuse (leaving it up to individual departments to choose how to respond) and not thoroughly enough integrated (why is diversity—or, better yet, “inclusive excellence” or “universal inclusion”—not part of the description of disciplinary capstones?) We propose formalizing a diversity course requirement AND creating structures of support, assessment, and accountability for diversification of the common academic program across all four years of study in order to facilitate the developmental acquisition of diversity competencies.

3) While the four-year developmental approach is appreciated, it appears to be structured so as to make certain kinds of innovations and experiences—such as college transfer or a semester-long study abroad—very difficult to manage. The HIR document calls for “expanding opportunities for international and intercultural study.” We fail to see how CAP does this.

4) The multidisciplinary Arts and Social Science CAP courses seem fuzzy, impractical, and much too ambitious. They seem to assume too easy an assimilation of multiple disciplines—each with multiple “ways of seeing.” The Arts course ought also to include creative writing if it is to fulfill its currently defined mission, which we are not sure it can or should.

5) The ethical action course raises many concerns. Why are the outcomes for scholarship, diversity, and community not associated with the course? Why not link “ethical action” with service learning? The document also does not make clear how proposals to fulfill this requirement from departments other than Religious Studies and Philosophy might be evaluated, and the standard of “significant understanding of ethics informed by CST” is vague. We are concerned about how the gate will be kept and by whom.
6) We have concerns about the shift away from a comparative religion option in first year REL 103 course and the loss of the upper level philosophy course option. In this and other areas of the curriculum we sense the danger of what could become too narrow prescription. How will the proposed 1st year REL course, with its singular focus on Catholicism, help prepare students to function in a diverse world? If the 1st year course focuses on Catholicism and the second course focuses on non-Christian religions, how will students be adequately exposed to other forms of Christianity?

4. What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?

1) Literary studies—in English or a “foreign” language—should be retained in the common curriculum. CAP cuts it, with no justification. In addition to expanding opportunities for domestic and global diversity in general education, literary study is one of the crucial fields in the humanities where practical wisdom is fostered. Literature offers imaginative and critical windows into specific issues and other worlds—both real and possible worlds—in ways that promote understanding of domestic and global diversity, ethical reflection, and the pursuit of practical wisdom. Literature, as a mode of representation, brings before us the concerns of our age and others in unique and compelling ways. Further, the creative imagination is essential to empathy, ethics, and social change. Ethical action requires, for instance, the ability to imagine “oneself as another,” in Paul Ricoeur’s terms. The ability to imagine other ways of being—in response to what history and the sciences reveal about present reality—is likewise an ability foundational to the outcomes we desire for our students. Such “habits” of perception, reflection, and imagination are promoted by the study of literature. Literary study courses should therefore be options at the 300-400 level and should be considered for inclusion in the first-year humanities curriculum, alongside composition.

2) Similarly, there is no rationale given in the proposal for the radical change with regard to communication competencies. If the current system of “modules” is ineffective, as we believe it is, then we should look to assessment and to experts in the discipline to provide direction for addressing reform. Simply turning over the responsibility to individual departments without any clear rationale for doing so seems to duck the issue. The Communication Department ought to be given leadership in shaping oral communication outcomes and their delivery.

3) Writing competencies need to be infused throughout the curriculum—beyond the 200 course. In order to achieve competency writing in their disciplines, all majors need discipline-specific, writing-focused instruction in the third and fourth years. The University needs to invest in faculty development and the establishment and sufficient funding and staffing of a University-wide Writing Center to aid and support such curricular developments. We are also concerned that writing studies—a major disciplinary sub-field in English—not be reduced, in the view of general education, simply to the delivery of “basic” or easily “transferable” skills.

4) HIR called for revisions in first-year seminars (e.g. ASI 150), but this is nowhere even mentioned in the CAP proposal. Why was this recommendation discounted?

5) HIR also called for expanding and facilitating multidisciplinary minors and self-declared or occasional clusters. The proposal for an “integrative capstone,” while intriguing, does not clearly
draw upon or support any currently existing structures, practices, or “habits” of interdisciplinary work at UD. It is unclear that students would have much freedom in the proposed structure to develop the interests that lead to interdisciplinary minors or second majors.

5. What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

1) A whole new structure for the staffing and delivery of the proposed ENG 100 course.
2) Major curriculum revision at the 300-level to re-align our many current cluster courses with possible needs in CAP; likely doing away with many of our current general education offerings
3) Possible development of a new course on textual/representational ethics for the “Practical Ethical Action” course. Such a course could be focused on issues such as cultural patrimony and cultural appropriation, representations of the marginalized “other,” copyright and intellectual honesty and informed by Catholic Social Teaching on themes such as the common good and community, human dignity, participation, and global solidarity. It is not clear whether such a course would be acceptable, however. Would it need to include Church documents, or could it be “informed” in less obvious ways? Must one uphold any particular elements of CST in the classroom in order to be eligible to teach such a course for CAP?

6. What resources and or changes would be needed to make that development possible?

1) A major investment in new FT faculty lines to further reduce our reliance on part-time instructors and the burden on graduate TAs; a reduced teaching load for TAs; increased pay for PT instructors; a major commitment to on-going professional development for the entire instructional staff.
2) Summer stipends and course releases to support major overhaul of current general education offerings by the tenured and tenure-track faculty.
3) New classroom spaces to facilitate combined course meetings.

7. In particular, what if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

See responses 1 and 2 to question 5, above.

8. What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?

These are our more foundational and over-arching concerns:

1) More foundational consultation is needed. Although significant consultation across campus and some research on general education in higher education went into the HIR source document, departments were never asked how they, specifically, might propose to meet the learning outcomes and/or otherwise address the curricular recommendations of the HIR Report. For instance, departments currently delivering the Humanities Base, Jack Ling, and others should play a more contributive role in shaping this curriculum.
2) The timeline for reviewing and approving the proposal is much too short; we propose extending Senate review to spring 2011 at the soonest. We are concerned that pressure will be applied to approve the document “in principle”—before sufficient time for the consideration of feedback, further conversation, and verification of the real budget needs and confirmation of resources.

3) Why does general education as it currently exists need such substantial revision? How do we know we’re not already doing much right, including meeting HIR outcomes? We question the assumption underlying the charge to the committee, and the proposal that has resulted, that a radical overhaul is needed. We want to know what failures in the current system of general education this proposal is meant to address and to see evidence of how this proposal will address them.

4) We question whether HIR is a sufficient singular foundation for this proposal. CAP appears to be a largely original model of “Marianist education” proposed to take the place of “liberal education [à la Newman, Arnold, and Dewey] in the Marianist tradition.” We believe HIR should be one central resource alongside others, and we find the CAP document itself lacking in evidence or other sufficient support for its proposed changes. We would like to see more direct and thorough engagement with research on general education. We also doubt that all the outcomes of HIR can be fully achieved through a prescribed general education program alone.

5) The conceptualization of the issues central to the humanities disciplines—and the conception of the disciplines themselves—in the CAP document is a significant concern.
   a. “Vocation” is too quickly collapsed in much of CAP into professionalization. The document fails to recognize that humanities disciplines (and others in the liberal arts) do not, in fact, primarily aim to produce students with “professions” per se. It makes sense that our students should be able to engage in thoughtful discussion about the concept of vocation, but to require that they have a sense of vocation seems too ambitious given their age/experience. Further, a sense of vocation is not something we can produce. Making it a student learning outcome is akin to trying to make something as unmeasurable and un-manufacturable as “spirituality” a required “student learning outcome.”
   b. The way the proposal document employs the term “perspectives,” in some instances, seems to reduce disciplinary knowledge to a simple point of view.
   c. The document also tends to construct “reason” from what seems to be a purely instrumental view.
   d. The move away from consideration of the Catholic Intellectual Tradition to an emphasis on Catholic Social Teaching concerns us. What gets included in the latter? We are concerned that much that is vital to the humanities will be lost or marginalized.

6) The proposed curricular change is huge and would take a massive dedication of resources and energy to attempt to implement. We are not at all confident this would be a feasible, effective, or worthy investment. We are opposed to its adoption—either in principle (with logistics to be worked out later) or in its specifics—in its current form.
**Geology Department**  
Summarized by Allen J. McGrew, Chair of Geology

The Geology Department discussed the Common Academic Program in Department Meeting on Nov. 17 and held subsequent exchanges via e-mail. We support the consensus statement of the Science Chairs. In general, we do not re-state those perspectives here except to add greater emphasis to points that we believe are especially important, or to underscore areas where Geology has a somewhat distinctive perspective from the other Sciences. The results of Geology’s review are summarized below:

**General Comments.**

We recognize the impressive thought and effort that went into the drafting of the CAP proposal and we applaud the intent of the CAP to enhance the education of University of Dayton students through intentionally designed curricula to achieve the seven outcomes specified in HIR. However, the current document does not adequately address the issue of what is broken in the current General Education system and why such sweeping reforms are necessary to fix it. Many of the new structures envisioned in the CAP are intended to enhance the integration of the educational experience, presenting an implied critique of the 1983 General Education Program that it fails to build synthetic thinking skills in our students. We share this perception and strongly commend the effort to enhance the capacity of our graduates for synthetic thinking, but the document should make this case more clearly and compellingly. In addition, we believe that the proposed reforms are overly specified or complex and may not achieve the admittedly challenging goal of integration. Nevertheless, we urge that this goal be kept clearly in view as the dialog on CAP continues. In an ever-more complex and interconnected world, the University of Dayton must develop effective pedagogies to develop synthetic thinking skills in our students.

Specifically, we believe that the commendable effort to achieve integration has led the current proposal to be overly complex, over-designed and inflexible in the first year, and in subsequent years we wonder whether the current Cluster system needs to be adapted rather than discarded. The CAP proposal will be difficult and costly if not impossible to implement, and will not adequately embrace the diversity and individuality of students’ curricular needs. Moreover, we believe it reflects a fundamental conceptual flaw in that it places the preponderant burden of integration on common experiences in the external instructional delivery system rather than on the internal development of synthetic thinking skills by the students. Integrating the instructional experience (through team teaching or shared experiences such as the CAP CORE addresses) may provide useful models to support the development of synthetic thinking skills, but only if accompanied by exercises that compel the students to practice synthesis themselves. Otherwise the students are merely watching faculty synthesize for them. Students must be challenged to synthesize for themselves, and they must first have something to synthesize. Substance must precede synthesis. Substantive and meaningful synthetic thinking is perhaps the highest of all critical thinking skills, and must rest on a firm foundation of basic knowledge in a variety of disciplines. The extensive effort to integrate the first year experience strikes us as premature and over-reaching and likely to undermine the foundation of a disciplinary knowledge base upon which true interdisciplinarity must be built.
We would argue for a developmental model for the building of synthetic thinking skills throughout the four-year career of students that places the emphasis on discipline-based thinking early in students’ careers while enlarging the demands on synthetic thinking skills through thematically-focused courses later in their careers. We believe such a model would more fully realize the developmental spirit of Marianist education. We recognize that many aspects of this expectation of growth are already embraced in certain aspects of the CAP proposal. For example, we commend the redesign of the English sequence, with the second year course being theme-based and more synthetic in nature.

We also believe the proposed CAP Integrative course in the third year is a promising concept, although we wonder whether it would not be possible to achieve much the same ends by simply taking the current Cluster system and either making the CAP Integrative course the third, culminating course in students’ cluster – thus each cluster would have its own integrative course. Alternatively, we suggest that perhaps the Cluster system could be salvaged simply by adding a 1 sem-hr Integrative Seminar requirement to be completed by the Fall of the Senior year. This seminar would be faculty-mentored with once-a-week meetings focused on the theme of the cluster and would require each student to write a final “capstone paper” synthesizing what they had learned through their cluster experience. Instituting such a capstone element in the clusters we believe would impart a sense of cohesion and direction currently lacking in the requirement without requiring the formidable task of a total overhaul of existing curricula. Whether through one of the above models or some other mechanism, we strongly commend the concept of an upper-division integrative experience for students.

However, we emphasize that the fact that the Sciences are not currently included in this concept is a remarkable oversight given how integral the Sciences are to many of the most interdisciplinary challenges that human society faces today, ranging from human health issues to global environmental change.

The Role of the Sciences in CAP

Given the emphasis on integration in the CAP proposal, it is dismaying to see how little thought appears to have been given to the integration of the sciences. The sciences appear almost as an afterthought, leading to some glaring oversights. For example, we note that Appendix D does not identify the Sciences as supporting the “Practical Wisdom” outcome of HIR. Surely in the modern world any conception of “practical wisdom” that is not grounded in a basic appreciation of the sciences can be nothing more than practical foolishness. Below we offer some specific comments pertaining to the role of Science in the CAP.

1) While we recognize that a change in basic credit hour expectations for the sciences is politically unlikely, for the record we believe that an expectation of just 6 hours of lecture in the natural sciences with no laboratory requirement is inadequate. Science is Inquiry, and labs are where students practice active, hands-on inquiry in the Sciences. Taking science without labs is akin to taking art without engaging in a creative effort. We recognize the logistical and infrastructural barriers to expanding the science requirement by 2 credit hours from 6 to 8 in order that all students might have a lab experience, but still we feel compelled to tell the truth. In addition, we point out that in practice this would only affect students in the SBA as all other students currently meet this minimal expectation.
2) Several of our colleagues upon a first review of the document have inferred that the 6 sem-hr minimum Science requirement implies that the 11 sem-hr Integrated Natural Science Sequence is slated to be dismantled. Clearly, the document needs to be modified to make clear that this is not the case.

3) To date, the Sciences have not been charged to review whether the current Science curricula effectively support the HIR outcomes of scholarship, reading the signs of the times, and (we would add) practical wisdom. We believe that the time for such a review is now. This review should encompass not only the INSS but also the courses that mostly serve the general education requirements of the School of Business Administration. It strikes us that the courses serving the SBA are disparate, disconnected, *ad hoc* and (as noted above) lacking in any laboratory exposure. We pose the question: Is there some rationale why the future business managers and corporate directors that the University of Dayton produces need a less cohesive science education?

4) **Analysis of the INSS.** We note that the current document gives minimal attention to the Integrated Natural Science Sequence. As noted above, we believe that the time for a review of the INSS is ripe, and below we summarize the current perceptions of the INSS within our department.

   a. For the most part, we believe that the basic structure of the Integrated Science Sequence is sound, though all of us believe that it could be improved and some of us believe that substantive improvement is possible. We note that we are only in a position to evaluate the “Environmental Track” of the INSS in which our department participates. Particular strengths of the INSS as we see it include:
   
i. Courses are presented in a reasoned, sequential fashion, and that in itself represents a substantive improvement over the old “cafeteria model.”
   ii. The core integrating themes of Energy, Environment, Evolution and the Nature of Science are well-chosen and, for the most part, well-developed.
   iii. Most instructors show a passion for tying these themes and the importance of Science in general to students’ lives in ways that are pertinent for non-science majors.

   b. Major defects that we see in INSS include:
   i. Lack of integration between labs and lecture sections. At present, labs are not co-requisite with their corresponding lecture sections, and students are required to take only two-out-of-three of the available labs. These parameters require that labs must stand alone and cannot be integrated with the lecture sections that they are meant to support. Remedying this situation would be difficult (perhaps impossible) and would require a comprehensive rethinking of the curriculum, but as noted above we believe the time is ripe for such a review.
   ii. Students commonly take the first course in the sequence in the Fall of their first year and then put off the completion of the INSS until their junior or senior years, destroying the integrity and coherence of the sequence.
   iii. The sequence is only superficially integrated despite the sincere best efforts of instructors. Simply having students take courses in sequence with no intentional framework for asking them to do the work of integration does not achieve true integration in any deep sense, particularly if they take the first course in their first
iv. There is a large imbalance between the two tracks as students preponderantly seek out the environmental track.

v. Students enter the INSS with widely disparate high school science backgrounds. Some students enter with woefully inadequate experience and sometimes deeply entrenched hostility to the sciences, whereas others have quite solid backgrounds in science and are bored by rehashing basic science information that they learned in high school. This creates a challenging pedagogical environment.

While some of the above concerns may be impossible to address in any meaningful way, we believe that a thoughtful review of the curriculum could well reveal creative strategies for improving the CAP in the Sciences.

**Department of History**

**RESPONSE TO THE COMMON ACADEMIC PROGRAM (CAP) DRAFT DOCUMENT**

**Introduction**

The Department of History developed a systematic strategy for responding to the Common Academic Program Proposal (CAP). First, each of the standing committees of the Department (the Executive Committee, the Curriculum Committee, and the Assessment Committee) held a series of meetings to review the CAP proposal and report back to the entire Department. With the minutes of these meetings serving as the beginning point for its deliberations, the Department’s tenure track and tenured faculty met twice to consider the CAP proposal. At these meetings, the faculty considered the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal and developed an initial response. The Executive Committee then prepared a first draft of the Department’s response and distributed that draft to the Department. The full faculty then met to consider the draft and based on its review the final report was prepared and approved by the Department. In its review, critique, and recommendations we recognize the critical role of the General Education Program in our mission as Catholic and Marianist, the integral place of the discipline of History in that mission, the need to review and revitalize our General Education program, the centrality of “Habits of Inquiry” in shaping our present conversation, and the CAP proposal as the beginning point for revitalizing and restructuring our General Education requirements.

The response of the Department is divided into five sections. These sections are:
- The CAP proposal and the Catholic and Marianist mission of the University
- The CAP proposal and the CORE program
- The CAP proposal and its overall affect on the disciplines including history; its critique of the present General Education Program; and the demands the proposal will have on pedagogy, faculty development and the recruitment and hiring of faculty
- A summary of the Department’s own critique of its contribution to the General Education program particularly the Humanities Base and its curricular plans.
- Conclusion
In preparing this response, the Department drew on its considerable experience in creating and delivering the present General Education requirements, its participation in and leadership of the CORE program, its contribution to a variety of interdisciplinary collaborations including the learning/living communities, and, finally, the Department’s review and proposed revision of History 103 to strengthen it and to better serve the learning outcomes of “Habits of Inquiry.”

SECTION 1: The CAP Proposal and the Catholic and Marianist mission of the University

- The humanities, as UD has long acknowledged, are foundational to university education rooted in Catholic intellectual tradition. The vision of knowledge presumed by Catholic intellectual tradition is inherently integrative, and the humanities are indispensable to that vision. They have the longest history and the most highly developed methodologies of reflection on the relationship among various aspects of human knowledge and its complex relationship to information on the one hand and wisdom on the other. Their centrality to Catholic intellectual tradition is reflected in the design of the current Humanities Base. The general sense that the time is ripe for revision of General Education need not lead to full-scale redesign. In particular, a basic insight such as the centrality of the humanities to university education informed by Catholic intellectual tradition should not be set aside in favor of professions-centered interdisciplinary work without some explicit consideration and agreement. While there may be some need to revisit and revise the themes and other aspects of the current Humanities Base, it has, barring evidence to the contrary, served as a fairly sturdy foundation to General Education—complete reconstruction does not seem to be called for. What is clearly necessary is a renewed commitment to creative faculty development, especially for those new to teaching in the Base.

- History is integral to any fully developed understanding of tradition. Commitment to tradition without a lively sense of history, of change over time, leads to traditionalism, what G.K. Chesterton called “the dead faith of the living.” Genuine tradition, Chesterton’s “living faith of the dead,” requires a sense of the claims on the present made by the past, the ability to understand and appreciate the past on its own terms, and a sophisticated appreciation of the contingency of the present in historical time.

- Catholic social thought in some senses originates with the emergence of papal teaching on the consequences of industrialization, beginning with Leo XIII’s *Rerum Novarum* in 1891. However, reflection on the relevant issues has been part of Catholic tradition since the earliest centuries. A thorough understanding of the distinctiveness of the questions raised by modernity requires sufficient historical grounding to see the difference between modernity and what precedes it. Marianist education arose in response to the insight that the French Revolution had made new forms of education, available to all classes, necessary for meeting the needs—material and spiritual—that the new world had created. Marianist university education should, at a bare minimum, acquaint students both with enough of the content of that history to situate their own educational experience and with a lively enough historical sensibility to discern how that history contrasts and interacts with that of people in other times and places.

- All the student learning outcomes that structure the report of the CAP sub-committee require the development of a historical sensibility for full attainment.
  - **Scholarship** is only possible when the scholar knows enough of the history of his or her discipline to undertake new exploration and to articulate the results in a way that makes their significance apparent.
Faith traditions must be understood in the context of their historical development for any mature appropriation.

Diversity is inherent in the historical enterprise, committed as it has always been to knowledge of diversity within and across societies and culture. Even when approaching the study of the “same” culture, the study of history nonetheless opens students’ eyes to the diversity of human experience, as “the past is a foreign country.”

Community exists only in particular forms in specific times and places, the particularity of which can be understood by seeing their historical context clearly. Marianist communities, in particular, which exist not solely to support their members but to send their members out to meet the needs of the world around them, have a special stake in helping their members discern the commonalities and differences among communities of people in different times and places.

Practical wisdom is a rich concept that hearkens back at least to Aristotle, and can be an effective tool for helping students understand the distinctiveness of Marianist approaches to education, if its roots and development are presented with their full historical complexity.

Critical evaluation of our times is possible (and surely responsibly undertaken) only by those sufficiently aware of historical contingency and causality to possess the requisite humility.

Vocation also presumes an ability to see and meet the world’s needs in a way that requires a historical sensibility for clarity and intention.

In the course of an extensive review of its curriculum, the History Department has examined extensively the curricula of dozens of UD’s peer and aspirant institutions. It is clear that all universities, especially Catholic ones, to which UD regularly compares itself require at least two courses in history of their students. At the very least, relegating required historical study to one course in a university curriculum would put UD at a significant disadvantage, especially when compared to other Catholic universities. Arguably, an institution seeking to stand out at as a national leader in Catholic higher education would re-dedicate itself to the study of the history of the world and its peoples, and seek to extend and deepen such a requirement, rather than attenuate and limit it.

SECTION 2: CAP and CORE

CORE has been used as a model for a number of curricular innovations here at the University of Dayton, including the Humanities Base, clusters, and learning-living communities. Some of these innovations have proved to be quite creative and successful; others, not so much. But all of them are marked by the way that they do not fully replicate the CORE program, by the way that they are, in the end, “CORE lite.” This is certainly true of the current CAP proposal, and perhaps more than the other innovations, this failure to fully appreciate or implement the CORE model weakens the proposal.

Much of the CAP proposal attempts to borrow from the first year of CORE, namely ASI 111-112, Core Integrated Studies: The Roots and Development of Modern Cultures and Values. These two courses are taken by all first-year Core students, and are taught by a team of six professors from History, Philosophy, and Religious Studies. History provides the narrative frame for these courses, which deal with the history of the “West” and its encounters with the rest of the world from the beginnings of civilization to the present.
These are truly team-taught courses, which means that professors on the team attend all of the lectures (which are given Tuesday and Thursday mornings in Sears), and meet in numerous planning sessions to discuss lecture content, assignments and examinations, and seminar activities. In 2003 the first-year Core professors implemented revisions that more tightly integrate all of the first-year Core classes, including the Core English sections; central to this effort, the team implemented a curriculum in which the ASI seminars and English classes share a “block time” – either 9.00-11.45 WF or 1.30-4.15 TTh – in which the time is divided differently every day, with the students sometimes working in very small groups, sometimes working in their seminars, and sometimes working together as a “block” on one academic exercise.

The contrasts with the current CAP proposal should be obvious. For one thing, ASI 111-112 is strongly interdisciplinary, yes, but it has content, a substantive focus, an argument. This is not interdisciplinary work for the sake of being interdisciplinary, or even for exposing students to different interdisciplinary perspectives. The latter does happen, of course, given that professors lecture from their particular disciplinary perspective – but driving these courses is the content. This is in contrast with the proposed “linked” courses in CAP, in which the interdisciplinary perspectives are primary, and – it would seem – the content is an afterthought.

One additional comment re: the “contentfulness” of ASI 111-112. It should be pointed out that history provides the narrative frame. The historians give twice as many lectures as their colleagues from the other disciplines. As a result, the students receive six credits in history, as opposed to three in philosophy and three in religious studies. Here the CAP proposal – with its reduction of required history courses – rejects the CORE model altogether.

As regards the team teaching that occurs in ASI 111-112, it should be obvious from the above description that – with everyone attending all of the lectures, and with the numerous planning sessions – the time commitment required of ASI 111-112 professors is immense. For those who teach in the program the gains certainly outweigh the costs; in fact, many would attest that teaching this course is the best teaching experience of their careers. But the point is that those who teach this course have voluntarily chosen to do so. It is quite reasonable to ask if this can truly be replicated across the University. Is the University really willing to put in place a system of faculty development to prepare the large number of faculty members who would be asked to engage in the intensive work of good interdisciplinary team-teaching? Is the University really willing to put in place sufficient incentives to encourage all these folks to engage in this work with the commitment required to make interdisciplinary team-teaching a success?

The effects of mandating interdisciplinary team-taught courses without insuring faculty ownership of these courses could be disastrous. Faculty members who are forced into teaching these courses without adequate faculty development and without adequate incentives would be quite apt – for good reason -- to do the minimum when it comes to working with their colleague(s) or making interdisciplinary connections. The result would be courses that do not come close to doing what they say do, thus undermining the rationale for the CAP. And the next iteration of general education would very likely see a decisive move away from a focus on interdisciplinary teaching.
One final comment: It is not at all clear what would happen to the CORE program if the CAP proposal is implemented. It would be ironic, to say the least, if a proposal that presumably wants to institutionalize what we have learned from CORE kills CORE while at the same not coming close to replicating what has made the CORE program a great success.

SECTION 3: The Disciplines, Integration, and Implementation
The critique of the CAP proposal in this section focuses on five specific areas: the major and the disciplines; the focus and formation of the interdisciplinary courses; the practicality of the plan and the challenges of implementation; the impact on the recruitment and retention of faculty; and the assumptions about the current program.

As a comprehensive Catholic university in the Marianist tradition, we combine a general education program centered on the liberal arts in the Catholic intellectual tradition with strong education in the disciplines. The study of history as a discipline is essential to the Catholic intellectual tradition and the liberal arts. The CAP proposal compromises the introduction of history as a discipline for all entering undergraduates. In particular, the introduction to history as a discipline is critical for history major as the 100 level courses serves as a foundation for further study.

While the Department recognizes the merit of integration across disciplines as integral to undergraduate education, we take issue with the approach of the CAP proposal. First, integrated, interdisciplinary study must be grounded firmly in the understanding of students of their own disciplines and of the methods and subject of other disciplines. Without a fundamental mastery of their own disciplines, students -- and for that matter faculty -- cannot understand the differences in scholarly traditions, methodologies, foci and subject between disciplines, or begin to integrate disciplines. Second, interdisciplinary study has to have a substantive focus, topic or subject that make use of different disciplines appropriate and transparently useful (practical wisdom). As described in the section of our response concerning the use of CORE as a model, the CAP proposal appears not to recognize how the substantive focus in CORE makes the interdisciplinary approach effective. The comprehensive nature of the University demands strong majors, and must form the basis for interdisciplinary study of carefully designated topics. We have deep concerns that the CAP integrative course can not be effectively implemented as now described.

The Department appreciates that any revision of General Education requirements poses demanding challenges, and that the status quo cannot be embraced to avoid the difficulties of change. Recognizing this, the Department finds the CAP proposal more fitting for a liberal arts college than for a comprehensive university. The success of the CORE program begins with a structure to accommodate a limited cadre of students and served by volunteer faculty working closed together to make it work. The CAP proposal is not the CORE program enlarged but is fundamentally different in scope and nature. The CAP proposal would demand a fundamental shift in the pedagogy of a large number of faculty. While a good number of faculty have participated in CORE and/or other interdisciplinary programs, the change expected by the CAP proposal makes a choice into an expectation of faculty to fundamentally change their pedagogy, their readiness for collaboration, and the subject of their courses. Realistically, are such massive changes practical, even possible?
As a comprehensive university we have recruited and retained excellent faculty using the teacher/scholar model. In a fundamental way, the CAP proposal challenges that model and undermines its viability for many of the faculty. While committed to the University as Catholic and Marianist, the faculty are in good part drawn to the University by the opportunity to teach in their disciplines and do research in their fields of scholarship. The CAP proposal would require faculty to move away that model and focus their time and energy in ways more associated with liberal arts colleges. We suspect that this will not be appealing to some faculty already here, or to those we recruit to join us.

At the same time, we recognize that many of our faculty finds appealing the opportunity to collaborate with colleagues across departments, to undertake curricular revision that integrates knowledge across disciplines, and to experiment with pedagogical approaches that enhance student learning. In this respect, the revision of General Education can draw on the enthusiasm for and experience with interdisciplinary, integrative curricular programs and experiments. The faculty of the Department has been actively involved in the development and offering of such programs and is enthusiastic concerning further innovation and development of integrated, interdisciplinary programs. For example, the “Perspectives on the City Project,” and particularly the “Cities and Energy” course have been rich, innovative additions to the curriculum and the way students learn. Still, the issue of faculty receiving teaching credit must be resolved when, in this case, five or six faculty are collaborating to prepare and offer a course. Additionally, the sophistication of the methodologies and the relevance of the topic of the “Cities and Energy” course has attracted very bright, committed students from across the disciplines. However, not all courses offered by the “Perspectives on the City” Project have been as successful in attracting students.

The Department also questions some of the premises of the report. We know from previous assessment data (we appeared to have recently stopped assessment) that the Humanities Base has been fairly effective in achieving expected student outcomes including a number stated in “Habits of Inquiry.” While the Humanities Base has weaknesses (consistency for one) there is good reason to believe that the Humanities Base could be significantly strengthened and revitalized in its current form. While the Thematic clusters have been roundly criticized for being ineffective in achieving expected outcomes, we do know that smaller clusters have been stronger in implementation and in achieving desired outcomes. We take issue with the characterization of the present General Education program as consisting mostly of “distribution requirements” with no strategy to achieve the education goals of the University as Catholic, Marianist, and comprehensive. Weaknesses can be remedied and improvements can be made without radical change that does not promise success.

**SECTION 4: Department Of History & General Education: Responding To The CAP Proposal**

During the 2007-2008 academic year, the Department of History charged its Curriculum Committee with review of the entire curriculum offered by history and make recommendations for revision based on its evaluation of the effectiveness of the present curriculum in meeting the mission of the Department, the College and the University. At its annual retreat in August 2008, the Department reviewed the findings and recommendations of the Curriculum Committee and
supported its proposals for the major and for General Education. What follows is the sections of that the Curriculum Committee’s evaluation and proposal focusing on General Education including the Humanities Base and the distribution of course on the 200 and 300 level.

HISTORY 103
As integral to the review of the Department of History curriculum, the Curriculum Committee carefully considered the effectiveness and the suitability of the History 103 as the introductory course to the discipline of history at the University, and as an essential course in the University’s General Education Program. In evaluating History 103, the Committee considered:

- The History 103 course proposal as approved by the College and the University General Education Committee. In particular, the Committee examined the rationale for the course, the structure of the course, and the learning outcomes.
- As much as possible, the Committee assessed the achievement of History 103 in meeting expectations and outcomes. For example, the Committee reviewed the syllabi of the course as offered over the last two years. Unfortunately, there was no recent assessment data for the Humanities Base.
- The Committee examined how effectively History 103 as presently formulated and structured met the seven goals/objectives of Habits of Inquiry and Reflection.
- The Committee consulted with Sandra Yocum to assure that its deliberations were consistent with those of the Common Academic Program (CAP) Committee.

The Curriculum Committee concluded that History 103 should not be replaced but could effectively serve the General Education Program and as an introductory course to the curriculum of History majors. Nevertheless, History 103 would need significant revision to achieve four characteristics critical to success. The Committee defined these characteristics as:

**Commonality:** History 103 must have common core critical to addressing themes and issues central to understanding “The West and the World” within the paradigm of historical scholarship.

**Consistency:** The common core of History 103 would assure consistency in offering the course, provide a focus on a number of specific outcomes, and facilitate systematic assessment.

**Connectivity:** Offering History 103 consistently with common themes would facilitate connecting or integrating the course with the other courses in the General Education Program and provide a basis for learning-living communities.

**Creativity:** While having a common core, History 103 would take advantage of the rich variety of scholarship of our faculty, their pedagogical experience and their ingenuity as scholars and teachers to create a common core and distinctive and creative sections.

Within the context of the “four Cs,” the Committee, after much deliberation, developed a model for History 103. This model drew from the following:

- Best practices in structuring curriculum, especially CORE
- Curricular experiments, especially “Honors: On Globalism (HOG),” a learning-living community being offered in the 2008-09 academic year by faculty members in the Department of History (Merithew, Fleischmann, Darrow, and Agnew) in conjunction with Philosophy.
Inclusion of the common historical themes that would serve to achieve the outcomes of the present History 103, and the goals of Habits of Inquiry.

A model that would take advantage of the scholarship and expertise of the faculty would create distinctiveness in individual sections of the course as well as provide master lectures for the common core.

While the following model needs considerable development and much discussion, the Curriculum Committee offers it to the faculty for its consideration. This model proposes a common core based on specific themes and series of pods or modules to be offered by faculty focusing on distinctive themes or/and geographic areas.

Common Content
A series of master lecturers presented by selected department faculty to all students enrolled in History 103 in large groups of 250 or more. These lectures could be common to all students enrolled in History 103 or they could be offered to the students in specific modules or pods. The apparent preference is for common lectures for all students. The Master lecturers would focus on the themes of:

- The Idea of the West
- Modernity
- Global Encounter

A common set of readings would accompany the common themes

Pods or Modules
Teams (the preference is for teams of two to four faculty) faculty would work in concert to develop and offer students in sections (35 students) modules based on specific geographical areas and/or themes. There is also of the possibility of common lectures focusing on the specific focus of the pod or module.

The Curriculum Committee recognizes that the proposal is very basic at this point and presents many issues that must be resolved. They include:

- The meaning and substance of the common themes; the idea of the West; modernity; global encounters.
- Facilities for offering the master lectures
- Scheduling the master lectures and the pod or module sections
- Staffing the master lectures and the development of the thematic and/or geographic pods
- Decision concerning distribution of work-load, evaluation of performance.

200 LEVEL COURSES
The Curriculum Committee also considered the history courses offered on the 200-, 300- and 400-level. In doing so the Committee reviewed the following:

- All existing courses offered by the Department of History and included in the University Bulletin.
- The history curricula of the departments of history at aspirant and peer institutions.
- The imbalance of courses offered at the 200- and 300-levels
- The outcomes of Habits of Inquiry and consulted with the CAP Committee

The Curriculum Committee recommends that all regional histories and perhaps broad surveys
courses be offered at the 200 level. This would achieve greater balance between 200 and 300 level courses which is a significant concern of the CAP Committee. This redistribution of course would prepare students with the background to take advance courses in specific themes, periods, and national histories. In many cases, these broad regional history courses could become prerequisites for upper level courses.

SECTION 5: Conclusion
The Department of History submits this response in the best spirit of the University of Dayton as a collaborative community of learners, teachers, and scholars sharing our common mission as Catholic and Marianist. While flexible, open and responsive to a variety of options for the revision of the General Education, we as the faculty are committed to the centrality of the humanities, and to the essential place of the study of the past and tradition as integral to the Catholic intellectual tradition and to a liberal arts curriculum at the University of Dayton. The Department recognizes the need to review and revise the present General Education program, and understands that the CAP proposal is an important and provocative stage in that process. The faculty is anxious to collaborate with colleagues in this critical work. The Department believes that its commitment to the learning outcomes of “Habits of Inquiry,” its experience with General Education, CORE, learning-living communities, and its leadership in the creation of and implementation of interdisciplinary programs can serve our common purpose well.

Department of Languages

1. What in your domain (e.g., unit, department, or committee) is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or in part with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

Our alignment with CAP courses and experiences is at the 300 level (Advanced competency in a foreign language), with experiences abroad and intercultural service projects, and with service learning in Spanish.

2. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?

The purpose to capitalize on the CORE program as a foundation for the implementation of the seven student outcomes from HIR is a major strength as well as the developmental approach to integrate GE and the major. I would suggest that the sentence “a more deliberate plan for integrating knowledge across disciplines” should include also “and skills” along with “knowledge” (page 7.) HIR includes “skills” and “abilities” explicitly in several of its outcomes. Practical wisdom and critical evaluation of our times are an essential framework of reference in the 21st century. They require both the knowledge and the skills or abilities to make this framework useful, to meaningfully intertwine education and action. I also support the philosophy of continuous and sustained engagement contained in the CAP. Engagement is connected clearly with Catholic and Marianist traditions at UD in which community encompasses the local and the global, the experience of similarities and differences. One of the great merits of HIR is the synergy of its outcomes and the interconnectivity among them. These outcomes foster engagement and alertness in a pluralistic culture and society that it is progressively becoming globally interdependent and our students should have this awareness.
I like the idea the CAP addresses. If carefully planned and managed, they will contribute to connect disciplines and to offer an integrative learning experience of multiple perspectives. 21st century students should be able to maximize and optimize information as well as to develop diagnostic skills so they become informed and responsible local and global citizens.

The very concept of a university is fluid. It is always changing, sometimes almost unnoticed, and other times markedly. Transformative education is at the core of this dynamic progress/process. Transforming GE into CAP brings a response and innovative options to the results of the assessment of GE and, therefore, this draft report deserves a lot of credit.

ENG 201 is a very valid inclusion with its emphasis on rhetorical analysis and writing academic arguments.

3. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?

_Telling the University of Dayton Story – 2007-08 Major News Placements_, opens up with a clear statement about expanding global and intercultural horizons. Under transformative education, contributions to communities – global, national and local, focus on addressing regional, diversity, international and global citizenship issues. Academic excellence, in the middle of the brochure, also emphasizes this aspect. This brochure ends with UD’s efforts to foster international and intercultural engagement and to help students develop as citizens of the world. Intercultural competence is a must, as President Curran rightly affirms (24). Given this context and the call for “international and intercultural citizenship and engagement” of goal # 4 in the _Strategic Plan 2006_, some fundamental elements are not contemplated in the CAP:

- **Linguistic diversity and intercultural communication** needs to be included as an affirmation of the dignity of the human as a social creature living in community and in contact with multiple others that represent many manifestations of difference.
- **Engagement**, understood as dialogue, participation, collaboration, and interaction seems to take place only in English in this draft report. Lower level courses at the Department of Languages facilitate the development of language and intercultural skills. They are not traditional content courses. However, their contribution to engagement with multiple others whether in the US or abroad is essential and no option for these courses is found in the CAP structure. Advanced competency in a language other than English is included in the CAP, but how are students going to acquire that competency if they have no options to develop it at a basic level in a tight structure as the CAP is in the first two years? At one of the meetings discussing the CAP, arguments advancing the idea that the CAP is about giving students a shot at a basic and solid foundation for their education and that part of the integration will occur in the brain, how is, then, intercultural competence going to be realized? Programs, however, with a language requirement address this issue. The learning and living experiences of international students at UD and the experiences promoted in the International Learning Living Community would be more relevant and also a more sensitive climate towards diversity and internationalization would be created if engagement in a language other than English along with intercultural competence was included as an option in a common academic program.
Internationalization and diversity are different. While “internationalization” of the University of Dayton has been emphasized by President Curran as a priority, it is hidden in the general definition of diversity. International and global awareness do not necessarily fit neatly into the concept of diversity and in the curricular proposals of CAP are swallowed up by it.

Literature is an art form and needs to be included in the CAP. Literature, like the other arts, provides a window into the creative world as well as to an array of diverse realities and aesthetic experiences. Literature—whether in English or another language—is ignored as an art form in the proposed CAP curriculum.

CAP tries to provide a solid foundation through lower level courses for successful study at the upper level. Within this structure, advanced competence in a foreign language (CAP Inquiry Elective, Diversity) has no foundation of lower level language courses or demonstrated basic language proficiency and intercultural skills.

Elimination of current language courses in GE: a few language courses count for GE in clusters/domains. The literature courses we offer for the current General Education program would likely disappear in the proposed CAP.

Logistics - Tracking of the required components of the program.

4. What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?

An option for language and intercultural skills should be included. Basic proficiency in a language other than English should be at least an option within the CAP.

5. What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

Our major in languages requires 25 hours at the 300-400 level. Three extra hours will need to be added to the major to accommodate the Disciplinary Capstone experience. Some courses will need to be hybrid courses in French, German or Spanish and English.

6. What resources and or changes would be needed to make that development possible?

Additional faculty and professional development.

7. In particular, what if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

[No responses]

8. What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before
moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?

Inclusion of linguistic diversity and intercultural communication.

Scheduling semester- or year-long study abroad experiences may be difficult with the sequence of courses in the CAP.

Advising will be more complex.

Tracking of service learning experiences. Duquesne University and University of San Francisco use Banner.

Spelling:
- page 11, last paragraph, line 4: of an (a) particular student.
- page 11, last paragraph, lines 5-6: can not (cannot)
- page 28, second line: Department of Language (Languages)

Department of Mathematics

These comments were gleaned from a meeting of the Department of Mathematics and represent a consensus of the Department on some aspects of the CAP.

The Department supports many of the goals of the CAP. We believe that students should know about other cultures, that they should think deeply about current issues, and that doing service is a good thing that should be encouraged and supported. The CAP also provides the Department of Mathematics with opportunities to develop new courses in collaboration with other departments which could better serve the academic goals of the departments and of the CAP. We plan to take advantage of the opportunities which will arise out of whatever version of the CAP is eventually implemented. But we also see many implementation problems with the proposed system. It seems that implementation and oversight will require an enormous amount of work. We also believe that these goals can be reached in better, more efficient ways than some that are proposed.

1. Funding
As the document itself mentions there is some concern about the commitment of the University to funding this ambitious program. Without adequate funding implementation will be impossible.

2. Mathematics should be delivered by the Department of Mathematics
In section III.B.4. of the CAP draft is the following statement. “Ordinarily, courses satisfying the Mathematics requirement will be delivered by the Department of Mathematics.” The word “ordinarily” must be eliminated. The mathematics courses must be delivered by the Mathematics Department to ensure the integrity of the requirement. Also, these courses will someday be assessed, possibly by the Mathematics Department. We do not want to assess courses over which we have no control.

3. Suitability of some CAP requirement for mathematics as a discipline
a. In section III.B.4 of the CAP draft we read that “The CAP exposes all students to ways of knowing practiced in Mathematics and provides a framework for the reciprocal exchange of knowledge between Mathematics and other disciplines.” We are somewhat confused by this sentence. Does “ways of knowing practiced in mathematics” mean “thinking mathematically” or “using a mathematical approach to solve a problem or discover a pattern”?

b. Also in section III.B.4 of the CAP draft we see that courses “satisfying the CAP Mathematics requirement [should] enhance an awareness of the relationships between mathematics, the other disciplines, and societal issues. The CAP Mathematics course addresses the student learning outcomes on scholarship and critical evaluation of our times.” It seems reasonable that physics or engineering majors would have MTH 168 (Calculus and Analytic Geometry I) as a CAP mathematics course. But these courses don’t address societal issues, unless applications of calculus to physics or engineering are considered societal issues. Will every CAP mathematics course really be expected to address societal issues? We are concerned about the portion of the course that will be required to pertain to societal issues and how such content would be assessed. Will students from science or engineering units who already take many hours of mathematics be expected to add yet another course that can address societal issues, or are we expected to somehow fit a societal issue into a course in which we already struggle to cover the necessary topics within a semester?

c. Does the Communication requirement of the CAP refer only to oral communication? If mathematics majors take courses from the Communications Department, would working on our majors’ written communication skills be sufficient to satisfy the CAP Communication requirement? Getting our students to write mathematics in a clear and precise fashion is an important part of our courses, but we are not sure that this is what is meant by CAP Communication. If, in fact, this does count as communication, would we need to demonstrate how this is a part of our curriculum, or would we need to give samples of students’ work to demonstrate that the communication is taking place? Would we need to show that every student is communicating mathematics well?

d. We believe that it is a mistake to tie service to the major. One problem is in finding significant service that is actually related to the major. This is true in mathematics. One might think that having students provide tutoring to under-privileged elementary or high school students would be an obvious solution. But we have tried to arrange such tutoring in the past without success. One needs the cooperation of school systems and students in order to do this. Another problem is that this discourages students from participating in excellent service opportunities because they will not count for the CAP Service Learning requirement. Yet another problem is deciding how much service and how much learning should be present in the project. It would be very easy in mathematics to have a project in which either very little service is done or very little mathematics is learned. And how does one assess these things? This would seem to place yet another burden on the faculty. When the students leave the university and begin their careers, almost none of them will engage in service that is directly related to their career. They will build a house with Habitat for Humanity, clean up a park, volunteer at a hospital or nursing home, or help coach a community sports team. All of these things are made of lesser value under the CAP, because they are not related to the major. This comment should not be viewed as being negative towards
service or service learning. We will certainly look for service opportunities and take advantage of them with enthusiasm whenever we can. Rather it is saying that service is important and should be done in a way that makes the service of value for the server and the served. We believe that tying the service to the major does not accomplish that goal.

e. In Section IV.B.3 is the following sentence. “With curriculum in place, support will be required for faculty development to insure that all faculty understand the CAP and are prepared to draw connections to the CAP in their in-major courses.” Does this mean that faculty members are expected to draw connections to the CAP from in-major courses? Will this have to be assessed?

f. The Department of Mathematics cannot cover our courses without using part time instructors. There does not seem to be a good way to train a part time instructor to deliver the kinds of things asked for in the CAP. Would other departments face this problem?

g. Given the description of a CAP mathematics course, can the CAP Mathematics requirement be satisfied by EM credit or transfer credit? The document recommends against this. This means that we could see a student enroll with a 5 on an AP Calculus BC test or transfer in with at least a full year of calculus and be forced to take MTH 114, a course whose content is, mathematically, far below the abilities of the student.

4. Other possible implementation problems

a. Could having students take a professional examination, such that the actuarial examinations, or the subject GRE test count as a capstone experience?

b. The Department of Mathematics does not currently have a capstone experience. We know from mathematics departments that do have such experiences or courses that the burden often falls on one or two members of the department. Taking on this burden as well as carrying a usual load would be an unreasonable expectation. On the other hand, we don’t have enough regular faculty members to assign such a course or experience as one of the teaching assignments. Is the university willing to consider an additional faculty line so that we can cover a capstone experience in a significant way without compromising our regular curriculum?

c. It is not unusual for a student to be a double major in mathematics and something else. Will such students have to do two of some CAP requirements which are tied to the major?

d. This is related to Service Learning. It is very important for our students to be in the classroom with us, so we believe that students should not be taken out of one class to perform service related to another class or to no class at all. This is commonly done in high school, and we would be sorry to see that model repeated in a university.

e. Diversity seems to be a very individual aspect of a student’s experience, so it seems that the Diversity Requirement will be done on an individual basis. What is diversity for one student may not be diversity for another. We assume that the burden for ensuring that this is accomplished will fall on the advisors. Will anyone be watching over the advisors to make sure that a true
diversity experience is had by the student? Does this mean that some committee will have to evaluate every student’s program to make sure that diversity is truly satisfied? This seems unworkable, but without it this would be an easy requirement to sidestep.

f. QRC could present problems. As we mentioned earlier, we see possibilities for mathematics courses within the CAP. Our History of Mathematics course, MTH 395, could address diversity and possibly a critical evaluation of our times, depending on how those are interpreted. MTH 114, Contemporary Mathematics, has units which could address a critical evaluation of our times. There are other courses which could be developed. Many of them would be appropriate for BA students. MTH 114 is a course which satisfies a QRC requirement, but MTH 395 does not and would not under the current or proposed implementations of QRC. The new courses that we develop likely would not satisfy a QRC requirement under either implementation. We wonder how many BA students would be willing to take an extra mathematics class.

g. In Section IV.B.4 we read that “significant contributions to curriculum revision and co-curricular planning must be supported generously (e.g., through course releases or summer salary) so that faculty working toward tenure or promotion have sufficient time and receive due recognition for such activities.” Will CAP courses be given more weight than courses not connected to CAP? Will unit tenure and promotion procedures need to be rewritten to reflect this?

h. Section IV.B.7 says that each unit “will be required to also develop a process for demonstrating success of students achieving CAP outcomes in their majors.” This seems to be moving the requirements from a general education setting to the individual major setting. Or does this mean that the departments are responsible for keeping track of which CAP requirements their majors have satisfied?

DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC
Submitted by Sharon Davis Gratto, Department Chair (December, 2008)

Response to Questions:

1. The Department of Music’s program and curriculum is currently aligned with the provisions of the CAP proposal in the following ways:
   a. **Disciplinary capstone** – culminating ensemble performances at the end of each semester of the academic year; senior recitals in all music degree programs; weekly Friday at 1 recital performances for students engaged in studio music instruction; jury examinations for music majors taking studio instruction
   b. **Diversity learning requirement** – a required one-semester World Music survey course for music majors; diverse course and ensemble opportunities in the curriculum for majors and non-majors, including a World Music Choir, Jazz and Percussion ensembles, a Javanese Gamelan, a Gospel Choir, and an African American Music course
   c. **Communications** – written and oral communication skill development across the music curriculum with instructive feedback and assessment, including:
Individual public presentations in Friday at 1 recitals, master classes, junior/senior recitals, semester jury examinations

Group public choral and instrumental performances by large and small ensembles

Critical communication in weekly master classes and studio lessons

Critical writing in required semester concert reports and in musicology, ethnomusicology, and analysis classes

Group leadership in classes in conducting and through degree program organizations positions and ensemble leadership positions Music Therapy students – clinical interaction and case presentations, clinical language development, internships, related written work including reflective journals

Music Education students – Pre-K through grade 12 field experiences including pre-student teaching practicum teaching, method class pedagogy experiences to develop lesson and unit plans and teacher presentation skills, student teaching semester in the public schools, related written work including reflective journals

Composition students - creative presentations

d. Arts Study – a concentrated arts curriculum for music students that also often includes elements of visual arts and theater (i.e….visual arts and architecture in Musicology courses, the theater component of the Opera Workshop class); the planned addition of Eurhythmics instruction for a movement component in the curriculum

e. Service Learning – multiple opportunities for music students to perform and serve off-campus communities (i.e….Music Therapy clinical work and internships, Music Education field work and student teaching, Dayton area ensemble performances)

2. The following components of the CAP program should be considered strengths and worth pursuing: service learning requirement, disciplinary capstone, diversity requirement, the continuation of a required religion course

3. The following components of the CAP program should be considered weaknesses and be discarded: the arts course; the CAP integrative course; the loss of one double counting Music History course in an already over-crowded Music Education certification program; the loss of existing arts courses for non-majors that are in place and work very well, such as Music in Concert

The remaining questions are addressed in the following general comments:

The CAP proposal reflects the need to improve the current general education curriculum. It causes one to wonder, however, if the current curriculum needs to be changed so dramatically. Does the CAP proposal represent change simply for change sake? While the CAP proposal includes some lofty and valuable curricular goals, it seems weak in its inability to decide whether it is a goals-based curriculum or a ‘check-off’ list of requirements that students must satisfy. Diversity and service learning requirements, for example, should be integrated throughout the curriculum and not just be satisfied by one course or a single experience. Students should also be able to identify and pair courses that provide them with integrative experiences rather than satisfying this requirement through a single course. The proposal risks marginalizing diversity, arts education, and service learning and could serve to dilute what we already have in place in our department that works well.
Another major concern about the CAP proposal is how it will be assessed. How will faculty know that they are accomplishing the expected outcomes or being successful in addressing the University’s seven Habits of Inquiry and Reflection? What is the assessment process? Is an assessment process part of the plan?

The proposed arts course is of great concern for music faculty because it suggests a superficial scenario in which students will simply dabble in the arts for a short period of time and not explore individual arts disciplines in any depth. This will be especially true if students are expected to engage in active arts experiences as part of a single arts course. Music faculty view this course as an ‘appetizer’ that replaces what could and should be a ‘full meal.’ Music faculty wonder if anyone did the math before proposing this single arts course. How will 60 sections of the course per year be taught and administered? Who will teach all of the sections? What are the implications for faculty load and for tenure and promotion? How will faculty be trained to teach the course? What professional development opportunities will be available for faculty who teach the course? Will there be course release and common planning time to prepare to teach this course? How will the unique equipment and space needs of such an arts course be addressed? Could a four semester required sequence of studio instruction or an ensemble experience substitute for the arts course? Will this course be taught in three sections by three different faculty members in music, visual arts, and theater or will faculty members in three disciplines meet, develop, and work together to create a real integrated arts experience?

**Department of Philosophy**

**Section I: Philosophy and the Catholic and Marianist Intellectual Tradition**

Before we refashion the philosophy general education requirement at the University of Dayton, it is important to recall why philosophy has been required at Catholic universities for 800 years. Philosophy alone was the central discipline at Catholic universities, including the University of Dayton, until the middle of the twentieth century. Theology, later called Religious Studies at many institutions, only became a university discipline at American Catholic universities in the middle of the twentieth century. According to Philip Gleason, the senior historian of Catholic higher education, theology was taught at seminaries and not at American Catholic universities until the latter half of the 20th century. Until then, philosophy was the sole foundational discipline that provided the ‘curricular lynchpin’ of American Catholic higher education. This much praised model


led to the creation of the University of Chicago Great Books Program. Keeping the history of Catholic higher education in mind is important if we are to understand the current role that philosophy plays at the University of Dayton. We need to consider why philosophy has been and is central to Catholic universities. Only then are we prepared to reconsider the place of philosophy in our future general education program.

Theology was introduced as a university discipline in order that American Catholic universities might educate students not only in reason, but also in faith, in fact in both faith and reason. First philosophy alone, and then philosophy and theology/religious studies together, played the critical role in the education of undergraduates at Catholic universities including the University of Dayton. These two disciplines have provided the most striking academic feature of America Catholic university education, but in different ways, as is evident at every top Catholic university in our country and in our own current GE requirements. There is a complex history here that has grown as these two disciplines have grown and changed over the last 50 years. In large part, this is a history of Catholic universities striving to become universities of national excellence. And this history continues as the Catholic Church calls once again for Catholic universities, and all universities, to place philosophy at the center of the curriculum. We at UD ought to take this call into account before we reconfigure our general education curriculum, if we are to continue to look like and be a Catholic university.

Before the Second World War, Catholic universities in North America did not house faith within a required university discipline. Faith was something that virtually all students and faculty shared in common outside of the classroom, but not in the curriculum in an organized academic sense. One of the great intellectual stories about American Catholic university education has to do with why in the 20th century we came to think that the academic study of theology should no longer only be reserved for priests at the seminary but also be a central part of every student’s university education. This was a new idea, that all undergraduates should study theology in order to understand faith. And this goal came to reconfigure the shape of theology as theology was reconstructed for a largely lay audience.

For centuries, philosophy had been the significant discipline for graduates of Catholic institutions of higher learning because it provided a unified view of all knowledge and also an understanding of ethics. For Catholic institutions, philosophy connected all disciplines within a unified search for knowledge with implications for practical wisdom and ethics. After the Reformation, philosophy at Catholic institutions represented a Catholic commitment to knowledge over and against what was thought to be a Protestant one-sided commitment to faith and fideist positions. The Catholic tradition of university education is a longstanding intellectual tradition that embraced many of the figures of modern science like the Catholic priests Copernicus and Kepler, and philosophers and scientists like Descartes and Pascal. Contrary to some popular belief, this commitment to reason continued throughout the Enlightenment and into the 19th century. Late in the 19th century Catholic universities came to construe reason differently, as Pope Leo XIII called on Catholic institutions to embrace the philosophy and theology of St. Thomas Aquinas in order to provide a unified response to the modern world. While this change altered the canon of philosophical authorities it did not change the Catholic commitment to a unified search for truth wherever it could be found and to an education founded
on the liberal arts. This is the model that was taken up in the Great Books programs by the University of Chicago and other academic institutions.

After the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s, Catholic universities no longer had to respond to the modern world as if it were a threat but were encouraged to embrace the world and new types of knowledge in search of the signs of our times. Look around at the faculty at UD and you will see the excellence that resulted from this shift at our university. Dayton hired remarkable researchers and teachers from many of the best universities. These new faculty members have changed UD’s landscape and its rankings among universities. We have become excellent on many fronts and strive to become even more so, an excellent national Catholic university. The difference between the quality and the quantity of the scholarship that faculty members produced in the 1950s and 1960s and today is phenomenal.

In the 1960s philosophy and theology/religious studies departments at Catholic universities underwent transformation when they no longer were required to teach the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas. This transition was not without strife. In 1966 our own philosophy department was the locus of the most important heresy hearings in our country, ultimately involving our president Fr. Roesch and the bishop himself. Many of the changes that occurred represented a revolution in the thought patterns of the previous century and led to our current level of philosophical excellence. Since philosophy and religious studies no longer needed to focus on St. Thomas, UD had to rethink the content and direction of these disciplines. American Catholic universities, including UD, continue to experiment in this direction as they hire new faculty and create new courses. This experimentation and exploration will continue for some time because it has to do with our aim of becoming an excellent national Catholic university. There are no guidebooks on how to do this. For example, Catholic universities, including UD, now once again hire philosophers who are conversant with contemporary philosophy and contemporary intellectual issues in science, the arts, religion, and the professional schools. This pattern represents change for a Catholic institution because it concerns hiring faculty who are trained in disciplines that are conversant with their times. In philosophy we have hired faculty members in recent decades from places like the Universities of Chicago, Cincinnati, and Boston, as well as Emory, Fordham, and Princeton. Our faculty members publish at a very high level for the discipline in comparison with places that have a much lower teaching load. On many scores, we have successfully brought philosophy at Dayton into the 21st century. This is the experimental side of the Catholic intellectual tradition, one that continues to breathe at the University of Dayton.

The American Catholic tradition of higher education, as is evident at our Catholic competitors and in our present curriculum, is one of both faith and reason. In simple terms this means that philosophy provides an understanding of reason and knowledge and religious studies provides the faith component. This division is clearly evident at our more highly ranked Catholic competitors. Each of these universities requires that undergraduates take on average 2 courses in philosophy and 2 in religious studies/theology in order to cover the foundational areas of faith

---

4 Gleason, *Contending With Modernity*, pp. 310-312. Indicative of change, UD had already granted MAs in philosophy for almost 50 years, and now began for the first time to offer MAs in theology.
and reason.  At present, Dayton allows more freedom than some of these institutions, but ends up with the same result. After the introductions to the disciplines, students at UD can choose whether to take two further courses in philosophy or religious studies. Our records of enrollment indicate that UD undergraduates take on average slightly more than 2 philosophy classes. Recent graduates have taken from 2.06 to 2.33 to complete their degrees. This means that our students opt approximately one-half the time to take philosophy to complete their GE requirements. Our current practice in philosophy is therefore in line with the more highly ranked Catholic universities that are our competitors. Our requirement for taking philosophy and religious studies

---

5 See the chart on page 24 of this report “Undergraduate Core Requirements at several other Catholic Universities.”

6 Average Number of Philosophy Courses Sorted by Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2005 Cohort @ UD in 08/FA</th>
<th>2004 Cohort @ UD in 07/FA</th>
<th>2003 Cohort @ UD in 06/FA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>PHL Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is a large part of what makes UD different from Miami University or Ohio State, and more like Notre Dame, Boston College, and Fordham. But should we continue this Catholic style of university education? Should we, as CAP suggests, depart from the current American Catholic university practice and only require that students take one course in philosophy? If we do this, then what will be the impact on the rigor of our general education and on the logical skills of our students? If humanities education is up for grabs after the first year as CAP proposes, our students will lack the sort of logical skills that philosophy provides, and has always provided, in the Catholic context.

The Case for Philosophy
We need to consider what skills philosophy offers to our students and whether these skills continue to be important for Catholic and Marianist education. As more and more faculty at Dayton are not the product of Catholic higher education and so may not understand the role that philosophy plays at Catholic universities, the role of philosophy at our Catholic university can appear odd. But there are important reasons why philosophy continues to be a central discipline at Catholic universities, and should continue to be central at UD. These reasons are not unrelated to why it is that doctoral degrees are often called PhDs. Many university disciplines began as and long remained part of philosophy departments before becoming independent disciplines.

This observation is of more than merely historical interest. One result of the origin of university disciplines is that the serious study of many a discipline’s theory and conceptual issues are still carried out in philosophy, even when these disciplines are now independent from philosophy. Often the theory of a discipline remains in philosophy or the study of those conceptual issues, both of which are rarely encountered within the discipline itself. For this reason philosophy continues to be of central importance for universities as a whole. No other single discipline functions in this way, and this is the longstanding hallmark of Catholic education. For example, abstract scientific theory is normally taught and researched by philosophers and not within the departments of the hard sciences. The great authors of scientific theory in the 20th century like Karl Popper and Thomas Kuhn were philosophers. It is also the reason why philosophers often pioneer areas that become important in the social sciences. For example, John Rawls worked out the most important account of justice in the late 20th century, a theory that continues to have implications for political science and sociology. Another example is the pioneering American philosophical
work on Aristotle’s view of theoretical and practical wisdom, the very work that we are holding up as a central learning outcome for the University of Dayton.\(^7\) New philosophical work on community and the common good is important for political science and sociology. Philosophical scholarship on human persons continues to have import for psychology. Cognitive psychology is one example of the latter. For the arts, aesthetics is normally housed in departments of philosophy. For example, philosophers like Noël Carroll and Stanley Cavell have made significant contributions to film theory. The academic institutions in our country that highlight these connections and levels of integration are either Catholic or places that value the liberal arts.

Active departments of philosophy at Catholic universities like our own continue to connect and deepen learning and provide students with foundational theoretical courses like philosophy of science, philosophy of ecology, philosophy of mind, social philosophy, philosophy of law, political philosophy, philosophy and human rights, values and economics, philosophy of religion, philosophy of art, philosophy and literature, philosophy and music, and philosophy and film. As it stands now, CAP does not highlight the theoretical direction of university education. It is unclear how many of these courses would fit into CAP. But theory has been and is one of the core endeavors of excellent American Catholic universities and sets them apart from other universities. In fact, national Catholic universities are noted for providing this important model as a real option for university education today.

Philosophy gives students a chance to consider new directions and general issues in fields where such things are often not encountered until graduate education or after years of active experience. From this standpoint, philosophy continues to be very much the ‘curricular lynchpin’ of Catholic higher education. For example, there are not many non-Catholic universities the size of UD that offer students such varied opportunities for interdisciplinary connections to their major and vocation. Philosophy continues in many ways to be the central discipline that cooperates with other disciplines. This cooperation arises out of the structure and history of the discipline itself, and has important implications for our own institution as a whole.

In light of student learning and how to think through the signs of our times, philosophy is notable as a discipline that draws on and extends the best tools of our age to treat current theoretical and moral issues. Like engineering, but open to all disciplines, philosophy uses contemporary means to prepare students to solve problems in our contemporary world. This is the achievement of philosophy at Catholic institutions since the 1960s. For example, we prepare students to reflect on current views of scientific causality or on the role that the brain plays in regard to personhood so that they can understand and improve the place and environment of human beings in the world today. Philosophy gives students a chance not only to study an area of knowledge but also to participate in and work on current live issues. Philosophy does this because it is a discipline that prepares students to construct their own well-reasoned positions on both long-standing and newly emerging controversies. Once introduced to a topic and an issue, students gain practice at throwing themselves into big and important questions that are

foundational for different disciplines and for life-long learning. Philosophy prepares one for the problem solving that arises in different disciplines and vocations.

The Catholic Church at the highest level continues to defend a central role for philosophy in all undergraduate higher education. It has been 10 years since John Paul II put out his call for Catholic higher education to support the study of both faith and reason in his important encyclical *Fides et Ratio*, hence the title. Pope Benedict XVI marked the 10th anniversary of this wake-up call for rationality this summer in a talk that he gave at the Sixth European Symposium for University Professors titled "Widen the horizons of rationality: Perspectives for Philosophy." Because many university personnel no longer realize that philosophy is central to a university education, Benedict proclaimed “the urgency of relaunching the study of philosophy [at] universities.”

Pope Benedict urges us to “relaunch” the study of philosophy and to make it central for all undergraduate university education. This is an important point for Catholic universities and for our present reconsideration of General Education. What is interesting at present is the reason that Benedict gives for the central importance of philosophy in higher education. Benedict highlights that the study of philosophy prepares students to understand human nature in its present day complexity and circumstances. He notes that there are new issues and situations that require that we rethink what it means to be human. This includes understanding human nature afresh, and by extension, our environment. On this theme Benedict makes the important point that we cannot rest on our laurels but must continue to work out a rational understanding of human nature for our times:

> Modernity, if well understood, reveals an "anthropological question" that presents itself in a much more complex and articulated way than what has taken place in the philosophical reflections of the last centuries, above all in Europe. Without diminishing the attempts made, much still remains to be probed and understood. Modernity is not simply a cultural phenomenon, historically dated; in reality it implies a new planning, a more exact understanding of human nature.

For Benedict, there is an urgency for both students and faculty, especially at Catholic institutions, to use those contemporary philosophical tools at hand in order to make sense of ourselves and our place in the world as both we and the world continue to change in ways difficult to foresee. This is a theoretical enterprise open to many of the arts and sciences that has been a central theme of our own humanities general education and in which philosophy plays a special conceptual and logical role. From the Catholic perspective, philosophy provides the reason of “faith and reason.” It is important for students to gain experience in critically thinking through and reading the signs of our times.

This project also has implications for grasping the divine. For example, Benedict refers to his own recent dialogues with important philosophers in the very next sentence where

---
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he indicates that philosophy is open to the divine. He points to philosophical authors and notes that a regard for religion and Christianity arises out of philosophy itself: “Giving credit to some authors’ proposals in regard to religions and in particular to Christianity, is an evident sign of the sincere desire to exist from the self-sufficiency of philosophical reflection.” According to Benedict XVI the academic discipline of philosophy is significant for gaining a contemporary understanding of human beings and God. This corresponds to our practice at Dayton where philosophy handles rational issues in relation to the divine that are seldom treated in religious studies. Unlike decades ago, faculty members in philosophy at UD today carry out research on the encounter of faith and reason that has been recognized nationally and internationally. Publications of this sort were rare among UD philosophers in the past. UD’s five history of philosophy classes cover the history of Christian thought, including many of the individuals that Christian theologians from the beginning to the present take up and extend. Furthermore, our attempt this year to hire a philosopher on Asian, Islamic, South American, or Native American thought reflects our promotion of the study of religious and intellectual diversity. We often offer classes like Medieval Philosophy (includes Christian, Jewish, and Islamic), Asian Philosophy, Islamic Philosophy and Culture, and African Philosophy. All this suggests that philosophy at UD reflects a commitment to religion and especially to Catholicism in the manner that Pope Benedict deems important. Continuing to require philosophy beyond the Humanities Base at the University of Dayton offers students opportunities and motivation to evaluate human nature and creation in relation to their own disciplines in the manner that Catholic universities have fostered for 800 years. Philosophy allows UD to provide an education not of faith alone, but of faith and reason in the Catholic tradition of higher education. To provide reason with a lesser role in General Education, as CAP suggests, assumes that Catholic education rests largely on faith and thus fundamentally misunderstands the Catholic tradition of university education. This does not mean that there are not new ways that philosophy could work at the University of Dayton, but that we should continue to respect the Roman Catholic commitment to both faith and reason.

Section II: Response to Senate Document 08-01: The Common Academic Program

In formulating a response to the current proposal, the faculty of the Department of Philosophy begin with this understanding of the role of philosophy in the Catholic Intellectual Tradition. In addition, we begin with an appreciation of the importance of all of humanities for the transmission of this tradition and for providing an excellent education in the context of the Catholic Intellectual Tradition. In formulating this response, the Department formed working groups to address specific aspects of the proposal. Those groups submitted reports to the Advisory Committee who then drafted this document. The final form of this response was approved at a meeting of the Department on December 8, 2008. Our response is organized to address the questions posed to the community while also focusing on issues that we believe to be most significant.

II. A. An Assessment of the Current Curriculum

In the context of its commitment to the Catholic Intellectual Tradition, the University has built strong departments in the humanities. The Department of Philosophy at the University of Dayton is one of the strongest and most pluralistic undergraduate faculties in the country. It has long served the students of the University by helping them learn and strengthen capabilities needed for the life-long task of developing the virtue of
practical wisdom. This virtue, like all intellectual and moral habits, is a practice that can help realize a goal. As an academic institution, the University has as its primary goal, the pursuit of truth and the dissemination of knowledge. It is responsible for preserving and transmitting the best of the past and of the traditions that inform this past, for exploring the current situation and defining responses called for by that situation, and for preparing students for the future. The following is a summary of some of the ways in which the humanities and the Department of Philosophy in particular, are already accomplishing the development of the identified habits of inquiry. It should be noted that in delivering both general education courses and courses for our majors and minors, we are addressing additional outcomes which are specific to the content of the various disciplines and courses. In addition, the Philosophy Department has regularly worked in conjunction with other disciplines throughout the University to create courses that address dimensions of theory and values in these fields. We will, of course, continue with this collaboration.

1. **Scholarship:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity through the production of a body of artistic, scholarly or community-based work intended for public presentation and defense.

The Humanities Base Program introduces students to the humanities disciplines in a manner that lays the foundation for habits of disciplinary and interdisciplinary inquiry. The Departments of History, Philosophy, Religious Studies, and English have developed a unique and rigorous program that sets a tone for the development of more advanced academic inquiry in all disciplines. The integrity of disciplinary study is maintained while connections and integration are carried out by means of the over-arching question of what it means to be human. Philosophy plays an important role in this first year. Our courses are often considered the most rigorous. Our full-time faculty teach in this first year and so students in all majors are exposed to models of rigorous inquiry.

Our upper-level courses continue to enable students in all disciplines to develop critical thinking and writing skills that are important for their own disciplines and majors. All of our courses emphasize the importance of reading primary texts. Ethics courses are particularly important for students in the professional schools. We have recently hired someone in philosophy of science to help enhance the education of our science majors. Courses in philosophy of film, art, music, and literature help students reflect on the creative aspects of human life and on their own creative work.

While philosophy contributes to the development of the scholarship and critical capabilities of students in many majors, we also have a strong undergraduate major with a number of tracks. Our own majors produce scholarly papers as part of advanced seminars and thesis work. Majors have presented papers at student conferences at other Universities as well as at the Stander symposium.

It is also worth noting that the University currently has a very strong competencies requirement that was carefully developed. That requirement is far more than the requirement of some courses. The general literacy competencies have been integrated into many places in the curriculum. We are unique in having a communication competency requirement, and employers often praise the
abilities of our graduates in this area. We have a rich understanding of competencies on which we need to build.

2. **Faith traditions:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to engage in intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical inquiry regarding major faith traditions. Students will be familiar with the basic theological understandings and central texts that shape Catholic beliefs and teachings, practices, and spiritualities. Students’ abilities should be developed sufficiently to allow them to examine deeply their own faith commitments and also to participate intelligently and respectfully in dialogue with other traditions.

All students address questions about the relationship of faith and reason in their Humanities Base classes. Introductory philosophy classes are particularly important for helping students develop the critical skills needed to engage in reasoned and civil discussion of these issues. Some of our introductory courses engage students in the exploration of non-Christian traditions and the ways in which those traditions address the question of what it means to be human. The Core Program humanities base weaves the philosophical and faith traditions, including the Catholic tradition, with history to provide students with a particularly strong foundation for further development of this inquiry.

Many of our upper level courses also provide students from all majors the opportunity to explore a range of religious traditions. Many of these traditions do not draw a clear distinction between philosophy and religious practice or faith. Our courses in Ancient Philosophy, Medieval Philosophy, Metaphysics, Christian Philosophy, Philosophy of Religion, Existentialism, Asian Philosophy, African Philosophy, and Islamic Philosophy and Culture all contribute to this goal. In addition, the Department is in the process of hiring a new faculty member in non-Western philosophy. Our own major provides the possibility for following a track in “Religion, Mind, and Metaphysics.”

3. **Diversity:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical understanding of the cultures, histories, times, and places of multiple others, as marked by class, race, gender, ethnicity, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, and other manifestations of difference. Students’ understanding will reflect scholarly inquiry, experiential immersion, and disciplined reflection.

Many of our courses contribute to this goal. In the Humanities Base, history courses have moved to clearly address the West in the world. Many introductory philosophy courses also introduce students to diverse voices including discussions of race, gender, sexual orientation, and diverse cultures. The theme of the individual and community is frequently used to have students address the diversity of communities. The clusters all focus on this goal and so the courses that we have developed for the various clusters contribute to a scholarly inquiry of diversity. Some of our courses which particularly contribute to this goal are: Philosophy of Human Nature; Philosophy and Women; Social Philosophy; Philosophy of Religion; Philosophy of Art; Philosophy and Literature; Philosophy of Music; Philosophy of Peace; Philosophy of Punishment; Asian Philosophy; Christian Philosophy; American Philosophy; African Philosophy; Race, Gender, and Philosophy; Islamic Philosophy and Culture; Political Philosophy; Philosophy and Human Rights; Science, Objectivity and Values; Values and Economics; and Philosophy and Cultural
Diversity.

In addition, the current structure of General Education allows students to develop minors that contribute to this goal. These include Africana Studies, Women’s and Gender Studies, and Human Rights. Courses in the Department of Philosophy are fundamental to these minors, as well as to the majors in Women’s and Gender Studies and in Human Rights. Our major includes a track in “Culture and Human Diversity.”

4. Community: All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate understanding of and practice in the values and skills necessary for learning, living, and working in communities of support and challenge. These values and skills include accepting difference, resolving conflicts peacefully, and promoting reconciliation; they encompass productive, discerning, creative, and respectful collaboration with persons from diverse backgrounds and perspectives for the common purpose of learning, service, and leadership that aim at just social transformation. Students will demonstrate these values and skills on campus and in the Dayton region as part of their preparation for global citizenship.

This goal is closely related to the diversity goal, so much of the response to goal #3 is also applicable here. Many faculty in the Department have developed service-learning components for appropriate courses which also contribute to this goal. In addition, many faculty have been involved in the learning/living communities. Our faculty worked with faculty in History as early as the 2000-2001 academic year to pilot a learning/living community. A number of our faculty have worked with some of the most recent learning and living communities, including playing a central role in the Core Program. Many of our upper-level courses contribute to this goal. These include: Social Philosophy, Political Philosophy, Philosophy of Peace, Ethics and Modern War, Philosophy of Punishment, and Philosophy of Law. Our major includes a track in “Ethics and Social Justice.” Many of our majors participate in service organizations where they take leadership.

5. Practical wisdom: All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate practical wisdom in addressing real human problems and deep human needs, drawing upon advanced knowledge, values, and skills in their chosen profession or major course of study. Starting with a conception of human flourishing, students will be able to define and diagnose symptoms, relationships, and problems clearly and intelligently, construct and evaluate possible solutions, thoughtfully select and implement solutions, and critically reflect on the process in light of actual consequences.

The virtue of practical wisdom, as understood within the Catholic Intellectual Tradition, has its roots in Aristotelian and Thomistic philosophy. In order to develop this virtue, one must critically reflect on the nature of human good and how to achieve such good. The Humanities Base courses, by asking students to reflect on what it means to be human, begin this reflection. The Department of Philosophy has developed a wide range of 300-level courses that enable students to engage in further such reflections in relationship to their majors. These courses deal with ethics and values. We work with departments and programs to develop appropriate courses for students in a range of majors. These include: Medical Ethics; Environmental Ethics; Business Ethics; Engineering Ethics; Information Ethics; Family Ethics; Science, Objectivity and Values;
Technology and Values; Philosophy of Science; and Philosophy and Ecology. We also provide students with the opportunity to hone their logical skills in both Practical and Symbolic Logic. In addition, our courses enable students to develop critical imaginations in courses such as Philosophy of Art, Philosophy of Music, Philosophy and Literature, Philosophy and Film, and Philosophy of Peace. (See Section II.B of this report for further discussion of practical wisdom.)

6. Critical evaluation of our times: Through multidisciplinary study, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate habits of inquiry and reflection, informed by familiarity with Catholic Social Teaching, that equip them to evaluate critically and imaginatively the ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, and ecological challenges of their times in light of the past.

Philosophy is particularly important for the development of the critical reflection needed in the contemporary world. Students in our classes often comment that their philosophy courses are one of the few places where they can do their own thinking about what is happening in the world and how best to understand and respond to this world. It is worth noting that the humanities courses in history are also fundamental to achieving this goal. Our majors profit greatly from courses offered by the Department of History. Moreover, collaboration with other humanities departments as well as with social science faculty has resulted in the development of interdisciplinary minors that address this goal. In particular, the minor, and now the major, in Human Rights enable students to address the social issues of vital importance for contemporary times. Other integrated learning experiences such as Core and SEE have also been supported by faculty in philosophy. In addition, faculty in philosophy have played a key role in developing the minor in Marianist Social Transformation. Our major provides several tracks which especially contribute to the achievement of this goal. These include: “Ethics and Social Justice,” “Science, Technology, and Values,” and “Culture and Human Diversity.”

7. Vocation: Using appropriate scholarly and communal resources, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to articulate reflectively the purposes of their life and proposed work through the language of vocation. In collaboration with the university community, students’ developing vocational plans will exhibit appreciation of the fullness of human life, including its intellectual, ethical, spiritual, aesthetic, social, emotional, and bodily dimensions, and will examine both the interdependence of self and community and the responsibility to live in service of others.

The Humanities Base curriculum encourages students to begin to think about these matters, and some faculty have worked to introduce the theme of vocation into the Base. However, this goal is one that is best achieved through advising and mentoring. It is in close work with faculty in a specific discipline that students begin to make career and life vocation decisions. Our majors are reflective in choosing their careers and life directions. We have students who go on to develop lives in teaching, medicine, law, and community service. Philosophy ultimately pushes one to self-examination.

II. B. Towards Student Understanding and Exercise of Practical Wisdom
The proposal for a Common Academic Program as it stands does not stress the importance of the sciences or theory as one of the prerequisites for the life of practical wisdom. It does not make
clear that each student should encounter the humanities in tandem with the social and physical sciences in order to consider that all knowledge and all academic study are required to carry out practical wisdom. To this end it helps to recall the use of the words “human flourishing”, a technical expression, in the statement on practical wisdom in our Habits of Inquiry and Reflection:

Practical wisdom: All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate practical wisdom in addressing real human problems and deep human needs, drawing upon advanced knowledge, values, and skills in their chosen profession or major course of study. Starting with a conception of human flourishing, students will be able to define and diagnose symptoms, relationships, and problems clearly and intelligently, construct and evaluate possible solutions, thoughtfully select and implement solutions, and critically reflect on the process in light of actual consequences.

The concept of “human flourishing” carries much of the intellectual weight of the reemergence of practical wisdom over the last 28 years. It is a complex concept that concerns human biology and behavior together with the environment and our place in the world. Many concerns arise across individual, social, and environmental levels if we are to educate students to understand and promote human flourishing. In order to build proper habits of inquiry that prepare students for a life of practical wisdom, our university should offer every student an education that bridges the humanities and the sciences broadly conceived in a careful and intellectually respectable way. Practical wisdom drives CAP as a whole but is not presented in the proposal with the clarity needed for either a general university audience or our curriculum. According to those who work on practical wisdom (John Inglis has some experience, see below9), the development and exercise of practical wisdom do not occur in isolation, but within a wider intellectual and historical context of science and theory that empowers one to understand what it means to talk about human flourishing.

Importantly, there is an intellectual understanding of the world that frames practical wisdom and suggests how it needs to work. This wide-ranging view is that the arts and the sciences fit together in an interlocking intellectual vision of what is needed in order for human beings to do well in our world. Academics in the 19th and 20th centuries opposed a key component of this view by arguing that religion, art, and ethics have no intellectual foundation and exist apart from the sciences. They followed David Hume’s view that one cannot arrive at how we ought to live from looking at how things are (“No ought from an is”). This view that has so governed many academic discussions up to the present locates ethics, religion, and art outside the purview of a knowledge-based university education. From this perspective, academics often consider that religion, ethics, and art exist largely in the area of human feeling and not within disciplines that involve scientific knowledge. Individuals like Alasdair MacIntyre reintroduced a wider understanding of knowledge and science in the early 1980s, one in which science stands
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in close relation to practical wisdom and the flourishing of human beings. Significantly, this intellectual project does not begin with practical wisdom in isolation from science and theory, but with broader intellectual issues that stretch across the sciences and have important consequences for practical wisdom and ethics.

If we are going to raise practical wisdom to a significant learning outcome at our university, we need to communicate this important and complex way of seeing the world to our students. We, faculty and students, need to work through and consider why it is important to study biology, sociology, physics, political science, geology, and the other sciences in order to arrive at informed ethical judgments that apply to our world. For example, biology has ethical implications that concern us all. Biological knowledge is important for practical wisdom and the ability of human beings to flourish ethically. Furthermore, since mathematics is central to many sciences and areas of life, it is also important for the learning outcome of practical wisdom.

The humanities can provide the intellectual framework for understanding that all knowledge is interconnected and that practical wisdom works only if it stands in relation to science. That is what Hume was thought to deny. This popular understanding of Hume explains why people at universities—apart from Catholic ones—in the 19th and 20th centuries did not talk much about practical wisdom. In fact, this relationship between science and the practical life has been at the core of the Catholic intellectual tradition for centuries. But in the 1980s, all sorts of academics of different faiths and backgrounds began again to work out a view of practical wisdom that reconnected the sciences with religion and especially ethics.

As part of CAP, the humanities at Dayton should help each student understand how the arts and sciences fit together in order to prepare for a life of practical wisdom. The humanities are particularly well suited to helping students consider and work through this way of seeing the world. For example,

1. It is not accidental that North American philosophers recently reintroduced practical wisdom into the academic discourse or that UD’s Department of Philosophy includes many philosophers trained in this tradition. Philosophy is the discipline where students probe the relationships between science/theory and practical wisdom. Philosophy could offer courses for students to appreciate the relationship of the entire university and their major to the life of practical wisdom. This could steer our university education in the direction of vocation.

2. Historical context is the place where we are able to read the signs of the times, according to 20th-century theologian M.D. Chenu. If we are to adopt a learning outcome of practical wisdom, then students should be trained to embrace the historical context before making ethical judgments. This historical education can focus on those huge changes that allow us to take an interest in people and the environment or be tailored to a specific time and place.

3. Literary study is another crucial place in the humanities where practical reason is fostered. Literature offers imaginative and critical windows into specific issues and other worlds, both real and possible. Literature brings before us the concerns of our age and other ages in unique and compelling ways. In doing this, literature promotes ethical reflection and the development of
creative imagination, both of which are important for social change.

4. Religious Studies could introduce Catholic Social Teaching in the first year, so that other courses and disciplines can more effectively build upon this important learning outcome. (See section II.E.4 below.)

A more robust vision of humanities general education, one that offers points of connection across the arts and the sciences, would improve CAP. Models for how to do this already exist at our more highly-ranked Catholic competitors, like Boston College. For example, while Boston College does not place the same stress on practical wisdom as we seek to do, it does aim to provide an education that embraces the arts and sciences in the direction of one’s majors and vocation.10

II. C. Disciplinary Rigor in the Context of Integrated Learning and Interdisciplinary Teaching

The scholarship outcome, as described in “Habits of Inquiry and Reflection,” rightly requires that all students develop and demonstrate “advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity.” In order to achieve this outcome, students must establish a solid foundation in the diverse modes of inquiry that characterize distinct academic disciplines. Interdisciplinarity is important as well, and CAP’s overall emphasis on interdisciplinarity is admirable. However, we have serious concerns about how the CAP document envisions bringing interdisciplinarity into the early parts of students’ academic careers. In what follows, we address in turn our concerns about disciplinary identity and rigor in CAP as currently drafted, and what we believe experience suggests about the requirements for successful interdisciplinary teaching and learning at UD.

In the interest of broadening and integrating the multi-disciplinary base of the common academic program, the document states that the CAP-Core courses will not be “the standard introductions to a discipline often associated with general education courses” (p. 15). In fact, PHL 103 as currently taught in the Humanities Base is already not quite a standard introduction to the discipline, in that it aims to achieve the stated goals of the Humanities Base, including interdisciplinarity. PHL 103 is designed, as our bylaw states, “to establish connections among the foundational disciplines” via investigation of the four Humanities Base themes. For this reason, PHL 103 tends to emphasize certain subareas of philosophy over others, and many of our faculty members already choose to incorporate substantial elements of interdisciplinarity. Furthermore, we believe that the degree of flexibility that PHL 103 affords us, in contrast to the CAP-Core proposal, allows faculty members to play to their own strengths while introducing students in a substantial and meaningful way to our discipline’s unique mode of inquiry (about which

10 For example, note the different directions available at BC in philosophy and theology/religious studies and how they fit together and in the direction of a student’s major and vocation: http://fmwww.bc.edu/core/largelist.php While not identical with ours, the BC goals for general education are carefully thought out and clear in regard to specific areas of study: http://fmwww.bc.edu/core/Task.doc.html
more below). Increasing the degree of common content, while also requiring an interdisciplinary approach of all faculty teaching in the CAP-Core, risks undermining both of these valuable features of our current program.

The draft document states that CAP-Core courses are meant to “[connect] to multiple disciplines . . . primarily through the CAP-Core Addresses.” We have difficulty imagining what such connections will amount to. If the integration of the Addresses into the CAP-Core courses is fairly minimal, then it is unlikely to be meaningful. If it is meant to be substantial, on the other hand, then it risks undermining the value of disciplinary immersion and rigor while presenting faculty with puzzling dilemmas about how to plan and structure their courses around these Addresses. We believe that substantial interdisciplinarity is best incorporated at somewhat later stages of undergraduate study, once students have a sufficient grasp of the various discipline-specific approaches and can meaningfully bring those approaches into dialogue with each other. (As one of our faculty members pithily puts it, “students have to know something before they can integrate.”)

While these are no doubt important concerns for all disciplines in the current Humanities Base, they may be particularly acute for philosophy. Philosophy is entirely new to virtually all students since, unlike most other fields that students encounter in college, they are very unlikely to have studied it in high school. Furthermore, the average student finds philosophy to be quite foreign and challenging, at least initially. Primarily non-empirical in nature, philosophical inquiry requires explicit logical reasoning, conceptual sophistication, and—perhaps most challenging of all for most students—a high level of sustained abstraction. In addition, philosophy requires students to confront in an intellectually rigorous manner questions of value that many are inclined to see as merely “matters of opinion.” Bringing the average student along into this new and challenging mode of thought can be an uphill battle, and requires a degree of focus and immersion which may be undermined by requiring a substantial interdisciplinary approach in all CAP-Core sections. The latter may also risk undermining UD’s (already relatively small) philosophy major program, since it is the early immersive experience in philosophical modes of inquiry that “lights the fire” in those select few students who then choose to pursue the major.

Our other major response related to disciplinary rigor and integrity concerns item #7 in the CAP document, the “course in practical ethical action informed by Catholic Social Teaching.” We fully agree that meaningfully integrating ethics into CAP requires that ethics-oriented courses emphasize “theoretical understandings of underlying philosophical and religious questions.” Such understandings have, of course, traditionally been the domain of philosophy, along with theology and religious studies. While it is not impossible for faculty members outside these disciplines to develop an understanding of ethical theory sufficient for teaching ethics to undergraduates, it is difficult, particularly given the unique features of philosophical inquiry outlined above.

We believe that academic excellence requires maintaining a distinction between normative ethics, which is the domain of philosophy, and the more descriptive approach to moral beliefs and practices characteristic of some other disciplines (such as the social sciences). We are thus very concerned about the apparent assumption that the CAP ethics courses can be taught by
faculty members from virtually any discipline, department, or school.

From our experiences with integrated learning and interdisciplinary teaching, we offer the following observations about what factors help to strengthen integrated learning, and what factors tend to weaken it.


a. The programs are entrepreneurial: committed faculty members have generated the ideas, experimented with various patterns of learning opportunities, and address issues of deep concern to them.

b. Many of these efforts have been more than stand-alone courses, and include features that are difficult to make a regular part of stand-alone courses. Examples of these features include a sequence of coordinated courses, significant experiences outside the classroom (e.g., service learning, community-based research, participation in arts activities downtown), and academic offerings for living communities, have been vital to the strength of these programs.

c. The faculty involved have a commitment to each other. This develops over time; some people are better suited to this kind of teaching than others, and good chemistry between teaching partners cannot be mandated.

d. It is vitally important to maintain disciplinary integrity within the programs. In the first-year Core integrated courses, the faculty from philosophy, history, religious studies, and English give lectures using the methodologies of their own disciplines. They demonstrate to students how the same text or issue can be addressed with disciplinary specificity. This suggests that in interdisciplinary courses, it is important that faculty from the different disciplines be present together in class sessions, and that they make differences in disciplinary methodology explicit to the students by modeling them.

e. In philosophy (and, we suspect, in other humanities disciplines), methodology is difficult to teach. Methodological tools are described with ordinary English terms; thought patterns from across millennia are utilized. This cannot be conveyed absent deep engagement in the discipline itself. That means that for advanced integrated learning, as in the CAP Integrative Course, it is important that students bring with them a prior experience of deep engagement with disciplinary methodologies. Given the suggested patterns for the CAP-Core, we worry that students will not develop these perspectives with sufficient specificity.

2. Features contributing to lack of success:

a. Insufficient time and support for faculty preparation and development.

b. Faculty who are not committed to the project are assigned to participate.

c. Weak disciplinary foundations in students or the structure of the course.
d. Scale: One of the weaknesses of the clusters was that the scale was too large to ensure tight integration. Smaller scale allows tighter integration, focus, and cooperation and makes coordination easier.

II. D. Impact Considerations

We are particularly concerned about the following impacts that the current proposal might have.

1. The move away from a strong commitment to the Catholic Intellectual Tradition would put us in a weakened position in relationship to our aspirations to be rated among the most excellent Catholic universities in the country. We have explored the curricular offerings at several of the institutions to which we should aspire. We attach a chart summarizing their current requirements.

2. We are concerned that the structure of courses proposed would eliminate the opportunity for students to complete many of the interdisciplinary minors that we currently offer. This would seem to work against the goal of providing integrative learning experiences for students.

3. We are concerned that the resources, human, financial, and architectural, are not available to implement the proposed changes. Without such resources, changes will not be well-implemented and so may well weaken rather than strengthen our curriculum. Determining what curricular changes to make requires a realistic look at the resources (buildings, faculty, and funds) that we have.

II. E. Recommendations

In light of all of the foregoing reflections, we offer the following recommendations as places to start a discussion which clearly needs time and nourishment before any actions are taken.

1. Conduct a thorough evaluation of the current program. Determine what we are doing well and work to build on and strengthen those elements. We have provided an excellent education for students and have done this while strengthening Catholic higher education. We should not abandon what we have done well. We also need to look at what other Catholic universities are doing. We strive to be among the excellent Catholic institutions. We need to be in dialogue with them about what is most vital to education in the Catholic tradition.

2. Retain disciplinary rigor in the context of introducing interdisciplinary study. Assess faculty interest in and commitment to interdisciplinary teaching. Are sufficient numbers of faculty willing to work with interdisciplinary models to make at least some interdisciplinary changes feasible?

a. The University of Dayton supports many successful programs and many experiments in multidisciplinary teaching and integrated learning. These include a number of interdisciplinary majors and minors, the Humanities Base and Clusters, Learning Living Communities, the Core Program, the SEE Program, Berry Scholars, Chaminade Scholars, Fitz Center Civic Scholars, and some ISSAP offerings. Many of these programs have already generated a substantial amount of assessment data. Faculty experienced in these existing programs should be consulted and their
assessment data reviewed to get a more concrete picture of what has worked in the past, and what has not.

b. Do an assessment of the extent to which students are already experiencing integrated learning. Do we need to change the curriculum to the extent suggested in order to accomplish this, or can we continue to build on and expand opportunities of the sort that already exist? For example, using the concept of clusters, but constructing more tightly integrated sequences of courses, as SEE is planning to do, might provide a better model for integration.

c. Think about integration more broadly than in terms of stand-alone courses. While there is integration among the first-year CAP courses, second and third year courses are essentially stand-alone courses. Rather than focusing on how to make stand-alone courses interdisciplinary, we suggest looking for other ways to introduce integration into the curriculum. The aim could be to have such an array of interdisciplinary opportunities available, that few students would graduate without participating in at least one of these opportunities. For example, students in interdisciplinary minors may gain much more from these than from taking the proposed CAP Integrated Course; or courses from a range of disciplines could focus on a common problem or theme, and have some sessions in common in which students present their work or a panel discusses the common problem.

d. Take seriously the importance of maintaining disciplinary methodologies and disciplinary integrity within multidisciplinary offerings. This includes team-teaching, with professors from the relevant disciplines present in the classroom.

e. Take seriously the emotional commitment of the faculty involved to the project and to each other, with serious attention to the conditions under which these commitments are fostered and sustained, or hindered. Pay particular attention to providing sufficient support for planning and faculty development (e.g., Fouke and Sidhu developed a program through a Humanities Fellows grant; the Core Program began with a NEH grant and has had a number of subsequent grants for innovations).

f. Include integrated programs that cross divisions, as well as disciplines. The current proposal as it stands does not specifically call for integration among the college’s three divisions of the sciences, social sciences, and the humanities.

3. Review the first-year configuration of courses.

The Humanities Base has been very successful. Assessment results have confirmed this. English is currently proposing a change in how the writing competency courses are delivered. This will impact the Humanities Base. The four disciplines involved in delivering the first-year General
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11 Currently offered as ASI 343 and ASI 346/EGR 398: Undergraduate Research on Environmental Sustainability: two semesters integrating philosophy, science, engineering and other disciplines and involving community-based research. The first semester of this course is counted as meeting the requirement for engineering ethics by some departments in the School of Engineering.
Education curriculum should be involved in assessing this proposal and determining whether it should be implemented, and if so, how the other disciplines need to respond. Religious Studies has had a grant to better integrate REL 103. The results of this work needs to be shared with the other disciplines. History has moved to one course, HST 103, and is currently thinking about how best to deliver this course. Again, these reflections should be shared with all of the disciplines. Philosophy has had the most consistent course in the base, but we know that other institutions do not do an introduction to philosophy. We are open to rethinking the first philosophy course in relation to these other courses. It is time for the four departments to be provided with the resources for some extensive workshops to think through the delivery and integration of the first year.

4. Consider how best to deliver the content of Catholic Social Teachings.

The proposal before us includes one required course to cover ethics and Catholic Social Teaching. But it is unrealistic to think that both of these important areas of study can be handled in a single course without short-changing one or the other. This is in part because social thought and ethics are two different areas of study that each require due attention.

The Catholic Church has one of the most developed traditions regarding social teaching in the world today. Catholic Social Teaching covers a vast area that relates to social and political thought. It includes important texts on the economy, on workers’ rights, justice, just war, and on values that relate to capitalism. For a Catholic university to adopt Catholic Social Teaching as a learning outcome is laudable. But to do it right requires that students read critically and reflect on important letters and statements from popes and bishops written over the last century and a half. A good part of a semester is needed in order to introduce this important area of study. It would not be possible for students to obtain a basic mastery of Catholic Social Teaching and ethics in a single course.

There is another reason why the introduction of Catholic Social Teaching does not fit well within courses devoted to ethics. The scholarship and university curricula of the last half-century have drawn a distinction between social thought and ethics. These are not the same areas of study. While they share similar concerns, ethics uses practical wisdom to reflect on individual action. In contrast, social thought and teaching, hence the use of the word ‘social’ in Catholic Social Teaching, focuses more on social behavior in regard to society as a whole. A semester is too short to allow students to process both ethics and social thought. Ethics is a complex study where students need many weeks to process the dominant ethical theories if they are going to prepare to apply practical wisdom to issues in our world. Furthermore, today we need to learn diverse ethical views from around the world and not rely only on the standard western accounts. This takes more time. In order to do this well, more weeks are needed to unpack diverse theories and practices. Only then can students be ready to test ethical theories on actual cases in specific locations around the world. The Department of Philosophy delivers roughly one-half of the ethics courses at the University of Dayton. We are one of the strongest philosophy departments

12 For example, the NGO Interfaith Worker Justice based in Chicago, which represents all faiths in the US, has chosen to educate all their summer interns in Catholic Social Teaching (http://www.iwj.org/template/page.cfm?id=14).
in the US in the areas of ethics and social philosophy. Our considered judgment is that it would deepen and strengthen the University of Dayton’s general education to introduce Catholic Social Teaching in the first year and to handle ethical issues in later classes. Such a structure could serve to build habits of inquiry across the humanities and prepare a suitable base for a Marianist and Catholic education at the University of Dayton.

In reviewing the first year of studies, the integration of Catholic Social Teaching should be a focal point. In the past, documents by popes and bishops that express these teachings have been part of the common readings. In thinking about how to best introduce Catholic Social Teaching, the common readings of the first year should be of fundamental importance.

5. Focus on how best to introduce questions about diversity into the curriculum.

Diversity is a significant issue that needs to be addressed in curricular change. Our accrediting body has noted the need for us to address diversity on multiple levels. In considering curricular reform, we need to reflect on the multiple meanings of diversity and how best to provide our students with learning that enables them to understand diversity and live in a world of complex diversity. Philosophy provides the tools that facilitate dialogues across multiple modes of difference.

We are concerned that the proposed religious diversity outcome does not represent a strong version of religious diversity. Aside from the proposed course REL 200, this outcome is presented as a minor addition to already existing courses that have not focused on world religions or the non-Christian world. If we are serious about having a student outcome of religious diversity, then it would make sense to have courses that 1) devote more attention to world religions and 2) are taught by faculty with some expertise in the field. Otherwise the requirement appears weak. We suggest a tighter definition of what counts as a course on world religions, one with more non-Christian content and one staffed by faculty that are either trained in or have a real commitment to world religion. At present the Department of Religious Studies is unable to staff such courses short of hiring many faculty who work on world religion.

There are already faculty members in the departments of English, History, and Philosophy who work on non-Christian religion and culture. We know from the Core Program that students gain a richer understanding of religion when approaching it from different disciplines. Appropriate faculty in the humanities can and should teach courses that count for diverse religion credit when their study and/or scholarship seriously embraces such religions. For example, individuals in philosophy and history departments have carried out some of the best work of the last two centuries on Islam, Judaism, Buddhism, and Hinduism because there is no wall between these disciplines and the study of religion. Otherwise we would not have some of the most important scholarship that we have from the 19th and 20th centuries. Importantly for this outcome, the university has experts on diverse religions and cultures in different departments precisely to engage students in the non-Christian world. If we adopt a learning outcome concerning diverse religions it would make sense to use appropriate faculty
from across the humanities to deliver this outcome. For example, History has an expert on Islam and the Middle East who conducts research into religion in the Middle East, a specialist on Africa, and another on Asia. Philosophy has an expert on African thought, another on the confluence of Islamic, Jewish, and Christian philosophy and theology, and a present job search for an expert on Asian, Islamic, or Native American thought. English has an expert on Native American culture. Since we have faculty trained in the area of religious diversity across the humanities, we suggest that the religious diversity outcome 1) include courses taught by appropriate faculty from across the humanities and 2) include courses like the following when they cover religious diversity.

Courses that could earn a strong version of religious diversity credit:

ENG 335 Modern Black Literature
ENG 339 American Indian Literature
ENG 345 Colonial and Postcolonial Literature

HST 331 History of India
HST 332 Modern China and Japan
HST 333 History of the Modern Middle East
HST 336 History of Africa to 19th Century
HST 337 History of Africa—19th Century to the Present
HST 358 Social and Cultural History of Latin America
HST 380 Native American History

PHL 311 Philosophy of Religion
PHL 351 Medieval Philosophy
PHL 355 Asian Philosophy
PHL 363 African Philosophy
PHL 365 Islamic Philosophy and Culture

While it is important to work on religious diversity, it is also important to focus on a broader understanding of diversity and how best to implement diversity in the curriculum. Dr. Jack Ling is an important resource for thinking about how to understand and introduce a broader understanding of diversity. In addition to working with him, we support requiring each student to take at least one course focused primarily on some dimension(s) of diversity, rather than allowing nonacademic experience to fulfill the requirement.

6. Consider how best to maintain disciplinary integrity in capstone courses.

While the proposed disciplinary capstone course allows for disciplinary design, we are concerned that the faculty in the disciplines are in the best position to determine what courses are most appropriate for the major. Requiring every major to have a capstone course that includes both public presentation and demonstration of practical wisdom may place constraints on a discipline that are inappropriate. For example, in philosophy, it is important that our majors learn to write philosophical essays. This requires the learning of research skills and habits that are different from those in other disciplines. Seminar presentations may be more appropriate than
poster presentations. It may be very difficult for many disciplines to determine what constitutes a
demonstration of practical wisdom. It
would seem best to leave these determinations to the specific disciplines.
Undergraduate Core Requirements at several other Catholic Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boston College</th>
<th>Theology</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Writing or Rhetoric</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Cultural Diversity</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>0-9 hours proficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fordham</th>
<th>Theology</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Writing or Rhetoric</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Cultural Diversity</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>0-6 hours proficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLU BA*</th>
<th>Theology</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Writing or Rhetoric</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Cultural Diversity</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 courses</td>
<td>3 courses</td>
<td>2 courses (world)</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>0-9 hours proficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLU BS Sequence</th>
<th>Theology</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Writing or Rhetoric</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Cultural Diversity</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 courses sequence (includes ethics)</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>1-2 courses</td>
<td>8 hrs in addition to degree</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>0-6 hours proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notre Dame</th>
<th>Theology</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Writing or Rhetoric</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Cultural Diversity</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>0-6 hours proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* St. Louis University has different requirements for the BA Core and BS Core.
** May be double-counted in another area.
*** May double-count.

Most of these have further requirements for the college degrees, especially the BA.
Physic Department
Submitted by Rex Berney, Chair of the Physics Department.

The physics tenured faculty met to discuss the QRC and CAP documents on Monday, November 3, 2008. What follows is from the CAP discussion and emails sent to me.

1.) From the CAP document page 24, section III. B. 9. (the italics are mine):

“The INSS sequence and other courses designed to satisfy the CAP Natural Science requirement should deliberately include material designed to show the impact of science and technology on society and the relationship of science to other disciplines. The CAP Natural Science courses should address HIR student learning outcomes on scholarship and the critical evaluation of our times.”

Who determines the content of our courses and if the courses satisfy these learning outcomes?

Other Faculty concerns about section III. B. 9. emailed to me:
a.) The last sentence reads, "Ordinarily, the courses satisfying the Natural Science requirements will be delivered by the Departments of Biology, Chemistry, Geology, and Physics." This seems to suggest that at times a physics course (SCI 190) can be offered by a department other than physics. If that is not what they have in mind, then why use the word “Ordinarily”, rather than something like "The courses satisfying the Natural Science requirements will be delivered by the Departments of Biology, Chemistry, Geology, and Physics"

b.) "No single, common sequence of Natural Science courses can serve the disparate needs of all students within the University." I do not have a problem with this statement, but it does raise questions about who decides what sequence is appropriate?

c.) The word "Should" in the following statement makes one wonder: "Students not pursuing BA degrees should take the INSS sequence or Natural Science courses that support their major course of study." Maybe “should” should be “will.”

2.) Questions with respect to section III. B. 9, CAP document page 27, the Diversity section.

How does diversity affect the physics curriculum?

Is the physics department responsible for creating a diversity experience, or just ensuring that its majors satisfy this requirement?

Who determines if a class meets the diversity requirement? Would this be the responsibility of the CAP committee?

3.) Questions and comments with respect to section III. B.10, CAP document page 28, the Service Learning section.
How do we make this significant and enforceable? Does the CAP committee decide?

Some faculty members have reservations about the idea of “required” service learning.

Can we create service learning opportunities within our department through SPS (the Society of Physics Students) with no curricular component and then force our students to participate?

5.) Question about the CAP Integrative Course section III. B. 11, CAP document page 28.

Who approves the CAP Integrative Courses?


Is our current system of having students do research and a presentation enough to satisfy this requirement?

7.) General Questions:

With the inclusion of all the CAP requirements, the various majors will be on tight tracks to graduate, how do you handle people who get out of sequence? (e.g. change major or transfer from another institution)

Will the new CAP courses double count like cluster courses, or will there be more required credit hours university wide?

8.) From a physics faculty member who does both premed and undeclared science majors.

I have a comment as an advisor.

The proposed CAP requirements, which create six credit hour linked humanities courses in the first year, would generate more exceptions to the requirement for my students than cases without exceptions. It is unadvisable, in my opinion, to create a requirement that has so many exceptions. For example:

1. Students with AP credits in the humanities would be an exception since they already have credit for one of the courses. With high schools emphasizing AP courses, UD would be at a disadvantage if we implement a plan that does not accommodate them.
2. Students in the sciences with weak math backgrounds. Science majors take 2 science courses with labs in the first year (8 credit hours). If their math preparation is weak, they are placed in MTH116 which is 4 credit hours. Science majors with weak math backgrounds need these 12 credit hours for their major in the first year to be successful. Since UD limits students to 17 credit hours, there are not 6 credit hours left to take the new proposed requirements.
Premedical Programs

Premedical Programs recognizes the CAP committee has done an exhaustive amount of work on this new proposal addressing implementation of *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection* (HIR) at the University of Dayton. Although we are supportive of the intent of the CAP proposal, there are many inherent problems with the current document.

1. Does the CAP trump the major or vice versa. Implementing the CAP requirements will conflict or compromise Premed/Predent major requirements. For example, the CAP Core requires that students complete 18 total credit hours in the first and second year. They will take two courses which are to be paired in the first semester, and likewise in the second semester of their first year. MED/DEN majors, in order to satisfy requirements necessary for applying to one of the professional schools must take at least eleven hours of science (Bio and Chem) and mathematics (Mth 148/149) the first and second semester of the first year. Those students entering the university with weaker credentials in math must take Mth 116 which is a 4 credit hour course changing the credit hours to twelve in math and science. Add in ASI 150 plus the two CAP Core courses, the student is now taking 19 credit hours! Alternatively, what happens with students who choose to take the Mth 168/169 sequence, each of which are 4 credit hours, instead of Mth 148/149? These students will be taking 19/18 credit hours respectively in their first academic year. similar situation will occur in the students second year, as they typically take O-Chem and Physics, plus genetics. Add to this schedule English 201 and Religion 201, they are taking a minimum of 17 credit hours. In order to make a manageable schedule for these students, it would be important to provide a pre-college summer course offering to get all MED/DEN students eligible to begin their math sequence with MTH 148. If we continue to allow MTH 168/169 the University would need to allow students to complete 19 hours without a tuition overload fee.

2. If a student wants to minor or double major as a MED/DEN major, where is the flexibility to do so in their first two years, given the required courses they must take for their major, plus the CAP core requirements. Does the CAP committee recommend that this student push this off to the third and fourth year?

3. What does the CAP recommend for students who enter the University with AP credit in English, History, or social science. Are they still required to take CAP history, can they move to Eng 201?

4. How are students who drop one of the CAP core courses to be dealt with? Or are they not allowed to drop one of the CAP core courses?

5. Is it appropriate for the CAP to demand that ALL students complete a service learning project? It seems more appropriate to allow students who desire a service learning experience to pursue so on their own, but to require such an involvement? Both MED and DEN majors are expected to have practical hands-on experience with a physician or dentist at some point in their undergraduate career. Many of them are involved in shadowing experience, and/or volunteer activities at local hospitals, retirement centers and hospice care facilities. Would these types of
activities be appropriate for satisfying the service learning project?

6. CAP Integrative Course – The CAP proposal states “The CAP Integrative Course is thematically and/or problem-based, engaging students in social/cultural problem from multiple perspectives. These problems must have linkage to the humanities, arts, and social sciences. What, did you forgot the contribution that the natural sciences would make to this course. How can you even entertain the idea of leaving out the natural sciences when you are discussing engagement of students in social/cultural problems in today’s society?

7. Disciplinary capstone– This particular requirement will cause significant problems with MED/DEN majors, for two reasons. One, we currently have over two hundred majors (not counting the more than 200 BIO majors), and two, we have no curriculum, nor faculty to offer a curriculum to MED/DEN majors. This means that the Biology Department would have to designate a specific course(s) as a disciplinary capstone course, and offer these courses on a schedule regular enough to accommodate more than 400 science majors. On the surface this seems a bit presumptuous of the CAP committee, asking that another department provide the resources so that our majors might be able to satisfy this specific requirement.

8. Another feature of the disciplinary capstone requirement is that all science majors will have a research experience prior to their graduation. This is even more difficult to accomplish than the previous requirement. For example, Premedical Programs has been successful in sponsoring a small number (6-8) of students each summer through a grant program that enables these students to enjoy an international experience, volunteering at medical clinics in Cameroon, Guatemala, and the Dominican Republic. Additionally, Premedical Programs has supported a small number of students (6-8) on summer research projects, either on campus or other university campuses. Each student is provided with funding somewhere between $1500-2000. These are certainly unique opportunities for our students, but where would the financial resources come to support over 400 students with some type of research experience. Simple math would suggest that the university would have to provide in excess of $600K in order for each student to experience some type of research appropriate to their major. This says nothing about faculty mentoring to accomplish such a daunting task.

9. Resources – Where will the resources come from that will support the implementation and continuation of the CAP? There will be a need for more faculty, time and adequate infrastructure to ensure success.

10. A philosophical concern involves the reduction in student choice. In the viewpoint of college providing an opportunity for exploration, forcing the CAP requirement shifts the curriculum into a tightly packaged checklist of requirements with a significant absence of opportunity for personal choice in learning. Mandating service and research takes the intrinsic motivation away from would ordinarily be an opportunity to develop a personally relevant agenda for living a life of meaning. Overall, balancing a professional prep major with these additional mandates of what might fit well into a more liberal education model appears conflictual and in some areas inconsistent with present resource allocation realities.
11. Personal Note: Having worked at two colleges where we as faculty were required to shift our curricula, teaching loads and overall philosophy to accommodate the new requirements of first year linked courses and/or senior capstone, I am reminded of the following challenges which were pronounced:

a. In instituting first year seminars at the College of Mount St. Joseph, students found the forced linking of courses to be at times confusing, awkward, and somewhat boring in that they spent much time with the same cohort in the same environment. While this may be seen as valuable to students in the CORE program, they chose this format. Is this the format that is for ALL students? Interestingly, a developmental psychology professor at MSJ made the point that such interdisciplinary learning can seem attractive to the adults that design the courses but may be a more appropriate developmental fit for a 20 yr old student vs. an 18 yr old first year. Another concern may be about the degree to which important content from the INTRO courses in English, Philosophy, Religion and History are sidelined or minimized in order to focus more on employing an interdisciplinary lens. A question worth considering is whether a student benefits from interdisciplinary inquiry BEFORE learning the basic principles of each specific discipline. It will be important for the Academic Policies Committee to articulate the reasoning and goals behind linking courses in order for faculty to buy into this format.

NOTE: Because the linked course model (in this case 3 classes linked together) was so unpopular at MSJ, the faculty senate approved the recommendation from the academic dean one year later to change back to our previous general education plan since this new model had such a dire effect on student attrition.

b. How will workload be assessed using linked courses? Will both faculty assigned to a CAP core be attending all meetings of their linked course? This would typically mean spending 6 hours in the classroom if they team teach a CAP core course . Will this be reflected in their workload? This means a doubling of costs (as compared to 2 faculty teaching their own course). If they are not in the classroom together, the “linkage” is lost and the course becomes confusing. Again, it is important to ask what is the goal of linkage, is it worth the resources, does it fit as a pedagogy for this audience, at this age, in this academic content area.

c. We also initiated the senior capstone as a requirement during my tenure at MSJ. I think it is very important to consider the specific goals of the capstone as this will impact conversations about program structure and resources. Is the capstone intended to measure BOTH attainment of the University baccalaureate learning outcomes (HIR) AND major specific outcomes? These would be very different goals. More discussion needs to occur about how many (all?) of the HIR outcomes need to be addressed. It was my experience that when the baccalaureate learning outcomes were the central focus of assessment in the senior capstone, it required a level of understanding of these outcomes from the STUDENTS that was not there. While earlier courses may impact these learning outcomes, that is different from the student having the level of understanding to develop a project which incorporates each of these learning outcomes. Asking how these projects will be assessed is an important consideration. Of course the challenge of implementation becomes most pronounced in programs such as MED/DEN where there are
only one faculty associated with the program and a large number of students.

**Department of Religious Studies**

During a wide-ranging discussion spanning three separate departmental meetings, Religious Studies faculty responded to eight questions regarding the draft report of the Subcommittee on the Common Academic Program.

1. **What in your domain (e.g., unit, department, or committee) is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or in part with the provisions of the CAP proposal?**
   - REL offers courses on religions other than Christianity on the 300 level.
   - The present integration of the Humanities base indicates a wide-spread recognition of the value of integration across courses. Those courses have shared readings and shared themes.
   - REL 103, Catholic option does what is called for in the first REL course.
   - REL 103, General option often does what is called for in the second REL course. REL103-G also includes an emphasis on Catholicism among religions, which may serve as the "new and improved CAP" version of 103 also.
   - REL already requires a capstone for majors.
   - REL already offers courses on Catholic social teaching.
   - REL already offers interdisciplinary courses, such as Religion and Film.
   - Some REL courses require public presentations (Barnes, Orji, and Bunta include such requirements in undergraduate courses).
   - The “Regime” (support system for graduate students teaching REL 103, Catholic option) demonstrates the possibility of having a shared syllabus and still allowing teachers to shape a course to their own interests and style.
   - Campus ministry already richly contributes to learning outcome #2, in terms of encouraging students’ own faith development.

2. **What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?**
   - The integrated education Core students get does seem (based on many years of anecdotal evidence) to result in a better education, and so the attempt to increase integration is valuable.
   - Working to reinforce essential skills in reading, writing, and speech across the curriculum (and particularly in first and continuing consistently through the second year) should significantly improve the skills we meet in students in our 300- level courses.
   - Increasing collaboration among faculty across departments is valuable.
   - Increasing the frequency with which blocks of students study together across several courses is valuable.

3. **What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?**
   - The proposed lectures from the professional schools seem to be coming in from outside the integrated courses in an un-integrated way. A more explicit plan for them to be part of the course should be articulated.
Reducing the history requirement to one course is a bad idea.

Creating a second mandatory course in Religious Studies increases student resentment of being in courses they are not interested in.

Creating a second mandatory course will significantly reduce the variety of courses faculty can teach, especially within their own expertise, and thereby also make it more difficult to serve our majors' needs.

What will happen to our upper level courses, if students are required to take a 2xx course in other religions? We already have a desire to make a stronger push for more Bible in the curriculum: we have no required course in Bible (Wright State does).

4. What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?

- Has the Business School (or some outside consultant firm) been consulted with respect to economic and work-load feasibility (e.g., what number of hires will be required to accomplish the CAP goals?).
- The draft document does not draw on assessment of current curriculum relative to HIR outcomes. Do we know how well we are already doing? It was noted that some data is available through the NESI national survey – yet that is general, not specific.
- Some faculty are only just beginning to gain experience of working in Learning/ Living Communities and will have more specific comments as that initiative matures.
- Increased collaboration will greatly increase workload. That must be counted and compensated.
- For REL to offer the courses proposed will require faculty development, as many will have to teach courses outside their existing expertise. Plans for that development and the corresponding release time must be included.
- New and prospective students must be informed ahead of time that there will be a required course in Catholic theology (unless the current 103 general option suffices).
- Collaboration among faculty will require infrastructure. This should not fall on the chairs, to add to their workload.
- Junior faculty must be protected; expectations about collaborative teaching must take into account additional work and experience required to create courses and begin teaching.
- Current reality of religious pluralism may not fit into this two-course proposal for REL. For example, where will Christian ecumenism belong? (Outcome 2 on p. 9 mentions this, but later it is omitted.) Where will we train students in reading the Bible, as that is a matter of global religious concern?
- What will be the impact of CAP on current upper-level offerings? In other words, adding more requirements in CAP may mean a reduction in our offerings of upper level courses. Even at present our majors find it hard to get all the upper level courses they need; the situation will worsen under the proposed system.
- What degree of integration with there be among various courses?
- It looks like some disciplines lose out. This will affect the politics of the discussions. How will faculty interaction be structured? Problems of faculty interaction can be anticipated on the levels of both ideology and pedagogy.
- How will adjuncts and graduate student teachers receive training and opportunities for faculty interaction?
- There is a problem with the requirements for accreditation in the professional schools insofar
as their students have little room for further requirements. The curriculum in the Professional Schools is so full (due to requirements of their external accrediting agencies) that they are often unwilling to give up even one class for students to get more in other areas.

- How will Cap-Core lectures be managed?
- The proposal seemingly guts the humanities/liberal arts out of the curriculum—with a shift in curricular emphasis toward the professional Schools. To the extent this proposal undermines a liberal arts education, this is negative for the Department, as “Religious Studies” is best done in the context of a robust liberal arts approach to education.
- Consider a different paradigm. We currently track student performance through courses, encouraging a “checking off” mentality, in both the administration and the student (as in: create a curriculum of courses – take a course, check it off—where checking off the last course constitutes successful completion of program). Different paradigm: while keeping courses, shift the real tracking of student performance to other measures (as, e.g., with doctoral programs, where there is coursework, but Ph.D. exams are key). This can move student mentality from checking-off-courses to learning their subject.

5. What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?
- The major concern: the new demands placed on our Department by the new student learning outcomes. Our Department is most affected by the outcomes having specific content (especially #2, Faith traditions, also #6, Critical evaluation of our times).
- Personnel: This proposal would require REL to teach at least one new required course to every student, as well as contributing centrally to education on Catholic social teaching. This demand will be in addition to the current load of REL 103, varied upper division courses, majors, MA students, and Ph.D students. This creates a dramatic need for more faculty. Will there be more hiring? How many more hires will this proposal take to implement?
- Concerns: Is there too much to cover in the envisioned 200-level REL courses than is possible? Will faculty from other departments teach 200-level Religious Studies courses?
- Faculty development: Existing faculty do not have the expertise to teach world religions. Faculty development and the corresponding release time will be needed.
- Infrastructure: Infrastructure to facilitate collaboration across departments, to create connections among faculty, to allow them to develop shared courses, to recognize the significant time commitment required for that, and to assess and reward those efforts will be needed.
- Our General Option REL103 course could (along with the Catholic Option 103) include more specifically Catholic content. This might be a better way of handling some of the desired goals. Of course, we also need to meet the needs of non-Christian students. (Thus an apparent difficulty of requiring Catholic-and- Marianist education for all undergrads. Consider this change: instead of requiring all students to be given a Catholic-and-Marianist education (through the proposed required courses), provide the opportunity for all. Create options for them. (A comment: educating for “a Catholic and Marianist” identity includes the vast scope of a full liberal education – which we cannot make optional for students who choose UD.)
- Regarding the creation of REL 2xx courses, in particular the requested course focusing on Catholic Social Teaching: different departments could offer them. However, this could foster a competitive spirit among departments—the wrong kind of motivation for academic work.
6. What resources and or changes would be needed to make that development possible?
   - More faculty, both to cover the new course requirements and to cover courses when other faculty need release time.
   - Funding to pay for faculty development.
   - A structure for facilitating collaboration [a new administrative position?]
   - Changes to tenure/ promotion process and hiring letters.

7. In particular, what if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?
   - Creating new courses to deal with changing religious realities and evolving faculty interests.
   - Offering the current range of 300 level courses, which have been the principle source of our majors.

8. What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?
   - How many new faculty will REL have?
   - What structure will be created to facilitate collaboration?
   - How will the increase in faculty workload due to collaborative efforts be recognized and compensated?
   - How will new faculty be integrated into this collaboration?
   - How will this impact requirements regarding languages?

Addendum: Concerns regarding the basic guiding framework for CAP proposal (pp. 11-12, also 15-16)
   - The proposal makes a questionable assumption regarding best practice: first to educate students in Catholic identity, and only then grow in knowledge and enter dialogue with other religions. Consider the benefits of a curriculum that aims to form that broader religious identity throughout the entire undergraduate education.
   - Recommendation: rather than a wholesale revision, select two or three things to improve, moving more slowly and incrementally. Recall that CORE took over a dozen years or so to achieve its present shape. In other words, keep what we have, but modify it in certain ways. Do this incrementally. Start with the first year program. Build from there. The elements of an alternative system are here (e.g., interdisciplinary) – just select and focus.
   - Getting the College and Schools more consciously to integrate each others' perspectives: the goal is good, but it is hard to envision it in practice, without extension, expensive and time-consuming work.
   - The goal of a more interdisciplinary education within the College is good, but the implementation is difficult to see. The very general (vague) description in the CAP proposal may be a weakness (results may be too random or too token) or a strength (getting too specific creates restrictions). Moreover, requiring extensive interdisciplinary work creates a difficulty for new faculty working toward tenure and needing to publish. Discipline-specific teaching can foster publications for journals, but interdisciplinary teaching is unlikely to do so (since most academic journals are discipline-specific).
3A. **Discussion of the Common Academic Program (CAP):** Dr. Chris Duncan, Chair of the Academic Policies Committee (APC) of the Academic Senate, requested that departments review the current draft proposal of the Common Academic Program and provide him with their feedback electronically by December 12. The eight questions provided by the APC and the comments made during the ensuing discussion include the following:

1. **What in your domain (e.g., unit, department, or committee) is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or in part with the provisions of the CAP proposal?**

   - Our department already meets or exceeds the proposal for a capstone course. The Sociology and Criminal Justice Studies capstone courses were revised beginning with fall term 2007 with students performing a research project and presenting their work at the Social and Behavioral Sciences Symposium (fall) or the Stander Symposium (spring). The department is in the second year of Senior Research Projects mentored by faculty. The change in expectations has been well-received by both faculty and students.
   - Our students already get introduced to diversity through the essence of our major. We are conducting a diversity audit of our courses this academic year, so may make diversity more explicit as a result of this review.
   - Many of our courses require students to do group projects and give Powerpoint presentations to the class.
   - Service Learning: The department is strong in this area, with a good number of students taking internships in social work and criminal justice studies as well as sociology each term. There are also service-learning options embedded in some courses and supplemental one-hours to upper-level courses.
   - Urban Sociology certainly addresses some key components of community. In addition, the Dayton Civic Scholars Program, developed by social science chairs as an intentional pathway to community engagement, has drawn in a number of our students in extensive community involvements.

2. **What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?**

   Effort to produce more integration connecting General Education or the common programs to majors. We should think of this proposal as being evolutionary. It should help us address some of the limitations of our current General Education program.

3. **What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?**

   Concern that this proposal will lead to ignoring or throwing out some of the strengths of our
current program. Does not bring together the important things we are already doing. Ignores Social Work and Criminal Justice Studies as applied social sciences in the College. They are a component of the social sciences. Since we are emphasizing practical wisdom, they should be more explicitly integrated into the social science component.

4. What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?

- There is little attention given to global and international concerns. It was an important component of HIR.
- Living-Learning Communities.--These could provide the themes for the common courses as well as the tool for integration. Faculty are already actively engaged in this initiative. There needs to be some connection between CAP and LLCs.
- Concerning the introductory social science course.--Make this more explicit in the document that __% of the course will be common to all sections and __% course remains under the instructor’s autonomy.
- The social science introductory course should be in the first year, rather than the second year.

5. What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

The CAP social science course, as well as CAP integrative courses, although some of the existing cluster courses could evolve into CAP integrative courses. However, these initiatives will take extensive retooling and faculty development.

6. What resources and/or changes would be needed to make that development possible?

Continued support for course development and innovation.

7. In particular, what, if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

The development of the introductory social science course will require a real rethinking across the social sciences of how we deliver this universal basic social science course. It will impact our ability to offer introductory courses in the major. This could potentially impact majors in the social sciences, particularly if the social science course occurs in the second year, rather than the first year. This will strain our ability to deliver the CAP courses and the introductory courses. It could potentially negatively impact our ability to deliver the minors.

8. What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?

- How is the recession going to affect resources two or three years from now?
- How might this program affect faculty’s scholarship expectations with the greater demands in
teaching collaborative courses that will come with this new program? However, if it simplifies General Education delivery, it might in the long run free up faculty time. In the early years, it will certainly have workload implications.

Regarding faculty teaching loads.—Due to the considerable amount of work the introductory social science course will be for the faculty member in charge of coordinating these sections, s/he should get a course reduction that term. The demands of this course will be particularly hard for Anthropology (and Social Work), which is put on par with majors that have larger faculty resource bases.

There is a concern with the course in Practical Ethical Action Informed by Catholic Social Teaching (# 7, p. 25). As described, the course goes against our goals of diversity. Although CIT is an important ethical tradition, it should not supplant other ethical traditions. It would be more appropriate to call it a course in Practical Ethical Action influenced by major religious and secular traditions informed by major social religious teachings, including CIT.

Other comments on particular program components include:

a. The new introductory social science course:

- If College requirements stay as they are, students will only take the one social science introductory course in addition to the CAP. How will this impact majors and minors?
- Social Work instructors could teach the social science introductory courses even though SWK is not considered a traditional social science. The five social sciences include SOC, ANT, PSY, POL, and ECO. Given the emphasis on practical wisdom, maybe we should think more inclusively of social sciences in the College.
- Thirty sections of this new course will likely need to be offered. The department will have to stop teaching as many sections of SOC 101 Principles of Sociology as we have in the past. This has been an important recruiting tool for the major. Also, there will be a redundancy between SOC 101 and this introductory social science course; the department will have to change how SOC 101 is offered.
- How much flexibility will faculty have concerning this new social science introductory course? There will be a common syllabus for a percentage of the course but leeway for the instructor in charge of the course to teach from their perspective. Would the theme or topic change each year?
- Common readings will be done around common addresses that students in all sections will attend; common lectures could be taped and built into the course rather than have faculty give a live lecture in each course as the proposal suggests.
- A great deal of development time will be needed in creating this course.
- It would be best to offer the social science course during first year; then students can take the introductory course of the discipline they like during second term, maximizing the department’s opportunity to attract new majors.
- Getting this foundation in an introductory course is important as it prepares students to take upper-level courses. This proposal would move us in a positive direction in that all students would have a basic social science course as part of their education.
- When registering, students will know by the faculty member listed for the course what discipline emphasis the course will have.

b. Communication Skills:
This requirement places a burden on the department to develop and assess communication skills. How much can departments take on? Should departments be responsible for all of their students’ communication skills? The department will need to develop a communication assessment tool.

c. Service Learning:
- The majority of students do something that would likely fulfill a service learning requirement; however, there is concern that service learning could be diminished to simply charity work.
- There needs to be some academic component to service learning. How can this be developed into an integrated experience and how can this be reviewed? Should all students take service learning or should it just be an option in the program?
- Should field experience be tied to a course or could this be done through a student organization?
- The department will need to develop a service learning assessment tool.
- The department would like to broaden service learning options while recognizing the needs of the community. Care will be needed so as not to inundate local agencies and organizations with students trying to do service learning projects.
- Faculty would like to see a move toward more students taking internships, although not making this mandatory. Could some requirements be reduced in order to get that into the curriculum?
- The possibility of combining the Social Work and Criminal Justice Studies internship programs was mentioned.

Other general comments include:
- How will faculty be able to manage the requirements of this program with all of the other expectations of their position?
- Where is the response of students for this program? How do we cultivate student hunger for these changes?
- What are the faculty incentives to support this program? Grants for innovative teaching are available. Academic Excellence grants have been awarded to faculty in this department to enable them to develop new courses.
- It is expected that there will be faculty resources available to support the implementation of this program.
- In view of the elimination of clusters, the goal or idea of clusters will have to evolve to meet the expectations of this program. This will likely free up some credit hours. It is important for students to get to know a theme in some depth. This may be sacrificed in this new approach, unless it is connected to something like LLCs. It is not clear how we will make integrative connections throughout the whole CAP program.
- Departments must have a plan on how their majors will achieve all aspects of CAP, so that they have demonstrated all of the learning outcomes by graduation. How each department handles this will be variable.
- Ethics was NOT listed as scholarship which is a terrible oversight—especially since our society is so in need of the scholarship of ethics to guide many of the major issues we are discussing (immigration, global economic issues, stem cell research). It should be seen as contributing to education in community which was also not listed.
- Ethics should not be framed in the context of Catholic Social Teaching. While that should
certainly be included, and perhaps given some prominence, our commitment to diversity demands that the rich ethical traditions of other religious and secular traditions (humanism, feminism) also be a major component of these ethics courses.

**Theater Program**  
**Response from Darrell Anderson, Director**

1. Within the Theatre Program we currently offer THR 105 which is a popular Gen Ed Arts Elective and a part of the Arts and Human Experience Cluster.

2. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?

   1) Overall, the mere fact that we are reexamining the structure of General Education is probably the greatest strength of the proposal.

   2) A high point of the proposal is the recognition by the CAP committee, in the section “Implementation Challenges,” of the difficulties inherent in attempting to convert teaching personnel to a new way of delivering the common curriculum, with a sobering admission of the need for extensive training in new methods, as well as the need for additional faculty and of appropriate facilities to implement such a plan.

3) What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?

   The major weaknesses are:

   1) The dependence of the CAP plan on collaboration among faculty from different disciplines is idyllic. While such a structure may work on a voluntary basis (as in CORE) among select and interested faculty, it is unlikely that faculty would, across the board, be willing or, if willing, be able to provide consistency in instruction.

   2) The adoption of collaborative teaching becomes an even larger issue when the part-time faculty who are the back bone of the basic instruction in much of what is now the Humanities Base and General Education (those structures which the CAP is intended to replace) are depended upon to fill the gap(s) in the new collaborative course instruction. Mere “rewards” for participation would not be enough to guarantee effective instruction. Attempting to achieve and maintain any consistency with a fluctuating pool of part-time instructors in these responsible positions could quickly create a new inefficient and unsatisfactory structure that looks good on paper but fails in practice.

   3) The Communication component addresses the problems of having a “one-size-fits-all” approach to effective communication. While the structure of the recommendation is left up in the air, it is encouraging that collaboration between the individual units and the Communication department is foreseen. Of course this would require that each unit (at least) would need to
consult with the Communication department in order to design a course or courses appropriate to its unique needs. This would place strains on the Communication Department, but those could be tempered by additional staffing. Again the issue of using part-time instructors to carry this out suggests that it would be difficult for this approach to succeed.

4) While the revision of the Arts component is at least an acknowledgement of the outdated principles upon which the current approach is based, the course as outlined is unwieldy and unlikely. Beyond the restrictions on the collaborative staffing implied, attempting to cram everything that is listed into a single course to be served by three separate departments/programs is impractical. Why is Science not offered in a similar manner? Imagine a Science course that is taught by faculty from a pool of the combined science departments? E.g., Science 200 – 6 cr. hrs. --- To cover physics, geology, chemistry and biology; No labs; One syllabus; To include the history and criticism of the science; Taught collaboratively by faculty from all four departments to provide a “science way of thinking”. This is ludicrous, of course. While the committee is at least attempting to modify the current approach to the arts, there is still the hint of a patronizing attitude (Omgosh! The Arts may get out of control!!!). The parameters of the course as proposed are impossible. The design of the course implied in the plan would waste the time of too many faculty members. Ultimately no instruction in the Arts of any real value would be delivered. --- Which leads me to the next comment.

5) It would seem that the recommendations concerning the Communication component and the English composition component were not considered when it came time to appraise the Arts component. Why then is it assumed that a bland, one-size-fits-all Arts course will be suitable for all students, no matter their interests or needs? If the committee recommends moving away from a one-size-fits-all Communication course – why move toward such a course in designing the Arts component? The committee endorses the new version of the English composition model which moves away from the traditional model of the past toward one that is more open. Why then move away from a structure of Arts delivery that is at least more open to one that is much more mundane and restrictive?

6) A more creative and insightful approach to the delivery of the Arts is needed, one that takes into account not just the different elements unique to each Arts discipline but also the varying needs of the students to be taught. Not all students will respond well to visual art or theatre, but may relate well to music. Some students might prefer the literary basis of theatre over the tactile nature of visual art or the ephemeral nature of music. No one three-hour Arts course can address all levels of relevance for all students. As a result, the Arts will be seen as bland, boring and unapproachable. In addition, those students who have an interest in one or the other of the Arts from their earlier education (it happens) will be turned off rather than edified, with the result that this would become just another three hours credit that will have to be survived.

7) Suggestion concerning the Arts component: There seems to be the aforementioned desire on the part of the committee both to standardize the common curriculum but also to make it more accessible and relevant to the individual student. In this spirit I would agree that the choice of courses available for General Education should be restricted, while still allowing some flexibility. I also agree that this should happen across the board, not just in the Arts. For the Arts I would advocate that one or two courses be made available in each of the Arts disciplines instead
of just one for all. Some students might prefer an Art History course with some creative exercises thrown in, while others might be more comfortable with a hands on course in drawing, painting, sculpture and/or photography with some history and criticism thrown in (such is likely a part of these courses anyhow). Both types of courses should be available to the student in an elective manner to fulfill the requirement. The same types of courses could be designed for Music and for Theatre --- one course more lecture based, with some creative experience thrown in, and another course more creatively oriented, with the historical and critical basis included. I realize, of course, that this would require the development of new courses in each area, but the chance of making this happen would be much more likely than in the proposed model. I reiterate that this would entail a limited number of courses – not an ongoing list that keeps regenerating newer and newer courses. Naturally, there would have to be some adjustments in staffing, but that would also be necessary with the course as proposed by the committee. What is different is that faculty would be more likely to adjust to this model than to the stifling and unwieldy model proposed, and the student would likely be more receptive. I would also hope that since this is to be a 200-level course that the student would have had some time to get their bearings during their first year and be better able to make a knowledgeable choice among the options offered.

8) Comments on other proposed courses:

a. **Course in Practical Ethical Action** --- This is a good idea, but my concern is that the course could easily become didactic, preaching rules rather than encouraging ethical reasoning and judgment. This is especially a potential issue with the inevitable use of part-time instructors.

b. **CAP Inquiry Elective** --- Again, an OK idea. This concept would probably become watered down as time went on and some students would find ways to abuse its intent, but I have seen students find connections in some of my technical courses that surprised even me. So some freedom for the students to make their own connections is good.

c. I agree that **Diversity** should be infused throughout the academic program. Some courses may deal more specifically than others with the concept, but requiring a single course to study diversity would likely become counterproductive due to resentment on the part of some students. Diversity should not have difficulty finding its way into most courses, especially in the Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences.

d. **Service Learning.** I respect the concept of Service Learning and I have seen some students derive much from the elective program as it now exists. However, making it a requirement for all departments to establish the delivery and staffing of service learning experiences is ambitious and a bit unrealistic. Will there be an Assistant Provost for Service Learning established to abet and monitor this process? Will permanent relationships be built up by the University with local and regional entities to help deliver these experiences? If not, will comp time be awarded to staff and faculty who assist in the delivery of the course or experience? There is also the question of those students, some brilliant, who are not mature enough to fit in to such a program – how are they to be managed? This is a concept that needs more study before full implementation. Perhaps introducing it as an elective, alternative to some related required course of study, could provide some needed testing and insight.

e. **The CAP Integrative Course** would be possible only as a course offered by or for each unit among the Schools, and possibly by each sub-council within the College. The course should be similar in intent throughout, but slanted to the particular needs and experiences of the students in the respective units.
Department of Visual Arts

The following constitutes the response of the Department of Visual Arts, College of Arts and Sciences to the eight questions concerning the Common Academic Program proposal (CAP proposal) that were distributed by the Academic Policies Committee (APC) of the Academic Senate. This response is the product of conversations that took place in the Fall semester, 2008 within the Education Committee of the Department of Visual Arts and within a meeting of the entire Visual Arts faculty that was sponsored by the Education Committee. Once drafted by the Education Committee, this response was considered, revised, and approved by the entire Visual Arts faculty for submission to the APC.

The Department of Visual Arts considered the CAP in its totality as a coordinated, four-year, and developmental approach to general education that calls upon curriculum in majors and that of a general nature to be mutually supporting and integrated. More specifically, as one of the areas that would be responsible for the design and delivery of the CAP-Core Arts course (together with the Department of Music and the Theatre Program), the Department closely examined that proposal within the CAP for what advantages and challenges it would bring to the Department of Visual Arts and the arts units in general. While time did not permit joint meetings among Visual Arts, Music, and Theatre to discuss this first response to the CAP proposal, the Department of Visual Arts fully recognizes that joint meetings will be necessary in the future for the design and delivery of CAP-Core Arts.

The Questions:

*What in your domain (e.g., unit, department, or committee) is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or in part with the provisions of the CAP proposal?*

There are five points of alignment between what is currently done in the Department of Visual Arts and what is outlined in the CAP proposal. First, the arts by their very nature are integrating pursuits, so the essential practice and study of the arts and the general philosophy of the CAP are in philosophical alignment. Second, the Department of Visual Arts offers a coordinated Foundations sequence of courses for all incoming first-year students. While this Foundations sequence is not modeled after the CORE Program, its design is to provide students similarly with a common foundation in the discipline of Visual Arts before specialization in Art Education, Art History, Fine Art, Photography, or Visual Communication Design. Second, not unlike Music and Theatre, education in the Visual Arts is also developmental and the design of curricula in the Department of Visual Arts specifically aligns with this approach to learning that is found in the CAP proposal. Third, the Department of Visual Arts has a long-standing tradition of senior capstone classes and/or experiences in studio disciplines, art history, and art education. Fourth, the Department has increasingly in recent years participated in the design and delivery of interdisciplinary courses that could serve as models and/or offerings for the CAP Integrative Course. And fifth, given that the Department has long been involved in providing education that equally emphasizes professional and more traditional liberal arts learning, there is alignment between what is presently practiced in Visual Arts and the emphasis on “reciprocal learning” between the College and the Professional Schools that
is provided for in the CAP proposal.

What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?
The Department of Visual Arts supports and applauds a developmental approach to learning and an integration of education in the majors with general education (through the emphasis on the seven student learning outcomes of Habits of Inquiry and Reflection) that is presented in the CAP proposal. Additionally, the Department supports the idea of the CAP-Core, the idea of an Integrative Third Year Course, a CAP Inquiry Elective, a Service Learning Requirement a Capstone course or experience, and the principle of reciprocal learning across the College and between the College and the Professional Schools.

More specifically to its own discipline, the Department affirms the value of a CAP-Core Arts class that would involve students from across the University in the meaningful study of all aspects of the visual arts as opposed to the more limited access that students currently have to arts education in the present General Education Program. In the present General Education Program, there is no possibility for the inclusion of studio arts classes to satisfy the Arts Study Requirement. The CAP-Core Arts class in the CAP proposal recognizes the importance of the arts as a valuable set of disciplines and modes of learning and thereby eliminates impediments to the inclusion of studio arts classes and/or content in general education and thereby promises a broader, richer, and more enlightened approach to arts education for all University of Dayton students.

What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?
While the Department supports in general the philosophy and progression of integrated learning in the CAP proposal, there was considerable concern expressed that disproportionate responsibility is assigned to different areas and courses for delivering of the various seven student learning outcomes of Habits of Learning and Reflection.

Additionally, there was concern in discussions about three matters associated with the CAP-Core: (1) that the disciplines and emphases of the CAP-Core (history, philosophy, religious studies, and English, together with the Social Sciences and the Arts) represent more a “reshuffling” of the existing General Education emphases and not a sufficiently new and exciting approach to education for all University of Dayton undergraduates; (2) that the CORE Program model, however, successful and laudable is not easily “scaled up” beyond its current size and focus and that doing so might proof very unwieldy if not wholly untenable; (3) that the present suggestion for a CAP-Core Arts class takes insufficient consideration of the very different ways, contexts, and lengths of time that are essential for the meaningful and authentic delivery of much of arts instruction that has either a studio or a performance base; and (4) that additional consideration will be necessary so that disciplines, such as Visual Arts, that offer both BA and BFA programs, the latter being particular full with existing discipline-specific requirements, can suitably accommodate the CAP without sacrificing necessary concentration in the major.

Finally, the Department felt that there was insufficient emphasis given to international, intercultural, and diversity learning and language education in the CAP proposal. While the Diversity Learning Outcome of Habits of Learning and Reflection is addressed, it leaves the
inclusion of diversity content wholly up to the CAP-Core, the CAP-Core Addresses, and the curriculum of individual departments while not also calling upon students and their faculty mentors taking a more active and authorial role in making these important areas of learning more central.

What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?
The CAP proposal comes across as a very responsible, structured, and integrated approach to undergraduate education in and beyond the major. What it seems to lack is adequate provision for and encouragement of students taking some active “ownership” over their learning and intellectual experience at university. In other words, beyond the independent “act” of selecting a major, something which many of our students do with mixed levels of understanding and sophistication, there is little that the individual student can do to both author and demonstrate her/his design of and engagement with university education. This problem is compounded by the fact that most of our students select their majors even before their college experiences begin, with the result being that few of our undergraduates do little more than follow prescribed paths and thereby fail to engage independently and creatively in the design and pursuit of their education.

What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provision of the CAP proposal.
Most particularly, the Department of Visual Arts would need to be in close conversation and collaboration with the Department of Music and the Theatre Program in the design and development of common content for a CAP-Core Arts class and individual class offerings (sections). The Department would additionally need to discuss ways in which it could contribute to the CAP-Core Addresses on an annual basis.

What resources and or changes would be needed to make that development possible?
Should the CAP-Core Arts class remain a feature of the CAP, serious consideration will need to take place regarding available faculty (full and part time) as well as available facilities for the delivery of this offering. Unlike lecture classes that can accommodate large numbers of students, studio classes by their very nature must be taught with limited numbers of students in more intimate, project-oriented contexts. Should the CAP be implemented, more faculty and/or more and improved facilities will be needed unless the studio- and performance-based areas of Visual Arts, Music, and Theatre are expected to deliver only a small proportion of CAP-Core Arts offerings. This, however, would seem to undermine the whole idea (and a laudable one of that) of providing all students with an arts course in which they experience inseparably the theory and practice of the arts.

In particular, what if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?
There are, in theory, any number of things that we currently do that in the way in which we do them constitutes potential impediments to the advancement of the CAP proposal. That stated, one area to emphasize might well be faculty recruitment and development as a way to underscore and advance the value of the CAP. Since the CAP is built on the philosophical foundation of integrating major-specific education and general education on a
developmental model, and with that model being one that at least purports to emphasize and value reciprocal learning between the College and the Professional Schools, it will be important to define faculty positions, hire new faculty, and mentor and provide them with faculty development opportunities that are in alignment with the principles of the CAP. The CAP will succeed or fail, or merely languish as a rather slightly modified form of business and disciplines as usual, without the investment of faculty commitment and new faculty who are enthusiastic about the exciting prospects of its development.

What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?

One concern is simply its feasibility: Can the CORE Program as model be sufficiently and responsibly “scaled up” to serve all University of Dayton undergraduates as opposed to the select few who presently are enrolled in the CORE Program? Another concern is whether areas such as the Arts in particular have staffing, facilities, and university-wide understanding of what makes the arts distinctive in order to deliver a CAP-Core Arts course as it should be authentically delivered as a suitable learning experience in the arts. And finally, the CAP proposal shares two things with the existing General Education Program that itself has never captured the interest or imagination of our community and could well stand to be revised accordingly: its rather Byzantine complexity and its emphasis on a menu of courses that are conceived more in the spirit of “what is necessary for our students at a Catholic and Marianist university” that “what will truly engage and excite our students and faculty in a vibrant learning community.” Along these lines, how will the adoption of the CAP change the University of Dayton for the better? There is good evidence here that aspects of the present University curriculum are preserved, and others are strengthened and promoted to the larger learning community in ways that have not been the case in the past (the arts in particular). But is this program workable? Is it interesting? Will it aid in our recruitment and retention both of students and of promising new faculty members? Will it enable our faculty to grow pedagogically over the years? Is it, frankly, new, transformative, and distinctive enough to be worth the effort of substantial revision of our existing General Education Program?
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Item II.
The Chair updated the committee on the information coming out of the APC regarding forums
being held to discuss Senate Document 08-01. A diagram of the CAP document that is posted on
the web was distributed to the committee at the last meeting in order to assist them to navigate
the site and to be able to read the CAP recommended changes to the curriculum.

The Chair distributed handouts related to the CAP Draft Proposal and reminded the committee
that our formal feedback regarding the CAP proposal must be submitted by
December 12. He directed everyone’s attention to the eight questions on the CAP Feedback Form
on the last page of the CAP Draft Proposal packet.

Discussion of the CAP Draft Proposal
[Process Questions]
Question: A question was asked about who will write the next draft of the CAP proposal
Response: Don reported that the APC made it clear that they will shepherd the initial discovery
phase and the revisions. Once the feedback from departments and committees has been turned,
the committee will determine what will go into the document. He also noted that all feedback is
currently being posted to the discussion website. A motion was made that our committee notes be
posted there as well.

Question: A question concerning the relative weight of the comments was posed.
Response: All feedback will be considered. Duncan has been saying that he will be looking for
patterns in the feedback. All departments should be dialoging—responding, reflecting, sharing
ideas between them not just at the Chairs’ meetings.

Question: How can the process of this interdepartmental conversation be built? Where
does the dialogue fit in?
Response: This concern or question should be expressed to the APC representative.

Comment: The lack of a clear outline of the process and the dates doesn’t appear to connect with
the idea of multiple drafts. Not all of the components are there for a complete document. Faculty
must take part in this and not a graduate student. The graduate student commitment is finite and
limited. There needs to be a financial incentive available for this.

Question: A question was posed asking if the promise of money for pilots has not already
sabotaged the process of conversation or its development?
Response: There may have been unintended consequences of putting out timelines in response to
the changes in priorities and process.

Comment: Huge resources are going to be needed for the New CAP, for pilots. There
should be ways to discuss common readings that would be applicable across the disciplines that
would allow contextual links to prepare for more common ground and for WAC.

Comment: It appears that there are whole ranges of issues that are being sped through.
Concerning linked courses: where would you put them? Do we have the faculty interest and
capability? Is there sufficient space? How do we begin to think these ideas through?

Question: A question was posed: How is it doable? Are we defining what Humanities Studies
mean? Are we looking at the Humanities tradition, the University identity? What makes our university unique? Another question asked: Can the document target those people who are concerned and then get them to talk? Is there something that is already being done? What were the problems that were defined in the previous document for the humanities? What is the intellectual justification of not reviewing those documents to see if we are in compliance already? What did we do with those documents? Where are they?

Comment: We need to understand the past. We need a definition of the problem before we perform a full revision. Did the committee define the current problems with general education?
Response: The assessment reports are clear. HUB goals are laudable but they suffer in the implementation phase. The charge said start with the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection. The faculty and staff is saying HUB needs a greater degree of integration. 50% of the people in the college were not involved in the last curriculum renovation.

Comment: The CORE is an amazing program. Is there a way to figure out how to structure a program that impacts the students the same way CORE does?
Response: CORE doesn’t go away in the new model. What the humanities should want is a more integrated model that would impact all the undergraduates. A model where students can be as directly engaged as much as Honor Students are.
Response: This is a matter of feasibility. Space and integration are challenges in implementing a change with this much scope and inter-dependence, inter-departmental cooperation, and scheduling. The Humanities Based curriculum was not sold well enough or was not inspiring enough for total buy in that would have included the allotment of adequate resources for full implementation. Collapse always occurs at the implementation stage. Which has happened even in the old model.

Comment: We really shouldn’t be talking about implementation at this stage. Our focus, now, should be about the curriculum. We can’t move forward without something big and transformative. It has to be bold and have something substantive to say. The Humanities Based curriculum was not properly introduced. It was just shoehorned in. This needs to be a bold initiative and it needs implementation money behind it. What is the point of all the effort behind the conversation if there is no money to implement the recommended changes?

Comment: It would be useful to understand how CORE operates and what was the time commitment from the CORE faculty before it was implemented. What were their struggles, issues, problems?
Response: The hallmark of CORE is the faculty interaction. CAP CORE is designed to be the evolution of CORE.

Question: Why are we calling CORE something else? Why a new acronym? “CAP” is meaningless.

Question: How does this move forward? Who owns this thing? Who is saying how this will work? Who are the champions?
**Question:** Have we defined or asked what is UD supposed to be as a great Catholic educational institution?

**Comment:** The Humanities needs to be central in keeping with the tradition of a great Catholic education.

**Comment:** There is a gap between the Habits of Inquiry document and CAP. There needs to be a comprehensive look at all the documents.

**Comment:** The outcomes do not have the same intensity. Some of the courses are already there in place…they just need to be designed to meet the current objective.

**Meeting Adjourned:** 12:00 p.m.
**Minutes recorded by Lori Phillips-Young**

---

**Notes from CCPD Humanities Sub-Council Discussion**

**Tues., Nov. 18, 11:00 a.m.**

**Present:** J. Amin, J. Hess, S.H. Hughes, J. Inglis, F. Peñas-Bermejo, A. Smith, and R. Whisnant

We like the idea that the CAP proposal is trying to think developmentally, though we have concerns about how this is applied. We also affirm the overarching goals. However, as humanities chairs and program directors, we have serious concerns about the proposed curriculum. The following issues emerged as points of shared concern among humanities departments and programs.

CAP seems to assume that we are doing nothing right in the existing gen ed program and need to start from scratch. What/where is the rationale for “junking” everything we now have? Why a total re-build? Why no articulation/memory of the general thrust or focus of what we’re already doing? The document reads as if we are not already meeting any of the desired learning outcomes in what we do now. And, rather than add missing pieces to what is already working, it takes a set of outcomes that need some new attention and makes them the center and whole of what we are to do. These outcomes are good in themselves, but they are not everything. They miss key aspects of what a liberal education ought to do. That is to say, CAP doesn’t sufficiently read HIR in the context of who we already are and what we are already doing.

- CAP does not propose a coherent, recognizable, or feasible model for interdisciplinary study. In fact, it looks to us like a step away from connected learning.
- LLCs and Clusters, to some degree, already do foster interdisciplinarity. LLCs, which are small enough to be specific, varied, and faculty-driven, are generating excitement. Clusters, though not perfect, do lead students into interdisciplinary minors and majors in a way that the proposed curriculum will not. Clusters have stated themes/content, and they give students some freedom of choice with regard to courses. These are aspects worth maintaining.
- The proposal for an upper-level interdisciplinary capstone with no clear content focus concerns us. At least two members of our committee hold PhDs in interdisciplinary fields, and the integrative capstone idea leaves us worried and “cold.” Students can do solid interdisciplinary work at the upper level when they have a question or problem that spans disciplinary approaches and knowledge. Interdisciplinary programs have the expertise and interest to develop advanced courses in these areas. Requiring a team-taught
“interdisciplinary-on-demand” course for all students that is not linked to existing programs (which are already insufficiently funded and supported) seems ill advised.

- CAP seems to do little to promote programs such as WGS and AMS; indeed, we are concerned it may undermine their efforts.
- CAP dilutes the role of the humanities.
- It is too “presentist” in approach, too often assuming practical wisdom as a starting point of inquiry. Other ways of knowing instilled by the humanities need to precede the kinds of practical application that CAP proposes to impose. General knowledge needs to precede practical knowledge in the developmental schema.
- It lacks sufficient attention to traditions. Traditions are deeply grounded in the humanities. They are historical (i.e. they change over time). CAP fails to provide 1st and 2nd year students with enough content and context. Eliminating the 2nd HST requirement for all undergrads seems unwise. Students need the kind of contextualization HST provides. A solid grounding in the study of history is crucial to being able to “read the signs of the times.”
- Perhaps because HIR does not emphasize certain crucial skills and habits that underlie the more advanced habits of inquiry and reflection—i.e. reading, writing, and oral communication skills in both English and Foreign languages—the CAP proposal neglects to attend sufficiently to the role education in these skills ought to play in the common curriculum. Developing increasing levels of competency in all of these areas is fundamental to and embedded in the HIR outcomes. Students cannot “read the signs of the times” if they cannot bring sophisticated strategies to bear in reading, writing, speaking, and listening with others both within and beyond their immediate communities. These need more specific attention in the proposed curriculum, and the Communication Department ought to be given leadership in shaping oral communication outcomes and their delivery. There is no rationale given in the proposal for the radical change with regard to communication competencies.
- The term “engagement” is used repeatedly, but seems to assume that student engagement happens, or will happen, entirely in English. Linguistic diversity is crucial to intercultural and inter-community engagement. CAP seems to be at odds with larger commitments to internationalization. The question was raised as to how CAP aligns with the University’s 2006 Strategic Plan, in which a major goal is global citizenship. How can students “read the signs of the times” with competency in a single language? How are UD’s international students to be engaged by this proposed curriculum? How can service learning be supported in languages other than English? How can students manage a semester abroad with this curriculum?
- The concept of vocation is to quickly collapsed in much of CAP into professionalization. The document fails to recognize that humanities disciplines (and others in the liberal arts) do not, in fact, primarily aim to produce students with “professions” per se. It makes sense that our students should be able to engage in thoughtful discussion about the concept of vocation, but to require that they have a sense of vocation seems too ambitious given their age/experience. Further, a sense of vocation is not something we can produce. Making it a student learning outcome is akin to trying to make something as unmeasurable and unmanufacturable as “spirituality” a required “student learning outcome.”
- Literature—whether in English or another language—is ignored as an art form in the proposed CAP curriculum. Why are literature and creative writing omitted from the CAP core Arts course? In this curriculum, English appears as composition & rhetoric only (via ENG 100-200). Other humanities departments are given the freedom to determine what their
contribution to CAP core will be, but English is not. Literary study is entirely absent. Reading the signs of the times requires skills in reading and interpreting signs and symbols in context of history, culture, politics, and tradition. This is what literary studies teach.

Other points:

**Internationalization & Diversity:** We want to see more support for internationalization and intercultural competence. As well, the diversity requirement needs beefing up. Why not a university-wide stipulated course requirement? This could do much to feed interdisciplinary minors and majors like Women’s and Gender Studies, American Studies, and Africana Studies. We don’t want to pit internationalization against domestic/racial diversity. Both need more serious attention.

**CAP Addresses:** Faculty teaching first year courses in CAP will not, en masse, go to the “CAP Addresses.” Indeed, the whole address structure looks to us like a shipwreck waiting to happen.

**The Current Core Program as Model:** The Core program is not limitlessly expandable, as the CAP proposal seems to be attempting to do. Core depends for its success on its small number of committed faculty. General education simply cannot expect that kind of buy-in universally.

**Natural Science Department Chairs**

This response derives from two discussions that occurred among the Chairs of the Departments of Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geology, Mathematics, and Physics, as well as the Mann Chair of the Sciences. These discussions were informed by discussions that the Chairs had with their several departments. The concerns raised in this response were common among the Science Chairs. Let us first say what we support. We support the efforts of the university and the CAP Committee to evaluate our General Education Program and try to find ways to improve it. We support rigorous program that will extend our students’ intellectual, social, and moral being. We will work with the university to provide such a program to all of our students. But we do have concerns about the proposed program and we are not convinced that it provides the best way to educate our students. Our concerns are divided into two sections. The first section contains general comments that could apply to departments across the university. The second section contains comments that are, or could be, unique to the science departments.

**General Comments**

1. **Diagnosis Before Treatment**

The draft CAP proposal correctly states that faculty support is essential for the successful implementation of the proposal. This support will be impossible to obtain unless the faculty are convinced that the goals of the CAP cannot be achieved without a serious reworking of the existing General Education System. We do not believe that the proposal has made this case. It needs to specify how the current system fails to deliver the seven learning outcomes of the HIR and to support a contention that it is impossible to deliver these outcomes through a simpler adjustment of the current system. Our faculty members want to know what is broken with the
current system that needs fixing, and how the draft fixes it. One motivation for the current system was interdisciplinary integration, just as it is with the CAP. The current system has largely failed to deliver this integration. Rather than a cluster being a small, tightly knit group of courses from several disciplines which are built around a common theme, it has become a large collection of disparate courses, still built around a common theme, but with no opportunity for students to truly synthesize what they have learned. The faculty needs to be convinced that the proposed CAP will not degenerate into the same kind of system. With such major changes and such a complex program the draft must argue why the new system will work better than the old system. Some faculty members question whether the proposed CAP was designed to validate the HIR, which was in turn created to support the Capital Campaign. To gain widespread faculty support for the CAP, the APC will need to address these concerns.

2. **Motivation for the Proposal**
   The charge to the Subcommittee on the Common Academic Program was to “to create a draft proposal for a common academic program for University of Dayton students based on the seven learning outcomes in Habits of Inquiry and Reflection.” Many of the recommendations contained in the current CAP draft follow recommendations made by the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection, but may not be the best way to educate students on the basis of the seven learning outcomes of HIR. Is the purpose of the CAP draft to implement recommendations made in the HIR or to thoughtfully consider what the best course would be to align our current program with the seven outcomes of HIR? In their discussion of the history of general education at the University of Dayton the only criticism of our current system is the lack of synthesis. There is no discussion of whether the current system does or does not deliver the seven learning outcomes. While we recognize the value of developing integrative thinking by students we question whether integration of instruction on the massive scale envisioned in this document is necessary or even desirable to achieve the outcomes specified by HIR. Could we possibly implement the seven outcomes more efficiently and with a better educational product without this integration? Is there an institution in which such integration has been successfully implemented, and has it been shown to improve the education of its students? The only criticism of the current General Education program which is found in the draft is regarding integration. See Section I.B. If this is the only problem, one must wonder if integration is worth the effort that the draft proposal would require of the university. Would it be better to simply ensure that the seven outcomes are attained in what we do with the current structure?

3. **Scope of the Proposed Program**
   It seems that the program outlined in the draft is too big. It seems unwieldy and very likely unworkable. The sheer size is daunting and the details are complex. The fact that the document calls for the creation of a new administrator (IV.A.1) and two new committees (IV.A.2 and IV.A.3) is a warning. The draft also calls for support personnel beyond these new positions to coordinate the paired CAP Core courses and the CAP Addresses (IV.D.1.d). And the document itself is unsure about the feasibility of the CAP Addresses. Section III.B.1.d on page 18 of the draft contains the following sentence. “The Subcommittee notes that there are significant implementation challenges to the delivery of the CAP-Core Addresses.”

4. **Interdisciplinary Integration**
The draft CAP proposal places the emphasis for interdisciplinary integration on instruction. We believe that it should be placed on the student. We also do not believe that meaningful interdisciplinary integration is possible without substance. By placing the emphasis on interdisciplinary instruction during the first two years of college the proposal creates significant logistical and pedagogical difficulties. If meaningful interdisciplinary integration is the goal it might be better to wait until later in the students’ careers to try to achieve it. For example, under the current cluster system more meaningful synthesis could be achieved by having students within a cluster write a paper on the theme of the cluster after they have finished the three courses. They would then have the substance on which to build and they, rather than the instructor, would bring together the various concepts and principles that they have learned. We believe that the CAP should in the first two years give students the basic skills and knowledge that they will need to achieve worthwhile synthesis of scholarship during the last two years.

5. Budgetary Concerns
The size of the proposed program raises legitimate budgetary concerns. The draft correctly states that in order for this program to work a great deal of faculty development is needed (IV.B.3). Many sections of courses that are currently candidates for CAP courses are taught by part time faculty or by graduate students. This means that constant training is required to inform these instructors of the intent of the CAP courses and to ensure that the goals of the CAP courses are met. It also means that faculty will need to devote time to training these instructors; time which is taken away from teaching, research or service. If current faculty must be pulled from classes to train part time instructors and graduate students, then more part time instructors must be hired to replace them. Alternately, the university could fund a significant number of new faculty lines across the campus. Either alternative is expensive. Will the members of the CAP Leadership Team and the CAP Course Approval Committee be given reduced teaching loads? What about the support personnel who coordinate the paired CAP-Core courses and CAP-Core Addresses? This will be another expense. Further, the draft calls for possible renovation of classrooms to accommodate CAP-Core Addresses (IV.B.6). These are just a few of the resource issues raised by the proposal.

6. Attempt to Bring Majors into the CAP
Some aspects of the CAP as it is outlined in the current draft go beyond general education or a common program and place requirements on individual majors. For example, every major is required to create a capstone experience. It is possible that for some majors this is not the best way to ensure a quality education. The departments have not been consulted on this issue. Since different majors will have fundamentally different types of capstone experiences this is no longer a part of a common academic program. Another area in which the draft intrudes into the curriculum of departments is the expectation found in Section IV.B.3 that all faculty members “understand the CAP and are prepared to draw connections to the CAP in their in-major courses.”

7. Oversight and Assessment
There are oversight and assessment difficulties, especially with outcomes such as diversity and service which can be attained with activities outside the classroom. Who is to be responsible for assuring that the activities meet the stated goals and the students’ participation is sufficient? Will
this add to the workload of the faculty? Will the CAP Course Approval Committee oversee extracurricular activities? The draft suggests that the NSSE survey be used to assess the overall program. Will a survey, which students can answer any way they chose, really give an accurate picture of how the program is operating and whether it is achieving its goals? Can we be sure that all students will take this survey? The draft calls for an annual assessment of CAP courses during the implementation phase. How long is the implementation phase? It is assumed that part of the assessment would address integration of different disciplines. How much integration is needed to be considered a success? How does one measure the connections that students have made between different disciplines? Some of the seven outcomes from HIR will be difficult to measure, for example vocation. Diversity and community could also be difficult to truly assess. Courses in the majors are expected to relate to the CAP. How will this be assessed? Instructors of classes may not have sufficient grasp of some issues to adequately assess whether students have actually achieved the desired goal.

8. CAP-Core Addresses
Unless we misunderstand the suggestion for CAP-Core Addresses they seem to present problems of time. The draft recommends five to seven CAP-Core Addresses each term (III.B.1.d). Does this mean that each pairing of courses has five to seven addresses each semester? In the next paragraph, when the structure of the CAP-Core Addresses is discussed, it sounds as though each pair has one address in the semester. For the draft states that “in the first year, the CAP-Core Address for the paired CAP REL/CAP HST course would be delivered to 800-900 students.” Are these addresses to be given during the regularly scheduled class time, or are they to be given at another time? If they are given during class then they would seem to make it difficult for the courses to cover important material that is an integral part of the course. If they are held at another time then they intrude on students’ time for study. They take up further class time in the discussion of the address. Will these addresses take up so much class time that essential material can be covered in only the most superficial way?

9. Credit from Outside the University of Dayton
The draft proposal recommends against placing students out of CAP requirements when they come to the university with AP credit, dual enrollment credit, or PSEO credit (IV.D.4.c). While the same recommendation is not made regarding transfer credit we assume that the subcommittee would like students with transfer credit to participate in as much of the CAP as possible. We would favor a more lenient view when it comes to such credit issues. Forcing a student to take a course when he or she has already mastered the majority of the material does not add significantly to the student’s education. In fact, it can be seen as diminishing the education that we offer. Bored students will not be receptive to the other values that the course is trying to instill. We will also create recruitment problems when students and their families discover that the AP, dual enrollment or PSEO course that they took will not count towards the corresponding course at the University of Dayton. How many transfer students will we lose when they discover that some of their credits, which are accepted everywhere else, are not accepted by the University of Dayton, or that they are required to take a similar course?

10. Double Majors and Minors
We fear an adverse effect on students wishing to double major or to get a minor in some
departments. The CAP can place a significant demand on students’ time, which will not make it easy to pick up a second major. Demanding minors will also suffer. Service is tied to the major in the current draft. Does this mean that a double major will have to do two service projects?

11. **Service Learning**
The requirement that service learning must be tied to the major should be relaxed. It can be difficult for some disciplines to find meaningful service for their students. By counting only service that is related to the major, we also inhibit the student from participating in very meaningful service that is not related to the major. This is not the way that service is done in real life. We are also concerned that the types of activities which count as service could be too restricted. Certain kinds of research could have great benefits for many people and should be viewed as service rendered.

12. **Work Loads**
Interdisciplinary integration encourages team teaching. But university workload policy discourages it. How can we support team teaching when the university recognizes it as at most half of a teaching assignment? This also has an impact on budget issues mentioned earlier. These and other logistics issues arise no matter how or when synthesis of knowledge occurs, especially if the emphasis is placed on interdisciplinary instruction. If the University is serious about this aspect of learning it will need to find a solution to this problem.

13. **Rewards for CAP Participation**
Faculty participation in the CAP is supposed to be recognized in the tenure and promotion process (IV.B.4). Will departments need to revise their tenure and promotion policies to ensure this recognition? How will such participation be weighed compared to research or to teaching and service outside the CAP?

**Comments Specific to Science and Mathematics**

14. **Delivery of Mathematics and Science Courses**
In Sections III.B.4 and III.B.5 when the draft discusses how the mathematics and natural sciences courses will be delivered it uses the word “ordinarily”, so that the mathematics course is ordinarily delivered by the Mathematics Department and the science courses are ordinarily delivered by the science departments. The word “ordinarily” must be removed. These courses should not be delivered by other disciplines.

15. **Lack of Involvement of Mathematics and the Sciences in the CAP**
The draft does not involve the sciences and mathematics in much of the CAP. When describing the CAP Integrative Course the draft demands connections with humanities, arts, and/or social sciences, but the natural sciences and mathematics are not mentioned (III.B.11). Why this omission when the natural sciences and mathematics play such a crucial role in attempts to frame and answer many of today’s most important questions? Are only six hours of science, with no laboratory experience, really sufficient?

16. **Effect of CAP on First & Second Year Schedules in Mathematics & Science**
Many courses in the sciences and in mathematics must be taken in a certain sequence due to
developmental and prerequisite concerns. Though the draft calls for a possible realignment of courses within the major (IV.D.1.c) this may not be easy or even possible in the sciences. The structure of the science programs means that some majors have a significant number of proscribed hours during their first and second year. Scheduling will become difficult if not impossible if first year courses can be scheduled opposite CAP-Core courses (IV.B.6). Time also becomes an important factor with some students taking at least 18 hours to satisfy both the CAP and their major program. In this situation the CAP-Core Addresses could take students to the breaking point.

17. **Effect of the CAP on the Content of Courses in Mathematics and Science**

We are concerned about the impact of the CAP on some courses taught in the natural sciences and mathematics. The chart given in Appendix D indicates that science courses are only concerned with scholarship and the critical evaluation of our time, while mathematics is concerned with scholarship alone. But these are minimal requirements and the CAP Leadership Team or the CAP Course Approval Committee could decide that other of the seven outcomes should be covered. In that case, or in the present case for science, will these other outcomes squeeze out essential material? Will the course become less rigorous in an effort to make it fit more of the HIR outcomes?

18. **Relationship of the CAP to the INSS**

The draft needs to clarify that the six-hour science requirement will not affect the current INSS
School of Business Administration

Department of Accounting

1. What in your domain (e.g., unit, department, or committee) is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or part with the provisions of the CPA proposal?

Unlike some of the other SBA majors, we do not have a “project” oriented capstone course in our curriculum. We definitely do not believe such a course is needed or desired given our mission and the nature of our discipline and related profession. While we in many respects consider our required four credit Auditing course somewhat of a capstone course (e.g., for assessment/assurance of learning purposes) it is not clear that this course would meet the definition of a capstone course others might have. A large proportion, but not all, of our majors also currently obtain professional work experience (i.e., internships, “co-ops,” etc.) during the time in our program. This is a key strength of our program. It is not clear if such experience and/or our “quasi” capstone noted above would meet the definition and requirement for “service learning,” although the relatively broad definition implied in the document suggests an affirmative answer.

(Our program maintains separate AACSB accreditation and seems very well respected and accepted by students, employers, alumni, and other key stakeholders. We do not wish to have a capstone course meeting some other group’s definition imposed on our curriculum unless such a course in fact makes good sense for our program. Relative to simply adding an additional capstone course, we also note that the accounting major already requires 24 semester hours beyond the 6 hours in principles of accounting required of all SBA majors. The major courses presently cover topics required for accreditation and or professional exams. The 30 hours in accounting is also the total required for our students to attempt professional exams (e.g., CPA) in most jurisdictions. Our graduates must meet this requirement for our program to remain competitive.)

2. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?

Enhanced collaboration and interaction between the SBA and the rest of the University is worthwhile, although it seems at times that related requirements to do so might be excessive and potentially inflexible (and costly). The concept of a course in “practical ethical action” is of interest. However, it appears that an additional ethics/professional standards course might be required in our program by accreditation standards or professional exam requirements in the not too distant future. We likely would wish to be able to meet accreditation/professional examination requirements with such a course, and these requirements might well be different than those resulting from CAP.

3. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weakness and should be significantly rethought or discarded?

While the “CAP Inquiry Elective” is possibly an example of a course that might well be of some value, there is a question of cost versus benefit here and numerous other places in the document. We must have a certain number of SBA and ACC courses in our program to remain accredited, for our students to meet professional exam requirements that typically met by graduates of
universities, and to be competitive. CAP must not be allowed to increase total degree requirements
to a material extent or cause the needs of specific majors or disciplines not to be met. Plus,
sufficient flexibility must be retained. We also were not quite sure what to think about the Social
Science course.

4. What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?

See above.

5. What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the CAP
proposal?

The answer would depend on whether or not we are able without excessive modification to meet
requirements for a capstone course and service learning. Involvement in the development of a
CAP Inquiring or Integrative course would also require faculty resources. If any “domino” impact
required a significant realignment or restructuring of our program, that would be a problem. We
also note that the combined BSBA with ACC major & MBA program completed by about 40% of
our majors, and the need to keep that program accreditable and competitive, imposes constraints
on us.

(Some SBA courses that currently are taken by most students in the second year, including
potentially ACC207 and/or ACC208, likely will need to be moved to the first year to make room
for additional CAP courses. The Department faculty believes that these ACC courses should NOT
generally be moved to the first year, although some first year students who have come to UD with
credit obtained during their high school years, or who have well above average academic
qualifications, might take ACC207 in the second semester of the first year. Many accounting
programs years ago attempted to move the basic accounting courses to the first year, generally
with very poor results. We do not wish to repeat this mistake.)

6. What resources and/or changes would be needed to make that development possible?

We have little slack in our faculty capacity and thus insufficient time to allot to significant
restructuring, course development, etc. without additional faculty resources and related time. Our
major and class sizes are relatively large at this point, and our faculty is relatively small and
overtaxed (with the supply of new faculty very short and very costly).

7. In particular, what if anything, might be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the
provisions of the CAP proposal?

We worry that we would stop being competitive in terms of excessive credits required to meet
BSBA graduation requirements in a timely manner given accreditation, professional examination,
etc. requirements. Plus, we worry that our combined and relatively seamless, integrated BSBA
w/ACC major – MBA would be more difficult for students to attain in a timely manner.

8. What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before
moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?
Will the University provide sufficient resources, especially in terms of sufficient faculty – these could be very significant. Will the concerns of the variety of programs in the College and professionals Schools be met adequately so viable, competitive programs can continue to be offered and continuously improved.

**Department of Economics and Finance**

1. What in your domain (e.g., unit, department, or committee) is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or in part with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

Economics: existing capstone course required.

Finance: two courses, although not called capstones, could be consider as such for investments. FIN 493, the real money portfolio management course and FIN 494: the simulated derivatives trading course. We have also introduced a bond-portfolio management course under the FIN498 special studies designation. This course would need to be numbered as a permanent course. Collectively these three courses could cover, at a maximum, 100 students. However, not all students wish to focus on investments. Some students are interested in managerial or corporate finance, and some may want to pursue a career in institutions. We would need to offer an additional two courses, capped at 15, per year. Also, the bond portfolio management course is currently staffed by an adjunct. In total, we would need to offer 4 additional courses per year, that are not currently staffed by full-time faculty. The implications that this requirement, along with service learning, creates a need for one more finance faculty.

2. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?

Elements that enhance interaction between the School of Business Administration and the rest of the university are worthwhile. However, the program imposes a much too rigid structure on the requirements for integration and interaction among disciplines.

3. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?

The CAP Social Science Course should be discarded as proposed. Students have had general social science courses in high school. While the course as proposed does allow for a discipline-specific component, the common requirement appears too general. Some integration of the introductory social science courses is desirable. This can be accomplished, however, in a much less restrictive manner. It could be realized by a topical component that is commonly shared by the introductory courses through either readings or a lecture series.

4. What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?

[Empty]
5. What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

We would have to develop a CAP Social Science course (Economics) and a service learning requirement. We would also probably be involved in a CAP inquiry elective and a CAP integrative course.

6. What resources and or changes would be needed to make that development possible?

Participation in the program would require a significant increase in resources on the economics side of the department. We expect that the program would require at least two additional full-time economics faculty. Principles of Microeconomics and Macroeconomics will be a continuing requirement for business and economics majors. Currently, we run several large sections of this course with 150-200 students. These students will continue to take the required introductory principles courses. In addition, many may choose to take the CAP Social Science course offered by the business school. There might be some decrease in demand from students outside the SBA as they substitute the CAP Social Science course for an economic principals course. However, many of these students would transition into a CAP Social Science course also run by this department. Consequently, there would be a net increase in required resources for second-year courses. There would be additional demands in the third and fourth year for staffing of integrative CAP inquiry and integrative courses.

7. In particular, what if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

[Empty]

8. What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?

The resource requirements should not be understated. We have had considerable negative experiences with integrative courses in the MBA program. The demands on faculty for new course have been considerable. Moreover, this is not just a onetime cost. Every time one of the instructors in a team-taught course changes additional course development is required. In addition, the courses have not been popular with faculty who prefer having more individualized control of class content.

*Management & Marketing Department*

**General Reactions**

*Positive reactions*
- moves us away from the previous clusters approach—which many faculty viewed as ineffective and/or too complex for students.
- The overall goals/objectives of CAP are laudable; we like the integrative aspects, the focus on experiential learning, and learning in community philosophy.

- Many of the elements of CAP are consistent with (or are literally) curricular/co-curricular elements already in place in all three Dept. majors (e.g., we already have disciplinary capstone in all 3 majors, arguably offer plenty of service learning activities/projects...though this depends on definitions).

- Service learning ideas are compatible with the SBA’s mission and dovetail nicely with programs and projects underway (e.g., “Walk the Talk”, etc.).

**Potential Drawbacks**

- Some view the CAP as overly complex. While general education is a wide topic with many inputs, some felt that the proposal tries to do too much.

- Several people felt that some elements of the proposal represent something of an “unfunded mandate.” This could present problems at the department level where those elements will need to be operationalized. Given that times are tough financially, and are likely to be for the foreseeable future, this is a serious challenge to the proposal.

- Some of the key terms in the CAP proposal are ambiguous or not clearly defined. This could turn into a positive to the extent we will be able to define terms in ways that make sense to individual schools and departments.

- CAP potentially creates a bureaucracy, significant management challenges.

- Schools with separate accreditation requirements (e.g., SOEAP, SOE, SBA) face some special challenges in terms of available credit hours/student time and other accreditation mandates. These need to be thought through fully in light of the CAP proposal.

**Specific Comments & Suggestions about the CAP Proposal**

1) **The role of the SBA capstone course** can be pivotal here.

   Our SBA curriculum already requires all SBA students to participate in a full semester, whole business simulation (MGT 490, the SBA capstone). This experience is already highly integrative, puts students in teams, and has been extremely successful. We do not want to layer in too many (if any) additional requirements into this class for CAP purposes (e.g., to accomplish service learning and/or diversity goals that we already tackle in other courses in department majors).

2) **Questions exist about what might “count” for CAP requirements.**

   Several questions exist as to whether Dept. courses, activities within courses, or activities outside of courses (e.g., department competitions) can count or double count for CAP experiences and/or requirements. For example, can the Emerson Advertising Challenge, a competition currently within MKT 421, count toward the CAP Service Learning requirement? Similar questions exist around: a) projects or competitions with organizations currently structured within various major capstone courses (i.e., MKT 450/455—client projects, MGT 410-P&G Leadership Challenge and other projects, MGT 430—consulting course with new ventures); b) competitions run by the department that are
not specifically tied to a course (i.e., P&G Marketing Challenge, Everest Real Estate Challenge, UD Business Plan Competition); and c) competitions not run by the department, but that require significant resources, high faculty involvement, and involve department students (e.g., our annual participation in the National Collegiate Sales Competition—we select a team of students and send them plus a faculty coach to the competition). Overall, we believe these projects, activities, and competitions are outstanding experiences for students and all involve outside organizations and are central to our mission.

3) **Implementation of the proposal by the CAP Team.**
   Faculty wonder about the ability of the CAP implementation team to execute the proposal, particularly over the long haul. We are not referring to team membership. Instead, the comment reflects faculty concerns about CAP complexity and the implementation approach—which is largely centralized. Perhaps allowing units more flexibility or the ability to demonstrate that their offerings follow a relatively specific set of guidelines (subject to periodic review) is a better way to go and would reduce the expense and inefficiency associated with a centralized bureaucracy.

4) **Role of Faculty Advisors.**
   The CAP document refers to faculty advisors at several points. This could present a concern given the direction the SBA is taking with respect to course-related advising. Specifically, the SBA is moving toward a centralized course and registration advising system. Moreover, the department already uses a centralized approach for our majors and minors (we also pre-register all our majors in department courses using a proprietary system). Consequently, we believe the SBA should inform CAP leadership of this move to a central advising model and that it should be reflected accordingly in how the CAP moves forward from an advising standpoint (at least relative to the SBA).

5) **The CAP Integrative Course.**
   We discussed the interdisciplinary execution of the CAP Integrative Course. Although the SBA will not be in the lead on this, significant cross-disciplinary integration is required, with a statement indicating that the course will be linked to other units. We were not clear what this means nor how it might impact department or SBA faculty. The examples of support provided by other units (e.g., guest lectures, etc.) are vague. Some concern was expressed that this interdisciplinary requirement could fall more heavily on our department than some others in the SBA since both the management and marketing sides of our department have strong disciplinary roots in the social sciences (e.g., to psychology, which underpins much of marketing and management).

6) **The CAP Diversity Requirement.**
   Department faculty feel that the CAP diversity requirement should be handled at the SBA level and should have some focus on international diversity. We note that the CAP proposal states that departments are responsible for ensuring their students have a diversity experience while noting that university wide programs might satisfy the requirement (e.g., CIP study abroad programs). The department faculty believes the SBA should take the position that to meet the diversity requirement, all SBA students should have either: a) 2
years of foreign language experience at UD and/or b) a significant study abroad experience (over summer or during a term). We also believe that this should be administered and monitored centrally in the SBA rather than at the department level, particularly because of the move toward centralized advising.

7) **The CAP inquiry elective has potential resource implications for MGT/MKT.**

   The department already has a very heavy external demand for course in both MGT and MKT, more than any unit in the SBA. Also, we have several section equivalents of non-SBA students taking our classes every semester. That said, the logical courses for the department to list as CAP inquiry courses would be MGT 201, MGT 301, and MKT 300. All three of these already meet at least two of the required learning outcomes for the inquiry elective. That said, listing these courses may well have resource implications since we would need to offer more sections.

8) **Key Learning & Department Courses.**

   Department faculty discussed what we would want all students at UD to learn and how this intersected with our current courses. Among the ideas suggested were a basic understanding of the law, particularly as it relates to business, personal financial skills, how to be an outstanding employee, how to operate effectively as a team, how to be a good consumer, and how to recognize opportunities. For the most part, these suggestions are covered in several department courses, including MGT 201, MGT 301, and MKT 300/301.

9) **Department “Social Science” Courses.**

   Department faculty discussed whether we would want to position our courses as “social science” courses per the CAP proposal. In a nutshell, organizational behavior and marketing have strong roots in psychology and sociology—both social sciences. Consequently, we are open to including both MGT 301 and MKT 300/301 as social science courses in the SBA.

---

**Department of MIS, OM & DSC**

The Department of MIS, OM, & DSC met on November 11, 2008 to discuss the common academic program (CAP) proposal and to develop feedback for Dean Shank. The first section of this document summarizes the responses from that meeting. In addition, Professor David Salisbury, who served on the CAP subcommittee of the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate, also provided written responses which are included. His thoughts are highly relevant given the time and effort that he invested in the development of this proposal.

**Overview of Department Response**

**Assumptions**

- We should question the ideas contained in the CAP proposal, not just the implementation issues.
Our current senior project courses in MIS and OPS will satisfy the *disciplinary capstone* requirement.

Our current senior project courses in MIS and OPS should satisfy the *service learning* requirement, although this is highly dependent on the definition used for service learning.

Observations

- Several SBA courses which are typically taken in the second-year will have to be moved to make room for the four (or five) CAP classes. We welcome first-year students into our statistics courses as long as they have had calculus. If a student needs MTH 128 and MTH 129, he will take DSC 210 and DSC 211 in his second year. This will make it difficult to take MIS 301 and/or OPS 301 in the second year. If the second natural science requirement is pushed into the third year, the student can take either MIS 301 or OPS 301.
- Diversity requirement may be met through a study abroad experience.
- ENG 101 and ENG 201 may present UD a marketing problem for students who have AP English credit, since these courses are taught as part of a larger experience. There is also a concern about how these courses are staffed. The department feels that the University should make resource investments to make this part of the CAP successful. Overreliance on adjunct faculty in ENG will hurt quality.
- The current requirements for communications is interviewing/group-processing/public speaking. We believe greater emphasis should be placed on presentations, and, in fact, public speaking could be increased to 3 hours. The department faculty members debated whether or not we should bring in the public presentation material into the curriculum on our own. Alternatively, we felt that a systematic approach as shown below should be used.

(A) A checklist of communication skills should be created for first-year students, second-year students, etc. This list should be given to the students and to the other units of the University (like the Communications Department) who will provide the instruction for the students.

(B) The unit should periodically review for the SBA how it accomplishes the task of teaching the skills contained on the checklist. This might include standing up in front of a group and giving a talk, providing a coherent summary of an issue, and providing a coherent 5-10 page thesis paper giving multiple point of view of an issue.

- The timing of teaching communication skills is important in OPS 301 and MIS 301.
- Another possible solution about how this material can be made more relevant for SBA students is to bring a faculty fellow from philosophy/English/communications into the SBA to teach business ethics, etc.
- In all cases, resources play an important role in the success of this proposal. The University must invest in faculty lines. This cannot be done for free.
Reactions to the specific questions from Professor David Salisbury

1. What in your domain (e.g., unit, department, or committee) is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or in part with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

In the MIS, OM & DSC department, we currently offer MIS Senior project for MIS majors and OPS senior project for Operations Management majors. The course involves students participating in a 2-semester (MIS) or a 2-semester (OPS) discipline-relevant consulting experience for a Miami Valley organization (either for-profit or not-for-profit). This is our offering that would (with rather limited modification) fit that requirement.

As currently delivered, our capstone experience also meets the service learning requirement as defined by the CAP subcommittee in the CAP proposal. To wit, seeing service learning as, “…a course or experience that features student service to a relevant community and that advances the student's learning and understanding in a specific body of knowledge.”

2. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?

The “Course in Practical Ethical Action Informed by Catholic Social Teaching” seems an excellent idea, but the document as currently written is not strong enough in emphasizing the practical application side, in our opinion. As written, there is no clear mechanism by which any unit would have to accede to any standard by which the “practical” could be enforced.

3. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?

The “CAP Inquiry Elective” doesn’t go far enough. As proposed, “Students are required to explore a topic of intellectual interest outside of their major in the case of the College and outside of their unit in the case of the professional schools.” If this is intended to expand the students’ horizons, I don’t see why students in the College can avoid it by simply trading a Philosophy course for a Religion course (as an example), while Business or Engineering students will be required to take yet another course outside their school. Would not “outside their area within the college” (i.e. in addition to options outside the College, humanities and arts would take a science and sciences would take an additional art or humanity) be more appropriate?

4. What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?

The CAP integrative course as currently proposed seems a bit constrictive and also appears to miss a golden opportunity to integrate the professional schools with one another and with the physical sciences. As this is written, the presidential candidates of both major
parties are promising an emphasis on green energy. Those products and services will have to be tested and developed (drawing largely skills from Engineering and Physical Sciences), but then will have to be brought to market (drawing largely from Business and Law). As currently written, the CAP integrative course appears to preclude Business and Engineering working together on an integrative course, which, given the issues surrounding climate change might offer a profound and favorable influence on society.

5. What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

To the extent that the proposed curriculum would require integrative courses with the College (e.g. Information Ethics or something similar), we would need faculty time and effort to develop these sorts of courses.

6. What resources and or changes would be needed to make that development possible?

Currently, our faculty members are tapped (as I am certain many other units can reasonably say). While integration and elimination of isolated “silos” on campus is a good idea, hopefully the University understands that the sort of integration being proposed will require significant increases in faculty resources across campus.

7. In particular, what if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

The underlying fundamental belief within some units that they are the only one who can offer certain kinds of content will have to stop.

Units that are used to offering large section courses may need to rethink this strategy.

Units that offer a huge array of electives may need to rethink this strategy.

8. What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?

Will the University be willing to fund the significant increase in faculty resources that this new curriculum design will require?
School of Engineering

1. What in your domain (e.g., unit, department, or committee) is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or in part with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

- Ethics is required in all programs.
- Capstone is required in all programs.
- SL is integrated into several required courses but is not currently a degree requirement.
- CMM is incorporated into multiple courses in all programs.
- Structure and sequencing of CAP is aligned with current SoE program requirements.

2. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?

- Ethics.
- Capstone requirement for all students.
- Change to the English requirement.
- CMM incorporated in required courses.
- Inclusion of service/service learning as a requirement.
- Improved flexibility in selection of upper-level CAP courses.
- Elimination of the cluster requirement.
3. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?

- CAP Inquiry and CAP Integrative may be more appropriately accomplished within major, possibly in collaboration with departments in CAS.
- Potential to produce innovative transformation of our programs with the revision of GE is compromised by the continuation of the credit hour distribution requirements across departments in the College of Arts and Sciences.
- Omission of impact of LLCs on CAP. We believe LLCs are more easily accommodated when they are restricted to required courses. There may be some value in restricting LLCs to only be connected to CAP courses.
- Failure to include courses in the professional schools as a CAP requirement for ALL students (including those in CAS) is a weakness.
- No commitment to technical/business writing as an option for 200-level ENG instruction for students in the professional schools.
- Failure to include the performing arts and languages as options weakens the CAP.

4. What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?

- Coursework in the professional schools for ALL students.
- Opportunity to include a linguistic competency (language) requirement for ALL students.
- Requiring a CAP "practical wisdom" course for CAS students in business, engineering or education.
- Assessment plan.
- Flexibility of the CAP compared to the current general education and cluster requirements.
- CAP proposal should explicitly deal with transfer students and should appropriately address the needs of transfer students and other students entering in with AP and other college credits.

5. What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

- Strengthen upper-level course integration between engineering courses and humanities topics to satisfy CAP integrative requirement.
- Few (if any) existing courses that might satisfy the diversity requirement. If this needs to be satisfied within a student’s major program of study it might be difficult to craft meaningful courses.
- Continue to develop, support, strengthen and FUND service learning activities.
- CAP inquiry, if it were satisfied within discipline, would require the revision of some upper-level classes.
- Develop a stronger connection to CMM dept. to guarantee effective instruction/assessment in discipline-specific communication skills.

6. What resources and or changes would be needed to make that development possible?
TBD – need to finalize above prior to looking at resources. At a very basic level we need more funding for service learning initiatives, more funding (or more appropriate faculty workload policies) for collaborative team teaching with CMM faculty and other CAS faculty to implement the CAP integrative, inquiry and communication requirements.

7. In particular, what if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?
   - Resolve the credit hour distribution issues in CAS.
   - Release ownership of CAP to the entire university from the CAS.

8. What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?
   - Resource impact.
   - Implementation plan.
Several faculty participated in a meeting on CAP on November 25th; below is a summary of the topics addressed.

Kevin Hallinan provided an overview of CAP
- He stressed that we must be sensitive to needs of transfer students and students entering in with AP credit (CAP does not require a H-II so what about those coming in with U.S. History)
- Eng 201 should emphasize connection to writing for profession. Margie Pinnell noted the value of having students prepared to write using good technical style and content, as opposed to having engineering faculty parceling out time in their courses to offer guidance to students who lack necessary preparation.

In the general discussion that followed many of the 1st and 2nd year features of CAP were viewed favorably, particularly the retention of some specificity through the first year so that incoming students would not be tasked with devising their own course plan. However there was a common opinion regarding the second year that individual student preferences would be unduly sacrificed by steering students to single course offerings in both Social Science and Arts Studies. More flexibility could be beneficial. For example, Margie noted that it might make more sense to provide students who are interested in a service learning experience in the U.S with a social science course option in the area of domestic poverty. Kevin suggested that courses in Music and Theatre that relate to performance should also be eligible for inclusion in Art Studies. Overall, there was general agreement that the course offerings for Social Science and Art Studies need to be less restrictive.

Regarding the service learning requirement, Aaron Altman supported the service learning component of CAP and suggested that service programs like, but not limited to, Habitat for Humanity could expand the options for service learning for students who may be seeking an alternative to international service experience. Regarding whether the Design Clinic would count for service learning, clarification may be needed as to whether service learning could include providing service to the commercial sector since this service could be viewed as an arrangement with tangible benefits to all parties.

Finally, there was a general sentiment expressed that an expansion of current credit hour requirements for the degree should not be a consequence of adopting CAP.

The department appreciates the School’s invitation for providing input regarding the CAP initiative. Please let me know if you have any questions regarding any of the above items.

Respectfully submitted,

John Petrykowski.
Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering:

Chemical Engineering Faculty Meeting
November 19, 2008

Present: Amy Ciric, Don Comfort, Larry Flach, Beth Hart, Bill Lee, Kevin Myers, Tim Resch, Jamie Riley, Tony Saliba, Sarwan Sandhu

Absent: Mike Elsass, Bob Wilkens

Guest: Kevin Hallinan

Dr. Kevin Hallinan was the guest at this meeting in an attempt to provide details, clarify the intent of, and answer questions on the proposed Common Academic Program (CAP). The draft of the proposed document was forwarded to the faculty via e-mail to review before the meeting. Dr. Hallinan said the committee had worked approximately one year in trying to develop the common academic program which would address seven learning outcomes in "habits of inquiry and reflection". These factors, the committee feel, are central in maintaining and enhancing the Catholic and Marianist learning outcomes that give UD its distinct characteristics that makes it unique from other Catholic universities.

He assured the faculty that there would be no implication with respect to additional credit hours for general education requirements, but felt students would have more freedom than the current structure. A handout was distributed summarizing the CAP requirements and any possible impact on the engineering curriculum.

First Year -- 12 credits of CAP core paired courses would be required – four 3 credit hour courses – one each in History, Religion, English, and Philosophy. There is no impact on credit hour requirements for engineering students.

Sophomore Year -- A 200 level (3 credits) required English CAP core course would be required. The English Department wants to move the second required English course to the 2nd year – generally taken in the 2nd semester first year – unless a student has advanced placement/earned merit. It is hoped that the course will assist in connecting the student's writing skills to their major -- whether it be business or engineering. The possibility of a technical writing course for engineering students was brought up (which is supported unanimously by the CME faculty) - questions arose as to whether the English department would be supportive in this option. To date, this course has yet to be more clearly defined. The movement of a course generally taken in the first year to the second year would free up 3 credit hours in the first year for a possible engineering course.

In addition, a CAP core Arts course (3 credits) and a CAP core Social Science course (3 credits) would be required in the 2nd year.

Third Year -- A 200 level Religion CAP Religion (3 credits) - students would have many choices – would not necessarily be a religion course, could be a history or philosophy course related to
the religious studies. Even though there are no additional credit hours, it appears there is not enough room in the engineering curriculum to accommodate this requirement. This course could represent the 3rd PHL/REL requirement.
Practical Ethical Action Course (PHL/REL/HST or other) (3 credits) -- Course would not have any impact to number of credit hours for engineering students – would equate to the 4th PHL/REL requirement.

**Third or Fourth Year** -- CAP Integrative Course (3 credits) and CAP Inquiry Elective (3 credits) – This course would pull together the previous knowledge obtained in the prior years – i.e., how history is related to (or connected) a specific area of study. It is anticipated the CAP Integrative Course could be coupled with the CAP Inquiry Elective so there would be no additional credit hours for engineering students.

**Fourth Year** -- Disciplinary Capstone (3 Credits) – This course is expected to connect students' learning to disciplines outside of their department. Many engineering capstone courses already do this implicitly.

Other CAP requirements were outlined:

**Communications**: The communications sequence currently in place CMM 110, 111/112, and 113 would be abandoned. Each department would be responsible in determining the way in which a communication requirement would be satisfied.

**International**: CAP would require each department to determine how international learning would be incorporated into the curriculum – either with a course requirement or through other experiences in the curriculum.

**Service**: CAP requires each department to address a service aspect – a service oriented project possibly in EGR 103 or in a capstone design course. It is not anticipated that additional credit hours will be a necessity in either the communications, international, or service requirements.

After some brief questions by the faculty, Dr. Hallinan left the meeting and the remainder was a deliberation of this proposal. The concerns the CME faculty have are as follows:

- Even though there is general dislike for the current general education requirements currently in place, the unanimous feeling by the faculty to the proposed revision – Common Academic Program (CAP) – is that it is exceptionally restrictive for our students, and will not enhance their general education experience but detract from it. The current general education requirements were developed in the early 80's and need to be overhauled, but this proposal does not seem to be the way to go.
- The CAP, as outlined in the proposed draft, is somewhat vague and ill-defined in many areas. The department is already adjusting the curriculum to accommodate ABET requirements, and the Integrated Engineering Curriculum. Additional adjustments in terms of more credit hours would be required to accommodate CAP. Moreover, CAP seems to be quite a bit involved and more complicated than the current system of Thematic Clusters.
- During the recent "town hall" meeting Dr. Saliba had with the senior class, the students expressed the desire to have more options with respect to electives. It appears CAP
would provide fewer options/elective rather than more – and provide less flexibility in the engineering curriculum.

- A technical writing course would greatly enhance our students' writing skills. The CAP should allow the ENG 200 level course to address this great need for our students. It was the feeling of some faculty members that the decision to adopt (or not) this type of course would not come from either the faculty of the Chemical Engineering Department or the School of Engineering, but from the English department.

- It appears that the CAP requirements would cover a breadth of topics with respect to general education while sacrificing any depth of learning any one particular area. It is felt this is an overall drawback to the idea of general education and a detriment to our students.

- Currently there are 30 credits of general education requirements, and according to the handout distributed by Dr. Hallinan, there appears to be 36 credit hours of requirements, not including the requirements for CAP communications, international, and service that may impact the content of some of the CME courses.

- Many faculty would like to see the general education requirements be reduced from 30 credits to 24 credits.

- Some faculty are extremely troubled by the possibility that no matter what the negative feedback is, either by the CME department, or the School of Engineering – these changes may become a reality regardless of any overwhelming opposition.

- If CAP is approved, every student would be required to follow these restrictions. When the CORE program was implemented a few years ago, students had the option to enroll in the CORE program if they preferred – It was not mandatory.

- The CAP Inquiry Elective does not seem to be a well defined course – and not beneficial from the write-up in the proposal for our students. Appears to be not very well thought out as a class – where are the details? It seems that the Integrative course and Inquiry Elective can be combined into one course.

- If the communication requirement is eliminated and replaced by each department's discretion to fulfill this requirement, will the Communications department be providing feedback or approval for each department's plan to incorporate communications into the course curriculum.

- Incoming students already are assigned to a living, learning community which restricts their choice of course. Some students would like to take classes that are not allowed by their community – how would CAP further restrict their choices?

- Concern was stated that the new system needs to explicitly state that AP and/or transfer credits will count towards fulfilling the requirements of the CAP.

To summarize the meeting, Dr. Hallinan outlined and briefly discussed the CAP changes that have been proposed, and after careful consideration and review by the CME faculty, there was significant concerns that the proposed changes would be beneficial to the students. Major recommendations are: the CAP should be more flexible, allow a foreign language development, have more depth of learning, should not add credit hours to the curriculum, and allow technical writing as part of the English composition requirement.

Respectfully Submitted: Janet Pastor

*University Programs, Organizations, Committees*
**Academic Affairs and Learning Initiatives**

Units include: ArtStreet, Career Services, Center for International Programs, Office of Academic Services for Student-Athletes, Office of First Year Student Engagement, Ryan C. Harris Learning Teaching Center, and the University Honors Program

We commend the CAP study team on the obvious hard work and visionary thinking put forward in their draft proposal. This feedback document is intended to build on the exceptional work of the CAP drafters in helping the University re-imagine UD’s general education.

**Strengths of the Draft Proposal**

We see that it offers numerous strengths, including:

1. The proposed curricular changes will create a **significant opportunity to integrate the seven HIR learning outcomes** into the curriculum.
2. The **process is open** and welcoming to all to contribute. This is not curriculum-setting-from-behind-closed-doors.
3. The concept of **integrating** across all courses, and in particular, to integrate general education and the major, **is critical**. As it currently stands, general education is seen by some on campus as a roadblock to the major. And CAP’s new vision of general education is more inclusive as it broadens the view of what is essential beyond the humanities base.
4. The **statement on diversity** is well written and could be a model for other campus statements on diversity.
5. There lies within this approach the **possibility** (a “glimmer,” as one put it) of an **easier, more simple format**, for students to follow to meet graduation requirements.
6. The proposal **puts more ownership for learning on the students**.
7. The **inclusion of a capstone experience** to help students synthesize their learning, regardless of major, gives students the opportunity to document learning, which they could then include on a resume to demonstrate ability.
8. The proposal **triggers majors to consider habits of inquiry and reflection** in their discipline. The potential is huge for this being a signature program.
9. **Extending experiential course-based learning** presents opportunities for partnering with the many centers and offices around campus whose staff could work with faculty to develop courses and with students to develop projects, service learning opportunities, and capstone experiences.
10. The plan allows for a great deal of **flexibility and ingenuity** at this point.

**Weaknesses of the Draft Proposal**

1. **Learning and Living in Community**

The proposal **falls short of where it could go in encouraging and facilitating the integration of learning and living in community and of expanding opportunities for experiential learning**. The proposed approach seems to stop at the classroom and at **faculty doors**. There are many offices and resources on campus that could partner with faculty in helping to develop courses that integrate learning and living, inside the classroom.
and beyond the classroom. In other words, beyond the experiential education credit, this proposal does not address living and learning beyond the classroom. Given habits of inquiry and reflection and the essence of a Catholic and Marianist education reaching beyond disciplines, and our emphasis on integrating learning and living in community, others need to be partners in development ideas early in the program development process. Also, service learning without credit could be problematic. Who will be helping to make this happen? Someone or some office on campus needs to be resourced to do the leg-work for these projects. Departments may need a lot of help in planning the Service learning component. Will the departments receive help in connecting with regional SL partners?

Proposed solution: Enrollment Management, Student Development, the Libraries, Women’s Center, Campus Ministry, all of the units of Academic Affairs and Learning Initiatives, and many others offer the strong potential for rich partnerships with faculty. More courses and opportunities for experiential education could be developed to support the CAP. These human and organizational resources can and should help re-shape and redraft the proposal and direction. These areas may have much to offer as regards student learning outside of the classroom, application of classroom learning to real-life settings, new learning strategies, experiential education, communication needs of students to transition to non-academic environments, etc.

This is only one of many possible examples: There is potential at ArtStreet for developing experiential learning opportunities as well as a variety of classes in collaboration with faculty. Possibilities can include addressing communication, creative thinking practices, hands on arts experiences, diversity experiences, international experiences, etc.

2. Curriculum change
   a. To some, the curriculum seemed quite similar to the current general education curriculum (at least for the first two years) recast in values terms, though not explicitly so.
   b. If multi-disciplinarity is the goal, should we be pairing humanities courses and social science courses even in the first year? Likewise, why are there four humanities courses and only one social science course proposed in the second year?
   c. The curriculum is more specific and unique to UD; this is a strength and a weakness. As a strength, it enables us to demonstrate we are different from other schools. But a weakness is this: Transfer students and high achieving students with significant high school AP coursework will not be able to have as many hours transferred in, and as a result, may be dissuaded from attending UD.
   d. The proposal creates the necessity for majors to reconsider all of their programming. The shift in delivering general education will also create new opportunities for programming. This is both a strength and a weakness. While time-consuming, the very act of revising the majors allows us to read the signs of the times and build programming that prepares students for tomorrow’s challenges.
e. Scheduling conflicts between CAP and majors courses are likely – especially if students remain in cohorts during first year Core classes.

f. Some majors may have a hard time creating a common capstone course. Other majors may have existing courses that could serve as capstones, but should be significantly rethought in light of the HIR learning outcomes.

g. The lack of a specified communications course could be considered a weakness, since the methods, vehicles and audiences for communication are becoming increasingly more complex, especially considering technology and globalism. How can the CAP insure that it can address and appropriately prepare students to communicate effectively in a variety of ways, from understanding and practicing visual, verbal, written, etc., and by a variety of means? This may be particularly tied to vocation and the professional schools. Assessments in these units consistently show that students need to further their communication skills. There should be articulated expectations for student development of a variety of communication skills.

h. The arts course should be rethought. The “arts way of thinking” entails exploring non-linear problem-solving, divergent thinking practices, and developing habits of mind that include critical thinking, empathy, synthesis, understanding failure, sustaining an effort, observation, reflection, persistence and revision, reading and developing complex modes of expression, learned as a result of research, experience, and practice. This would seem to warrant more than one three credit course.

i. Part-time faculty and teaching assistants pose a special consideration with regards to faculty development and course delivery. Will part-time faculty be flexible in delivering courses with significant cross-ties and collaborations with other disciplines? Part-time faculty and teaching assistants important and valuable resources for delivering CAP courses, so they should be included in the planning process.

3. Diversity requirement
   a. The diversity requirement needs much greater definition. The draft says that it assumes diversity will be a central thread in most CAP courses and that the one required diversity experience course will serve to deepen students’ exposures to diversity, but it is unlikely that faculty will accomplish the former effectively without substantive support in rethinking and retooling their courses. If we mean this to happen in the CAP courses, we need to spell it out.

4. Internationalization
a. One of the university’s strategic goals is to increase our internationalization. Given the description of the first year courses, and the heavy emphasis on reading and writing, incoming non-native speakers would have a very difficult time with the intensity of the humanities combinations. Under-prepared students, not just under-prepared international students, will also struggle with this new design.

b. There is a paradox, because even though HIR talks strongly of the importance of internationalization, the programming reduces flexibility and could make it more difficult for students to have a study abroad experience.

c. Nothing specifically international (courses or experiences) is identified or required

5. **Effect on certain groups of students**

   a. First year core of 18 hours could hurt international retention.

   b. It could also hurt student-athlete transfer students. Student-athletes are required to show progress toward degree completion, and the very specific courses expected could make it difficult for people to transfer credits into the university, thus making it a disincentive for student-athletes to transfer in. In addition, student-athletes of all types (not just transfers) may be more likely than non-athletes to have to take a course or two out of sequence, due to practice schedules and games; this could make following the expected sequence of courses very difficult, thus jeopardizing degree completion all the more, and rendering student-athletes ineligible to compete.

   c. It could hurt our weaker students because of the timing of some courses. For instance, students who won’t be taking first year composition until the second semester could be penalized during the first semester when there are heavy writing expectations and they are not offered the tools to get up to speed (on a related note, there is an English department sponsored and proposed remedial track for such students, but it is not mentioned in the proposal)

6. **It doesn’t go far enough in breaking away from traditional thinking**

   a. The course elements in the chart on page 46 reflect very traditional thinking. For instance, science can deal with issues of diversity, math can be about the critical reading of the times, and etc. Religious studies is not identified or linked to diversity when diversity of religious beliefs is a key dimension of diversity, and certainly one with political, economic, and social ramifications.

   b. See #1 about experiential education

7. **Does it move us away from being a liberal arts institution?** One participant identified that this approach changes the very essence of who UD says we are. UD is currently described as a liberal arts university in the Marianist tradition – this proposal makes UD a Marianist institution. Is that going too far away from the purposes and goals of a liberal arts degree?

8. **Knowledge valued over skills.** Related to the previous point, is satisfying the seven learning outcomes overriding the need for skill and knowledge attainment? The Habits of Inquiry and Reflection (HIR) document directly states that HIR is intended to “orient”
general education at UD. With this CAP document, it drives or defines general education as the inculcation of particular values or beliefs, not the attainment of particular skills, knowledge, and abilities. The two are not incompatible, of course. They just don’t co-exist in this document. This draft focuses exclusively on students’ attainment of required knowledge and the inculcation of particular values or beliefs (from HIR), not the attainment of particular skills, knowledge, and abilities that are the foundation of a liberal arts education. Should we be talking and planning to help students acquire skills and abilities to prepare them for the future at the same time that we talk about knowledge and values?

9. **Tightener requirements could limit achievement of several desired outcomes**
   a. Likewise, even though HIR emphasizes the value of experiential learning, the programming could make Co-ops and internships more difficult to fit into ones schedule, even when the economic downturn could necessitate students seek paid internships and coops in order to be able to afford their college education
   b. As mentioned above, study abroad could be more difficult

10. **Significant faculty development needs unarticulated**
    a. Unarticulated is that the proposal will create significant faculty professional development needs and also the need for a renovation in campus learning support mechanisms. The Faculty Development Committee, the LTC, and others are resources to help address these issues. It is not a weakness of the proposal that it creates development needs—that is a strength—it calls on all to revise and reconsider how they do their work. But the very process of doing that will require significant amounts of faculty time and willingness to rethink and retool.
    b. Moving toward a common syllabus and common readings (bottom page 16) is applauded and we need to acknowledge that this results in a very big faculty development issue in order to bring faculty out of their comfort zones. As an example, there is a fear that the diversity talks will be co-opted the minute a faculty person decides they feel ill prepared to handle the topic.
    c. **Areas for faculty development:** The LTC’s Offices of Curriculum Innovation and e-Learning (a division of UDit), Faculty and Leadership Development, and Student Learning Services are looking forward to helping with the significant faculty development needs of CAP. An early review of the changes suggests the following possibilities:

1. Faculty development required for course development.
   - Consider implementing some of the NCAT (National Center for Academic Transformation) models of large-scale course redesign.
   - Collaborative course development – helping faculty work in cross-unit/cross-departmental team environments.
- Encourage and support faculty leadership in course/program collaborative structures.
- Fostering team teaching and interdisciplinary teaching.
- Foster active learning strategies (including discussions, team projects etc.).
- Foster scholarly learning approaches (including problem based learning).
- Workshops and seminars on best practices in course development.
- Bring in speakers from other schools that have undertaken large scale course redesign.
- Workshops on how to integrate HIR learning outcomes (not found explicitly in the CAP proposal but nonetheless critical) into individual courses.
- Workshops on student learning/developmental models.
- Workshops on how to integrate CAP-Core addresses within a course.

2. Supporting the development of an academic advising model
   - Sponsor/host conversations on advising issues related to roll out of CAP.
   - Create training mechanisms for academic advisors.
   - Potentially host or help host advisor workshops.

   Reasons for ePortfolio:
   - Guide students on course registration process and share rationale for CAP.
   - Foster student awareness that HIR learning outcomes span entire UD experience.
   - Provide opportunities for students to reflect.
Repository for delivery of multi-section/course common learning experiences.

Document student learning for external constituents (e.g. employers).

Document student learning for assessment programs.

4. Help guide discussion on space allocation and new space design

CAP-Core addresses may require new learning spaces – share best practices in space design.

11. Other emerging needs: While it was not within the scope of the proposal to consider all its intended and unintended consequences, we see the following needs emerging from the proposal:
   a. Faculty development
   b. Training for advising
   c. Student learning support
   d. Changes in how we tell the UD story

12. Missing:
   a. In the entire document, there is no discussion about how students learn or on encouraging the development of skills in self-reflection on learning
   b. By its absence, we are assuming the decision was made that we aren’t going to require studying a foreign language? There is no specific intercultural, international, or foreign language requirement of all students
   c. While we talk about educating the whole person and the importance of spirit, mind, and body, there is no requirement focused on activities—the body part. If we are encouraging our students to live well balanced lives in which they contribute to the common good, should we not be expecting them to make a commitment to developing their bodies?
   d. In the entire document, there is no discussion of the need to assess continually all parts of the program so that we can evaluate how well it is working and make appropriate changes when needed.
   e. Nowhere in the document is it explicitly said that the CAP program is supposed to be our new general education program. It is simply assumed that HIR = General Education, but that relies on readers linking the CAP document to the HIR document. In moving the proposal forward, it would be very helpful to define general education in this document, especially its goals/purpose.
   f. In future drafts, it would help to make a concise case for replacing the current general education program. It would also be valuable to explain how CAP will replace the competencies program, the Humanities Base, etc. What data/arguments suggest that CAP will be a better program for our students than the current program is? This should be included in the proposal.
It would strengthen the proposal to include a more complete bibliography documenting the extensive research into the theory and practice of general education in American and/or Catholic higher education that was conducted.

Lingering questions:

1. Is the “scaling up” of the CORE model feasible?
2. Is the values base of this model going to be specified or merely inferred?
3. How will university centers and other staff-driven units be utilized/included/empowered to help develop experiential, international, diversity and other credit-bearing experiential learning opportunities?
4. Will the HIR learning outcomes become “graduation competencies” – in that students need to show proficiency in each of the seven areas? If so, what happens when students are not becoming proficient in one of the areas and will these deficiencies be addressed at the course level?
5. The role of LLC’s is tenuous at best… is this intentional? Weren’t LLC’s meant to be a defining and distinguishing feature of a UD education? How do they figure in?
6. What will happen to the existing CORE program?
7. How will we know the CAP design is working, or needs adjustments? Is there a corresponding assessment plan?
8. What happens with the quantitative reasoning competencies? This proposal does not address how it will replace the current general education program or which elements (if any) of the current general education program will remain.

Proposed next step:

A reasonable next step would be to find a couple of departments (say, one from the College and one from a Professional School) willing to start the discussion together about seeing the major/general education nexus differently in the past.Selected people from Academic Affairs and Learning Initiatives and the other units referred to in this text should also be at the table, exploring ways to enhance experiential learning and identifying campus partners. This group would develop more specific ideas, building on the CAP proposal.

A vehicle that could help provide resources to this effort would be sending the group proposed above to the AAC&U Summer 2009 Institute on Engaging Departments. Description of Institute (see http://www.aacu.org/):

With support from the Teagle Foundation, AAC&U will offer a new summer institute in 2009 called Engaging Departments as part of its signature initiative, Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP). The institute will be held on the University of Pennsylvania campus in Philadelphia, July 8-12, 2009, and will provide teams of academic administrators, department chairs, and faculty with intensive, structured time to
advance their plans to foster, assess, and improve student learning within departments and across institutions. Teams will focus on leadership for learning within and among departments and assessments for achieving and improving essential outcomes. For more information and application details, see the institute Web page.

Contributors include:

Amy Anderson, Director, Center for International Programs
Deb Bickford, Director, LTC and Associate Provost
Susan Byrnes, Director, ArtStreet
Jason Eckert, Director, Career Services
Beth Flach, Academic Coordinator, Academic Services for Student-Athletes
Vera Gomes, Academic Coordinator, Academic Services for Student-Athletes
Beth Harrison, Associate Director, LTC: Student Learning Services
Tricia Hart, Director, University Honors Program
Kathleen Henderson, Director, First Year Student Engagement
Steve Wilhoit, Associate Director, LTC: Writing, Research, and New Media
David Wright, Associate Director, LTC: Curriculum Innovation and e-Learning

Center for International Programs

1. The Center for International Programs provides leadership, coordination, strategic planning and administrative support for the internationalization of campus. In cooperation with other University departments and Dayton area organizations, the CIP operates programs and provides services which enhance intercultural education at the University of Dayton.

The CIP directly supports the diversity domain through a variety of programs and initiatives (e.g., education abroad, international students and scholars, intensive English program, international learning living communities). Our efforts also support diverse faith traditions and development. Our work brings people from diverse faiths to campus. We support the Chinese Student and Scholar Association, the Indian Student Association and the Muslim Student Association. We also bring various speakers, visiting scholars and performing artists who often have non-Christian backgrounds. We encourage the participation in the various opportunities (Diwali, Fast-a-Thon) to participate and learn about faith traditions. Community is another area that our efforts support. CIP philosophy and approach tries to link domestic and international students at every opportunity. This provides both the opportunity to expand the definition of community while learning the values and skills of accepting difference, resolving conflicts peacefully and promoting reconciliation (e.g., ILLC).

2. CAP proposal provides an opportunity to develop diverse perspectives across the curriculum. In an ideal environment, diverse views and perspectives would be an integral part of everything we do. By not positioning “diversity” into a box, it permits the focus to be both deep and broad.
The linked courses with an interdisciplinary framework provide significant opportunities for fostering all the domains. It gives faculty the opportunity to be creative and develop new themes and topics both within the College and in partnership with the other academic units.

The structure also offers a good opportunity to intentionally create courses that foster global perspectives and understanding, and to support the learning needs of a growing international student population.

3. The strengths noted above can also be weaknesses. If diverse views and perspectives are to be developed across the curriculum and the learning experience, then the development of this domain must be supported, recognized and rewarded. The danger of not doing this may result in the ‘obligatory nod’ to diversity that has no significant impact on learning. Given UD challenges regarding advancements in this area, serious consideration should be given to how the CAP will be implemented to ensure that this domain can be effectively developed.

Education abroad will likely be hindered to some extent by the new CAP. Students who choose to study abroad typically find some flexibility in taking general education courses overseas. UD faculty who choose to develop summer programs would also need to be conscious of the limits that the CAP would create for UD summer programs.

The CAP proposal does not integrate a foreign language or international/intercultural experience requirement. These are important components for the diversity domain.

In general, the current CAP proposal does not make international and intercultural engagement a unique or innovative component. Should UD wish to highlight this as a key facet of education at UD, it would need to be more clearly addressed in the base structure.

The CAP structure may disadvantage some international students, particularly non-native speakers and those who may not be accustomed to the American university environment. First year students, who are to remain in sync with their peers, would be required to take English, History, Philosophy and Religion in their first year. These courses can often be the most challenging for international students. International students often begin with less writing and reading intensive courses (e.g., math and science) and can already be a bit out of schedule with a typical first year student. Linking courses would make scheduling for international students more challenging. At the same time, if the CAP is to be adapted, this challenge would make a good case for offering sections that include both international and American students where the cultural and linguistic needs of the international students are supported and the diverse perspectives and worldviews are intentionally cultivated in the class. This would provide the opportunity to ensure the diversity domain is integral to the learning in these courses and support the needs of our growing international student population.

Assessment of the learning outcomes for diversity will be challenging under this structure.
4. The CAP proposal does not require foreign language study or stress its importance. International or intercultural experience (study, service, research, internships) are also not fully integrated into the design.

It does not address the matter of transfer students and who they would be accommodated within the CAP requirement.

5. I believe some type of program would need to be established to encourage and support faculty to develop the diversity domain within the courses on campus, and that would support international students, as well as to create education abroad programs that would align with the CAP. This would also require incentives and recognition of these efforts for promotion and tenure, as well as post tenure review.

6. To implement a program that would foster engagement would require significant resources. Rewards and support for faculty are critical to develop globally focused courses and appropriate education abroad programs. Assessment of outcomes will also require a resource commitment.

A bridge term for international students may be required to prepare them for the CAP courses in the first year. This would also require resources.

Training academic advisors will also be an essential component of implementation.

7. (and 8) On going discussion regarding these issues and others that emerge as part of the review process should take place.

A parent, alumni and student focus groups on the next draft of the proposal may also provide additional insight.

The CAP proposal should explicitly outline how it will interface with the learning communities.

[Note - Most of these comments seem to align under CAP feedback form questions 3, 4, 8]

Are clusters dead or just undergoing an evolutionary process? The CAP proposal doesn’t really indicate either way. Nor does it explain why clusters are/should be dead. An observation was offered that perhaps the CAP Committee wasn’t critiquing the cluster concept but rather the challenges presented to integration by the size of some of the clusters? Conceptually clusters provide the opportunity to integrate knowledge across the disciplines while taking advantages of the inherent intellectual strengths of the disciplines. Smaller sized cluster have repeatedly demonstrated their effectiveness, as themes from the Base are reinforced in upper level classes. We need to keep focused on what is common in General Education.

There will be implementation problems with the new curriculum proposed. We see this already with some of our newest programs. Examples cited included faculty donating time, no reflection
of these efforts in workload, and a dearth of faculty who really want to engage in these types of new initiatives.

We have to avoid repeating the history of not funding these large-scale curricular initiatives.

The absence of an emphasis on literature in the proposed CAP and dependence on the proposed ENG 100/200 sequence is not a good foundation for the new gen ed program. Shouldn’t the CC committee perceive the CAP proposal as evolutionary instead of revolutionary We ARE concerned that CAP seems to be launching a whole new program, but what we really need is more support for current programs (Cities, SEE, CORE) and to support more interdisciplinary collaboration within the current clusters. CAP should see clusters as a resource for creating some of those interdisciplinary courses and Clusters already have faculty that are interested and engaged in these collaborations. How can CAP draw on the strength of clusters and the work that they have been doing to create more integrated and collaborative programs for all of our students?

What have we learned from the various new initiatives (Cities curriculum etc.) that are underway now? Could we perhaps use these to build from what we have now? How could we expand some of these things to be “common”?

**Marianist Educational Associates (MEAs)**

Summary Feedback/Comments regarding the Common Academic Program from the Marianist Educational Associates (MEAs). CAP discussion meetings were held Nov 12 & 13, 2008

1. **What in your domain (e.g., unit, department, or committee) is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or in part with the provisions of the CAP proposal?**

In the past, UD has realized some success in delivering common content on the Catholic & Marianist philosophy of education and characteristics of Marianist universities in the ASI 150, BAI 150, EDT 110, etc. Many of the MEAs help to deliver this content. We want to stress the importance of continuing to educate first-year students on the Marianist pillars, such as community, faith, Mary, inclusivity, mission; as well as the importance of the development of practical wisdom and the ability to read the signs of the times.

2. **What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?**

We were pleased to see the focus on and priority of integrated learning in the CAP-CORE classes. UD has seen that communities of learners achieve better learning and better classroom discussions and creates significant opportunities. The MEAs valued the CAP draft’s explicit acknowledgement of the learning that takes place outside the classroom. The new CAP is definitely a gateway for us to be a truly outstanding university; it frames the right conversation.

3. **What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?**
Diversity Course/Experience:
The description of the Diversity class/experience is too vague. The MEAs were concerned that there be significant reflection on diversity and the student’s own life-experience (in major, work-life, etc.) The existence of just “one course on diversity” would allow faculty members who are not teaching that particular course to ignore their responsibility to integrate diversity into their courses. The inclusion of the “diversity course/experience” is not to be thought of as a weakness, but rather, we would say that the level of explication of the course was weak. We make suggestions in our response to question 4.

4. What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?

In general, many of the MEAs felt that some elements of the CAP do push us closer to a fuller “living out” of the Catholic & Marianist identity in the curriculum. However, the interpretation of seven Learning Outcomes seems multivalent. It seems that we’ve detached the CAP draft from the Catholic Intellectual Tradition; now the learning outcomes have replaced the tradition. We need to keep the tradition as primary, not just the 7 learning outcomes. We would like to see richer and more meaningful ways of talking about the Catholic Intellectual Tradition specifically in the courses.

Given our common search for truth and belief in the unity of truth, as well as the conviction that faith and reason illumine one another, the Catholic Intellectual tradition can be brought to bear on all fields of inquiry. Scientific inquiry as well as arts study is legitimate and important to the development of educated, complete persons.

Suggestions re: Diversity Course/Experience:

- Diversity discussions should take place earlier in the curriculum, included in all of the CAP-CORE classes. We are seeing too many Bias Related Incidents Taskforce (BRIT) complaints in first-year residence halls. We need to address these issues earlier in a student’s career at UD.

- The Diversity Lecture Series should be considered for inclusion as part of the “CAP-core addresses”.

- The CAP draft could include the language of the “diversity competencies” that came out of the President’s Diversity task force a few years ago?
  - Serious reflection – How am I different/how are others different from me?
  - Diversity Skills for being a good partner/collaborator in a diverse world

What else is Missing?

- What has happened to the “Competencies”? Literacy, mathematics, etc.? We still expect these to be met.

  - Perhaps something could be specified as a way in which students bring their practical wisdom skills to their neighborhood situations. More integration of learning & living for upper-class students.
Discussion of financial, faculty, and space Resources: Besides people who are able to deliver this coursework, we will also need more spaces for teamwork, as well as “learning/living spaces” for work on class & community projects.

We would like to see the development of small first-year student seminars. Perhaps this is where the content on Marianist education could be infused into the curriculum.

5. **What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?**

**Concerns about Faculty Development:**

In general, concerns were voiced around the significant role that faculty development must play in helping faculty members learn how to deliver courses in these new ways. For example, the practical ethical action classes will require intense faculty development efforts. Even faculty members who are “predisposed” to want to include ethical issues in their classes will still need training and re-tooling to master these content areas. We will also need to provide faculty development to learn about the creation of service learning opportunities and how to deliver a course that has a service-learning component. We could do a lot more in this area.

The faculty development process is intimately connected to the hiring process. What additional measures can we put in place so that we are hiring people who understand our new CAP and the objectives of the CAP, so that the faculty member really understands what they are “getting themselves into”?

The delivery and implementation of the new CAP will take faculty members who understand “practical wisdom”. Where/How faculty members learn about this concept in the Catholic Intellectual Tradition? Is there any way that the MEAs could serve as a resource to help develop the practical wisdom needed for success of this program?

6. **What resources and or changes would be needed to make that development possible?**

The President and Provost MUST find the resources required to deliver this curriculum or it will not be successful. Concern was voiced about the integrity of course delivery in 1st yr CAP-CORE. It is important that these courses are taught by full-time faculty members, not GAs.

The Promotion & Tenure system will need to reward faculty members who participate in faculty development efforts to improve their own skills and enable them to engage more fully in the delivery of this curriculum.

The university will need significant financial and human resources and partnerships (Fitz center, campus ministry, etc.) for gearing up that much service learning.

7. **In particular, what if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?**
8. What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?

**What is the CAP’s Impact on Recruitment? Enrollment? AP/PSEO/IB**
- How will this curriculum influence recruitment? Enrollment? The CAP does provide “signals” to the marketplace as to what kind of faculty & students we want to attract.

  How does CAP deal w/credit earned in high school in PSEO, AP, and IB credits? There are many high school students who bring college credits and experiences to their university. (The “senior to sophomore” trend.) We need to respect what the students are coming in with – maybe we need to create some way for the students to figure out how they will meet the 7 learning outcomes.

  - What is the creative “alternate plan” for AP and transfer students to help them get what they missed?

  - If we are highlighting “international” as one of our top strategic priorities, shouldn’t “international” be infused throughout our curriculum somehow?

**Concerns about Administration and Directorship**
- It seems there will be some significant pressure between courses for one’s major and courses to meet CAP. We were interested in knowing (and it may be too earlier to know this, but it should be a part of moving forward), how much can we still “double count” classes? Along similar lines, regarding the CAP integrative course, can any student take any CAP integrative class? Or would there be certain ones approved for certain majors? (Is it too soon to know?)

  - This may be obvious, but seems important that course evaluations should be tied to the 7 learning outcomes. The CAP director will need to be sure that the evaluation instruments for the courses are constructed to assess the right questions.

  - Make clear who is in control of course scheduling and control/design of space.

  - Great for certain majors, but some majors will have difficulty trying to implement this due to space concerns

**There are serious Scale issues for Service Learning:**
- Faculty development will be necessary for increasing the number of classes that offer service-learning components
- Relationships with Staff/Community partners will be essential

**The University Honors Program**
The University Honors Program (UHP) appreciates the general philosophy of the CAP proposal. We agree that the CORE program, with its team-taught structure utilizing engaged faculty who
seek to provide new levels of academic challenge to its students, offers an intriguing format that could potentially be delivered to a far broader cross-section of our undergraduates. The UHP feels the need, however, to respond to section IV.D.4.c. Specifically, the section reads as follows:

A determination will need to be made regarding whether incoming first year students will be allowed to apply AP, dual enrollment, PSEO and other types of college credit earned during high school toward CAP requirements. The subcommittee recommends that students not be permitted to place out of CAP requirements.

The UHP disagrees with the unconditional stance that “students not be permitted to place out of CAP requirements.” In response, we quote from our “A New Vision for the University of Dayton’s Honors Program,” which was approved by the Academic Senate on September 26, 2008:

In order to enhance the academic challenge for first-year students, the University will allow those Honors students who enter UD with relevant college credit and/or appropriate AP and IB scores to waive the corresponding introductory General Education courses and register for 200/300-level courses in the same disciplines during the first year for Honors credit. However, such a waiver should be accomplished in consultation with the student’s respective Dean’s office to ensure that the courses selected are appropriate for his or her program of study.

The UHP stands behind this statement: that the decision to require involvement in CAP should remain at the discretion of the Deans. Should a Dean feel that a student provides sufficient evidence for their academic maturity and skill—and thus not require involvement in some portion of the CAP sequence—the Dean should be entitled to move students beyond these requirements.

Some details about the recruitment of high-achieving students may provide the necessary context for the UHP’s stance. The above language was included in the UHP proposal because of the highly-competitive nature of the recruitment of these students. In fact, students recruited for the Honors Program by the University regularly arrive on campus with college credit already in place. Many of these students, and their families, perceive certain first-year courses as redundant to those accomplished prior to arriving at UD. Independent of the unique features and value of these new CAP courses, educating prospective students to the value of these courses is the challenge. High-achieving students that perceive CAP courses as a “re-take” of an already-accomplished History or English class, for example, may be less inclined to attend UD, regardless of the true value of the CAP curriculum.

Were CAP to become a universal requirement for first-year students, as the proposal seeks, the UHP would like to see assurances regarding three items. First, an aggressive model be created for educating prospective high-achieving students to the value of CAP to eliminate any perception of it being typical first-year coursework. Second, a method should be developed for counting the already-earned college credits in a meaningful way toward degree requirements that does not amount simply to using up the students’ open elective credits. Third, if this opportunity to take upper level courses is not available to incoming Honors students, additional ways to earn Honors credits would therefore need
to be created. The UHP is prepared to work on issues specific to our high-achieving students should it be sought by the committee charged with further development of CAP.

Women’s and Gender Studies

1. What in your domain (e.g., unit, department, or committee) is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or in part with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

**CAP Inquiry Elective:** Virtually all of our courses address at least two of the learning outcomes mentioned (diversity, community, practical wisdom, and critical evaluation of our times), and many address all four.

**Diversity Learning Requirement:** We have such a requirement: beyond our program’s focus on the gender dimension of diversity, each WGS major must take at least one of several courses that fulfill our “global/multicultural” requirement. (Our program has a goal of doubling this requirement from three to six credit hours.) In addition, WGS courses add an important diversity element to the curricula of numerous departments, and thus presumably to the education of students majoring in those departments.

**Service Learning Requirement:** WST 390, a course involving a service placement and associated academic study and reflection, is required for all our majors. To our knowledge, we are the only major at UD that currently has such a requirement.

**CAP Integrative Course:** Many of our departmental courses are significantly interdisciplinary in approach and in their readings; thus some of these courses might, with only moderate adaptation, become CAP Integrative courses (though see caveat below under #5).

**Disciplinary Capstone Course:** We have a capstone course for our majors, namely WST 490: Senior Seminar in Women’s Studies.

2. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?

As an interdisciplinary program, we value the overall emphasis that CAP places on interdisciplinary learning. We also welcome the clear emphasis on diversity, both throughout the curriculum and as a specific requirement. The latter, in particular, may help drive some students into our courses (and from there, into our minor and major programs.)

3. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?

Knowing that some of the Humanities departments (as well as the subcouncil of Humanities chairs and program directors) have expressed strong concern about some of the ways in which CAP envisions introducing interdisciplinary learning into the curriculum, we wish to echo that concern here. While we share many of the general objections being expressed by the
abovementioned units, here we add some observations about how CAP as currently drafted could affect our program specifically.

The quality of our interdisciplinary program depends on students entering our courses with a strong foundation of disciplinary learning. The current Humanities Base serves us well in this respect, particularly since its common theme of “what it means to be human” frequently engages considerations of diversity, community, and other issues central to WGS. The current structure of social science requirements also does well for us, since many of our majors have a first major in sociology or psychology, and their strong disciplinary basis from the current introductory (and upper-level) social sciences courses helps them to succeed in WGS as well. We are concerned that the envisioned CAP-Core program, by trying to build in interdisciplinarity at this early stage, may undermine these necessary foundations.

More broadly, we worry that in trying to build interdisciplinarity into individual courses, via an apparatus that seems unwieldy and unlikely to work on the scale being envisioned, we may put at risk one way in which many UD students currently do get significant interdisciplinarity in the curriculum, namely through the interdisciplinary minors and majors (not only WGS but American Studies, Human Rights, Africana Studies, and more), as well as the developing LLCs. The kind of massive overhaul we see in the current CAP document may undermine these successful and evolving programs. In our view, a more evolutionary approach—thinking hard about what works well both in our existing Gen Ed program, in well-established interdisciplinary programs such as our own, and in evolving efforts such as SEE, and trying to build on those successes while addressing any identified weaknesses—is likely to achieve better results, while also allowing us to sustain and increase attention to diversifying the curriculum (which Dean Benson has identified as a central CAS goal).

CAP affects the WGS program largely through how it affects departments, especially those (such as ENG, PHL, HST, REL, SOC, and PSY) that make the largest contributions to our current program. In CAP, we see a risk to our interdisciplinary minor and, through it, to our major. This is because some key departments are likely to lose, or to have a greatly decreased constituency for, the 300-level cluster and Gen Ed courses that now lead students to the WGS minor. (The key clusters for us are Women and Culture and Social Justice.) For example, losing the second HST requirement from the curriculum means a smaller constituency for courses such as HST 351 (Women and Gender in American History) and HST 354 (History of Women and Gender in the Middle East), which tend to spark students’ interest in pursuing further WGS coursework. Similarly for courses such as PHL 307 (Philosophy and Women) and PHL 364 (Race, Gender, and Philosophy), which may either shrink or disappear entirely with the loss of the current Gen Ed program’s second PHL requirement. To take another example, the absence of a literature requirement in CAP means smaller constituencies for courses such as ENG 333 (Images of Women in Literature) and ENG 336 (Gender in Fiction), also important “feeder” courses for our program.

We are proud of the quality of our courses, both core and departmental, and of our major and minor curricula. What the WGS program needs is at least to maintain our current numbers of majors and minors and, ideally, to grow. The growth of the WGS program can only serve UD well, particularly given our university’s accelerating attempts to prepare students for their lives
and vocations in a diverse world. Our growth is hampered, however, by the fact that few students enter UD even knowing that Women’s and Gender Studies exists, let alone with the intention to major or minor in the field. (Many, on the contrary, are initially wary of anything associated with feminism.) Rather, students typically end up in our courses to fulfill cluster and other Gen Ed requirements, and for some, the course then sparks an interest in further WGS coursework.

For this reason, it is vital for us either to maintain the curricular avenues that now lead students into our courses (and thence into our major and minor) or to ensure that any revised curriculum provides equally or more effective such avenues. Thus, a key question for us is what these curricular avenues are in CAP as currently drafted.

It is also important that, whatever such curricular avenues there may be in a revised CAP, at least some of them appear as part of students’ first two years of studies. Currently, the growth of our major program is hindered by the fact that many students do not take WGS courses (such as those mentioned above and more) until they are juniors or even seniors. By that time, it is often difficult-to-impossible for them to complete a WGS major, no matter their level of interest in doing so.

With these considerations in mind, here are some observations and suggestions:

1. It is important for students to have enough flexibility in their first and second year program to enable them to explore a bit, so that those who do have interests in WGS (or who are just curious and open) can take a course such as WST 150 early enough to make a major possible for them.

2. We appreciate that the document envisions integrating diversity issues into the CAP-Core. Making gender one of the dimensions of diversity to be explored therein would help stimulate some students’ awareness of and interest in gender issues early on. However, requiring a high degree of commonality among CAP-Core sections in a given discipline, as the current draft envisions, may make this less likely (unless departments specifically include gender issues as part of their common content/syllabus, which seems unlikely). The proposed model for ENG 201 may be more helpful in this regard, as its thematic approach will enable those faculty members with interest and expertise in gender issues to pursue them as topics in their sections.

3. In thinking about how some version of our current courses might best fit into the CAP program as drafted, it seems that at least some of them could potentially develop into CAP Inquiry electives. The fact that the CAP Inquiry elective is “ordinarily” not taken until the third year, however, poses a problem for us given the timing considerations described above.

4. Instituting a diversity requirement certainly has our strong support (though see our suggestions about revising this requirement under #4), both on principle and because it would help deliver students into our courses. The current document says that the requirement would ordinarily be fulfilled in the second or third year.
Requiring that it be completed by the end of the second year—or failing that, again, at least offering enough flexibility to enable many students to complete it by that time—would help us enormously by drawing students into our courses at an earlier stage.

5. Currently most of our majors are pursuing WGS as a second major. What enables them to do so is the ability to double-count many of their WGS courses for their first major, their Gen Ed requirements, or both. Without this, particularly given the timing challenges described above, very few students would be able to major in WGS. Thus, it is very important for us that any revised CAP curriculum contain ample opportunities for double-counting.

4. What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?

A key concern for us relates to the proposed diversity requirement. As a preamble to articulating this concern, we begin with a few remarks about the centrality of diversity issues to WGS, and of the WGS program to curricular diversity at UD.

The WGS program, in cooperation with numerous academic departments, is UD’s central venue for research and teaching on women and gender. Invocations of diversity often call to mind differences of race, ethnicity, national origin, culture, and religion—and rightly so. We wish to emphasize, however, that gender is an equally foundational dimension of diversity, one that affects all of our students’ lives in immediate ways every single day, and one that currently many students (especially, it must be said, male students, who with few exceptions do not flock to courses focusing on women or gender) never confront in any sustained manner in an academic context.

In addition to our obvious focus on gender, many other dimensions of diversity—such as race, color, economic class, ethnicity, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, and (dis)ability status—are central both to the field of women’s and gender studies broadly and to the particular identity, mission, and history of UD’s Women’s and Gender Studies program. All of the program’s core courses (WST 150, 310, 390, and 490) are meant to illuminate the lives of women in all their diversity and, inter alia, to explore the intersections of gender with other manifestations of identity, privilege, and oppression.

Most courses for WGS credit are offered within departments, and many of these courses also incorporate a significant focus on other diversity concerns as they intersect and overlap with those of gender. Finally, as stated above, we require service learning of our majors, and most students in WST 390 (Service Learning in Women’s Studies) complete semester-long placements in which their duties involve serving the needs of women or girls who are differently located from themselves along axes of race, economic class, and/or ethnicity. In this way, our students’ understanding of diversity is aided through “experiential immersion.”

Given the importance of gender to a comprehensive understanding of social, political, cultural, and economic life, and its multiple intersections with other vectors of diversity, the
WGS program must play an essential role in diversifying curricula across the College and even the University.

With all this in mind, we now turn to considering the diversity requirement as it is outlined in the CAP document. The draft states that this requirement may be fulfilled by “an experience of either a curricular or extra-curricular nature that is decided upon by the student in consultation with that student’s advisor.” It goes on to specify that “students may also satisfy this requirement via any number of existing programs at the University including, but not limited to, education and/immersion experiences abroad, advanced language study, significant immersion experiences, intercultural service projects, etc.”

While we fully recognize the educational (indeed often life-transforming) value of the kinds of non-academic and/or extracurricular activities mentioned, we believe strongly that every UD student should be required to investigate diversity issues in a sustained and academic context. We thus object to the inclusion of non-academic and extracurricular activities as options for fulfilling the diversity requirement. We believe that, instead, each student should be required to take at least one course that has a central focus on one or more dimensions of diversity.

Indubitably, structuring the diversity requirement in this way would aid the WGS program by drawing more students to our courses. However, we believe there are multiple good reasons for doing so that are independent of any specific benefit to WGS:

- First, requiring students to confront diversity in an academic context conveys not only that diversity issues are central to a liberal education, but also that these issues are complex and demanding ones, the understanding of which requires sustained academic and scholarly engagement.

- Second, restricting the diversity requirement to courses would help drive the diversifying of UD’s curriculum by giving faculty members a strong incentive to develop and offer courses that fulfill this requirement.

- Third, for most students the diversity requirement would not be an “extra” course to take, since no doubt most courses that fulfill this requirement would also satisfy some other requirement for CAP and/or for the student’s major. (The WGS major’s “global/multicultural” requirement provides a model here; it is not another requirement added on to the eight required departmental courses; rather, a subset of the latter also fulfill the global/multicultural requirement, and each major just has to make sure that she takes one of that subset.)

- Fourth, a number of our peer and aspirant institutions have diversity requirements structured as we are proposing. For example:
  - The Core of Common Studies at Marquette University includes a three credit-hour “Diverse Cultures” requirement.
  - Boston College has a one-course Cultural Diversity requirement.
Fordham University has a one-course Global Studies requirement and a one-course American Pluralism requirement.

For these reasons, we urge that students’ options for fulfilling the diversity requirement be limited to academic ones. Furthermore, we believe that a one-course requirement is still fairly minimal, and that a requirement of two diversity-focused courses (6 credit hours) would better serve our students while more effectively reflecting and promoting UD’s commitment to curricular diversity.

5. What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

- As mentioned above under #1, the CAP Integrative Course seems to be one potential place for WGS courses to fit into the CAP curriculum. The draft document states that “this thematically and/or problem-based experience will engage students in a social/cultural problem from an interdisciplinary perspective.” Our courses are not necessarily “problem-based,” except in the most general sense of considering gender oppression and other forms of inequality to be problematic. Rather, most are focused either on a particular disciplinary approach (e.g. Philosophy and Women), on a particular area of the world and/or historical period (e.g. History of Women and Gender in the Middle East), or on issues surrounding one or more particular dimensions of human diversity (e.g. Sociology of Sexualities). Thus, our courses would more typically be of the “thematic” rather than the “problem-based” variety. As for interdisciplinarity, again, some of our departmental courses already incorporate interdisciplinary elements. However, many do not, including some high-quality courses that are both academically rigorous and popular with students. Retooling these courses to make them substantially more interdisciplinary not only seems unnecessary, but could undermine the courses’ functions within their disciplines and thus their secure places in the curricula of their home departments.

- We look forward to many of our courses counting for the diversity requirement. Whether or not that requirement is revised as we have urged above—but especially if it is—student demand for our introductory course, WST 150, may well increase significantly, thus requiring that we add sections. In principle, we would be only too thrilled to do just that. However, because our core courses (including 150) currently rely on the generosity and flexibility of department chairs in releasing their faculty to teach them, increasing our core course offerings would present us with difficult staffing challenges. (See more on this below, under #6.)

- The CAP document requires that all units/majors “develop a plan for progressive development of communication skills for their students. . . . The plan may include a Communication course requirement, but a single course is not sufficient.” We wonder how this applies to us given that, again, virtually all of our majors are double majors. Can we assume that such students are getting this requirement filled via their first major, or do we need a separate communication plan for the WGS major? . . . In any case, we are inclined to think that it would be wiser to revise and build on our current Gen Ed competencies model with respect to communications, and to leave this important element of our students’
education to the department whose faculty members possess the relevant expertise, namely the Communication department.

6. **What resources and or changes would be needed to make that development possible?**

With respect to the staffing challenges mentioned under #5 above, we believe that in order to meet what we hope will be increased student demand for our core courses under a revised CAP curriculum, our program will require at least some guaranteed/dedicated teaching hours. That is, we could not continue to staff our courses solely via the current “beg, borrow, and steal” method. One possibility would be to share the time of one or more current faculty members with those members’ home department(s); another would be to coordinate with one or more departments doing tenure-track hiring, to explore the possibility of either sharing a line or—less ambitiously—securing one or two courses per year of a new hire’s contracted teaching time for the WGS core curriculum.

7. **In particular, what if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?**

[no response]

8. **What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?**

[no response]
Input from Individuals

Anonymous

1. What in your domain (e.g., unit, department, or committee) is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or in part with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

The CAP proposal essentially makes any contribution on the part of the Department of Languages to general education at the University of Dayton once again almost impossible because the attainment of functional proficiency in a second language is not seen as a way to fulfill any of the outcomes of the Habits of Inquiry. With the exception of the inclusion of one high-level (300+) language course as one of the many possibilities in section 8. “CAP Inquiry Elective” and the possibility of service learning (relatively simple in Spanish, much more difficult to arrange in French and German, at least locally), Languages essentially loses even its present very tiny stake in General Education. Presently, Languages offers a few courses that count for general education in a couple of clusters/domains. Since the suggested sequence in the CAP would almost preclude students who place into a 300+ level course from taking that course immediately out of high school, very few students would either retain that proficiency level into the third and fourth years of their academic career or expend the number of electives necessary to reach that level. As a result very few students could be expected to take advantage of this one opportunity. In this day of increased internationalization and globalization, such exclusion is short-sighted and seems to represent a rather myopic, America-centered approach to the world.

2. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?

I am not at all convinced that the proposal is an improvement over the present general education program. In fact, I tend to think that the proposal ends up needlessly complicating general education and eliminates some of the flexibility in the present system. It appears that advising would become an even greater nightmare than it presently is.

3. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?
Religious Studies ends up being the Department that gains considerably under this proposal to the loss of the other Humanities Departments. A major weakness in this proposal is the loss of the Humanities as the core of general education at the University of Dayton.

The proposal seems to place a very heavy emphasis on ethics (laudable in itself), to the exclusion of other questions as to what it means to be human, e.g. linguistic diversity, among other matters.

The overly strong emphasis on “practical learning” could end up devaluing a University of Dayton education in the eyes of parents and result in graduates who are ill-prepared for graduate school.

4. What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?

Linguistic diversity is nowhere represented as a legitimate form of diversity, yet language is one of the most pervasive and powerful forces that unite and divide humans. English may be currently the lingua franca globally, but the forms of World Englishes vary considerably and are not necessarily mutually intelligible. In comparison with the rest of the world where the acquisition of functional proficiency in multiple foreign languages is seen as an essential educational priority, the omission of such both practical and intellectual capability in American higher education and in this plan speaks volumes about our self-centeredness. The European Union, by contrast, pursues the goal of functional proficiency for every citizen in at least two languages other than the native language. The EU includes the UK, where English is the native language!

5. What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

I can imagine that Languages would be forced into a situation where more courses would need to be offered in English and where the goal of offering students opportunities to develop functional language proficiency would have to be curtailed severely, if not given up altogether. The question of turf arises in that current experience suggests that other departments (history, English, social sciences, etc.) seek to block the approval of any Language courses in English that overlap with their areas. Since a detailed approval process is outlined in this document, it is conceivable that Languages could be effectively blocked from the development of any courses that could address the other areas outlined in the document.

Furthermore, the need to develop the capstone course as outlined in the document could result in a major change to the major in Languages that would reduce the emphasis on the development of functional proficiency and put more emphasis on work in English. Such a change would result in a major that no longer fulfills the professional requirements for teacher licensure and preparation for graduate studies. Furthermore, the goals of the accrediting associations for Engineering and Business in terms of foreign language proficiency would continue to remain unaddressed in the curriculum.
6. What resources and or changes would be needed to make that development possible?

Space would need to be created for the Languages Department to develop more English-language courses that address cultural diversity in literature, political and social systems, history, and the arts. Such a change would require professional development for the faculty members. If a variety of courses are to be continued to be offered in which students have the opportunity to develop functional language proficiency, provision would need to be made for students in all areas of the University to fit a sequence of such courses into their academic program. I do not see how this is possible, particularly for students in the professional schools, in this crowded CAP.

7. In particular, what if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

As I have suggested, the implementation of the plan as it stands, could lead to a fundamental change in the mission of Languages and may well result in the elimination of the Teacher Licensure program in languages (an area where there is documented substantial need and many jobs available) and in the focus on opportunities to develop functional proficiency in a foreign language.

8. What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?

The document needs to be rethought in a fundamental way with regard to linguistic diversity. The accrediting associations of the Engineering and Business have placed high value on the development of functional proficiency in one or more foreign languages. They also have standards that require a very full academic program in their particular disciplines. A place in the curriculum needs to be found so that these students can at least optionally include the amount of course work necessary to develop functional proficiency in at least one foreign language.

Anonymous II

1. What in your domain (e.g., unit, department, or committee) is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or in part with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

No answer.

2. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?

Not to be harsh, none. The CAP proposal is grand in scope, but it overreaches in its attempt to sweep away the old and offer a new approach. The result is a faddish re"invention of the wheel, impressive but neither necessary nor desirable. (Please see the next response.)
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1. **What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?**

While the CAP proposal is an impressive document that clearly reflects a lot of thought and effort, it is NOT an improvement on the current General Education model and, consequently, it should be scrapped. In my estimation, the current General Education structure provides the framework for a more well-rounded basic educational foundation. If there are deficiencies with our current model, then tinker with it to make needed adjustments, but don't tear it up.

2. **What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?**

No answer.

3. **What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?**

No answer.

4. **What resources and or changes would be needed to make that development possible?**

No answer.

5. **In particular, what if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?**
8. What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?

The fundamental question is does this improve on the current General Educational model. The conclusion I drew after reading this document on two occasions and discussing with colleagues is that it does not. Furthermore, no colleague I have talked to likes this plan. So why proceed? It will lead to tumultuous change, not only in the way it fashions general education, but also in its intrusions into the way majors operate. The idea of the capstone course in each major will cause each major to re-evaluate its degree requirements, revise its curriculum and reallocate faculty or hire additional faculty members. It should be up to majors to determine whether they want to go down this path. Ramrodding every major into one institutionally prescribed format is neither desirable nor reasonable.

James Biddle  
Department of Teacher Education  
10/13/08

PREFACE
First of all, I think the CAP Committee produced a draft that honors the recommendations of HIR and extends them to some powerful implementation proposals. As a member of the HIR committee, I am pleased to see a draft of this quality out for campus-wide discussion.

Second, although I usually get annoyed when reviewers critique a paper/book/draft for what it didn’t address, I’m afraid that’s what I’m going to do. In reading the CAP Draft again in preparation for our next meeting, I couldn’t resist revisiting the HIR report for clarification on a couple of key points: international/intercultural study and innovative pedagogy. Furthermore, unpacking HIR’s connotations of “learning” helped me address the topic of assessment.

INTERNATIONAL AND INTERCULTURAL CITIZENSHIP AND ENGAGEMENT
One of my first responses to the Draft was the sense that I must have missed something—where’s the discussion of UD’s Strategic Goal #4 “International and Intercultural Citizenship and Engagement”? I don’t see how this goal, or any of UD’s Strategic Goals, can be met unless the Common Academic Program leads to significant and direct student-engagement. The HIR committee wrestled with how specific to be in our recommendations RE International and Intercultural Learning, but we included various suggestions/recommendations. Here are a few quotations from HIR:

For the second and third years of study, the report recommends expanding service learning, expanding and facilitating multidisciplinary minors and self declared or occasional clusters, and creating problem-based interdisciplinary courses in General Education. Expanding opportunities for international and intercultural study, promoting global learning, and increasing foreign-language study are also recommended.
The pursuit of learning in community also means that the undergraduate academic program should prepare students for intelligent and fruitful participation in various forms of community that mediate human life and activity in the local, regional, national, and global spheres.

Expand opportunities for international and intercultural study, including curricular revisions to promote global learning. Objectives for global learning should be incorporated in all multidisciplinary minors and in many capstone courses, in addition to the Humanities Base. Cultural immersions should incorporate explicit links to the curriculum in order to promote academically-informed reflection and analysis. Opportunities for and incentives to promote study of foreign language should be developed wherever possible.

INNOVATIVE LEARNING-BASED PEDAGOGY
During the mid-late 90’s, UD spent much time talking about moving from a Teaching Paradigm to a Learning Paradigm. Some professors “got it” and made the move; some departments considered it and a few have experimented with it; HIR adopted and supported the move; but overall, UD has neither embraced nor made the transformation. In spite of adopting a “learning outcomes” model, many of UD’s underlying curricular assumptions are still rooted in the teaching paradigm.

The second big impression from re-reading the CAP Draft was that it seems be remain tied to conceptions driven by the teaching paradigm. This is not to say that the Draft ignored the learning-based pedagogy; it spoke to the need for pedagogical engagement and student outcomes rather than teacher delivery. But overall, the thrust of its recommendations were rooted in curricular conceptions focusing on course designs and linear/concrete student learning outcomes. HIR continually recognized the generative and transformational potential of non-course activities; the committee hoped to embrace the power and quality of learning activities outside the classroom (“co-curricular”).

As with the international focus, the HIR report didn’t offer a full-blown treatment of the Learning Paradigm, but the committee used code-words, if you will, suggesting the needed transformation. As noted in the quotations below, the HIR committee assumed that UD’s current paradigm had to be altered: we needed “experiential, inquiry-based learning” and “innovative pedagogies.” As I recall, the HIR committee knew that a move to learning outcomes necessitated a radical shift in curricular, pedagogical and assessment approaches. If one was most interested in the what of learning outcomes, then the second order priority had to be about how student thinking and engagement had to change; only after significant wrestling with the what & how of student learning could we address the issues of pedagogy, or teacher beliefs and behaviors, and assessment. Again, here are a few quotations from HIR:

Significant faculty involvement in experiential, inquiry-based learning outside the classroom and the integration of co-curricular activities with the curriculum should also be recognized and rewarded in annual merit reviews for each academic unit.
Effective multi- or interdisciplinary curriculum development and teaching, integration of curricular and co-curricular learning, creation of new seminars, and the development of innovative pedagogies suited to these projects will require increased budgetary support for new full-time faculty lines and for faculty development, as well as for expanded support staff in such critical areas as service learning, international and intercultural learning, and Residence Education.

ASSESSMENT
I continue to be confused—my increasingly normal state of being. In re-reading the materials we have been given RE assessment, what is to be done by whom is still fuzzy. Until there is some clarity about those issues, any discussion of the “how” seems premature.

From my professional background, the move from a teaching to a learning paradigm is a quantum shift. American schooling, as opposed to the paradigms of some other countries, has always focused on controlling the classroom. Our heritage grew from the teacher-dominated classroom to the teacher and textbook centered system most of us experienced. To move to a focus on student learning requires a relaxation of control mechanisms; it requires the willingness to believe that significant academic learning can occur beyond established curricular vehicles. As noted in both HIR and CAP, learning outcomes should be expanded beyond courses and course delivery systems.

Enough—these were my first reactions to our assignment. I’ll try to refine them for our meeting.

Albert Burky
Department of Biology
10 December 2008

Common Academic Program (CAP)
Thoughts and Reflections:

A major goal of UD is to have our curriculum reflect and address Habits of Inquiry and Reflection (HIR). In a recent university discussion of CAP, Chris Duncan indicated that feedback about the current Gen-Ed curriculum was that it is broken. As a result of Mary Morton’s leadership we not only have the Learning-Living Model now required of all students in addition to the need to fulfill HIR criteria for curriculum and accreditation. Who remembers the request for feedback about Gen-ED? There may have been a request but it could have been lost in the massive amount of electronic “gunk” we are expected to respond to! UGH! Let’s be practical; step back and assess all the good things about where we are at in delivering an excellent education at UD and work for harmony across all disciplines within the university. Let us not throw the baby out with the wash. Learning-Living Community and HIR are great concepts but cannot be practically and successfully required of all students at a university the size of UD. Required rather than voluntary Learning-Living and/or Service defeats the purpose/goals of HIR and the Marianists mission. Engagement and Example in the spirit of the traditional Marianist approach at UD have been convincing (I am not Roman Catholic but share the outstanding Marianist values). If we can keep the ideals upfront and provide the examples for great outcomes.
we have always been proud of at UD our future will remain secure. The Marianists have always provided the example of living service of good-works as exemplified by the biblical analog of the parables. The replacement of the existing Gen-ED/Cluster curriculum with CAP would be outrageously costly but still a real potential for academic travesty. Gen-Ed has substance without flexibility. CAP lacks substance and is less flexible and appears to be movement towards Synthesis Without Substance. Does anyone like CAP? HIR embraces the tenets of Scholarship, Faith traditions, Diversity, Community, Practical wisdom, Critical evaluation of our times, and Vocation. The problem with the application of HIR is how many at UD interpret the initial statement of most of these tenets “All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate”. Many interpret the idea of “All” to mean “Required”. We should be providing the Examples of Service and Learning-Living to “All” students with an outstanding curriculum. We are already doing this. Where we fall short is the lack of flexibility of the existing Cluster Model for application of Gen-Ed. Lack of flexibility is where the curriculum is broken. To fix the curriculum UD could make Gen-ED more flexible with HIR in mind. Not costly but practical. If we are worried about how the accreditation process will evaluate UD in regard to HIR this can be achieved without many hours of envisioned personnel time and “the PAIN” of the CAP. Each Department/Major could outline how each tenet of HIR is addressed through their program with curriculum and activities. In Biology we already address all tenets with the exception of Faith Traditions. Our outcomes are already great. I give biology a grade of A++. Our graduates also have lots of exposure to Faith Traditions and the other tenets through UD degree requirements. UD should give itself a grade of A++.  
Albert J. Burky  
Department of Biology  

George Doyle  
Department of Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering  

Date: October 15, 2008  
To: Academic Policies Committee  
From: George Doyle  
Re: Comments on CAP proposal  

As I read through the document, I asked three questions.  

1. Why are some topics (courses) considered necessary for all students, while others are not? It is obvious that the CAP proposal suggests that only courses provided by the College are considered necessary for all students.  

2. What material would be contained in courses that are required? There is an extreme lack of specificity in the core courses, and many of the others.  

3. What are the logistics involved in following through with implementation of the CAP? Developing the details of the core courses, experiences and addresses is going to require a tremendous effort by many faculty. Will there then be a CAP committee that approves these courses, experiences and addresses, see page 17? Seems to me that CAP will be a much greater logistic problem than GE was.
1. First year: While I can accept CAP English 101 as content obvious, there are no indications of the content to be covered in CAP History, Philosophy, or Religion. What are the topics in these courses? “The devil is in the details.” Are these paired courses to be taught by one instructor – 6 cr. hr. to the same 30 students by 30 instructors per semester, or will it require 60 instructors each semester, 3 cr. hr. per instructor? How much collaboration will be required between instructors of paired courses? Are the same students in each of the paired courses?

2. Three CAP-Core Addresses per course plus a test consumes 10% of class time of the first year courses. Six CAP-Core Addresses per course plus a test consumes 20% of class time of the second year courses. That reduces course content significantly. It also means that one faculty member will have to give 30 identical lectures per semester, semester after semester. That is equivalent to one course per term. Looks like you will need a minimum of 24 faculty per semester to accomplish this requirement. How likely is it that you will find faculty that would be willing to do just that? What type of testing procedure makes sense for the addresses? DROP THE REQUIREMENT

3. Second year: I see the United States and much of the world as a capitalist/technological society. If you are at all aware of what are hot topics yesterday, today, and for the future, surely an understanding of basic economics and technology are an every day need. I believe that students would be much better served if they had some practical knowledge in these two areas. See HIR 6.

4. English 201: Would it be possible to have the second writing course specifically address writing techniques required in the students’ majors, i.e. have different sections depending on the major?

5. Religion 2XX: I like it, but this means that there will need to be as many as 30 faculty learning and teaching the traditions of the major religions. Is that a reasonable request? I hope so. I see that there are four different approaches suggested. That does not make the course “common.” I suspect that in some of the approaches there will be very little comparative religion, which is really what I would like to see. It would be nice if the course spent some time on Hinduism and Buddhism – two common religions in the most populous regions of the world. This addresses multi-nationalism outside the western tradition.

6. Natural Sciences: No change from GE

7. Mathematics: Apparently there are no mathematical topics that should be common for all students. There is no minimum standard. From page 21: Sounds like applied math topics, which I believe are not presently emphasized in many of the standard math courses. Do you believe that the MTH dept is going to be able to introduce “societal issues” and “critical evaluation of our times” into the calculus course?

8. Communications: Oral communication is probably the most important topic in the CAP,
except for, some would argue, writing. I am all for it. I would expect that majors in science/technology can easily fit (and probably already do) oral presentations into their lab courses, but other majors may have significant difficulties revising several courses to provide the students with oral communication experiences. These majors may require a CMM course, “but a single course is not sufficient.” Also, some committee will have to decide that each department is providing the necessary sequence of courses and material to meet some type of standard, or will we just let each program establish their own standard? It would be nice if UD was noted as a school that produced graduates that could give a coherent oral presentation, especially during an on-site job interview. I am all for oral communications, but it may be tough for some departments to implement.

9. Practical Ethics: I like it, especially since it can be fulfilled by many different courses in more than one department.

Page 12

10. CAP Inquiry Elective: I do not appreciate the need or usefulness of this course. Why does the policy limit the content to two of four student learning outcomes? Aren’t the other three student learning outcomes just as important? Who will generate “a designated list?” Looks like the list would contain hundreds of courses. As I read the “Detailed Description and Content” it would seem to me that students in the School of Engineering could count a 200 level math or science course, so this would already be a required course. On the other hand if it has to be an elective, I would say DROP THE REQUIREMENT

11. Diversity: I do not appreciate this course; is it a social science/history course? Seems ill-defined. The requirement states a 3 hour course or experience. It expects students and departments to be creative. This adds a burden to departments if it has to submit a student experience, in place of a course, to some CAP committee for approval. DROP THE REQUIREMENT

12. Service Learning: Not well-defined -- could be a course or parts of courses. Could it be a morning working with Habitat for Humanity, working a soup line for 4 hours, or donating blood 4 times? Is there such a thing as a service from which you do not learn? Is a committee going to be established to determine what counts as a service-learning experience? Will each department have to report the service-learning done by each student to some university committee? How much service-learning (hours)? Service is great, but it will require a lot of bookkeeping. I do it now for over 200 students in a four-course sequence. I receive many emails during the semester; I do not require verification. It’s a good idea, but probably difficult to implement.

13. CAP Integrative/Disciplinary Capstone: Seems that students in the Humanities/Arts/Social Sciences have to complete two capstone courses in their discipline, one that connects to outside disciplines, but not outside of the unit. On the other hand, those in the professions complete one capstone course in their discipline and one outside their discipline. Why don’t the Humanities/Arts/Social Science students have to do a capstone outside their discipline/unit? I have no idea how some departments might implement capstone courses, or if it even makes sense. DROP THE REQUIREMENT
14. Now instead on having four Humanities Base courses that are integrative and address “What it means to be human,” CAP requires six integrative courses (inter- and multidisciplinary dimensions), each of which must address the seven HIR student outcomes. Seems like a tremendous burden on the faculty.

15. “. . . mirrors the complexity of the world . . .” A few CAP-Core Addresses scattered over two years will hardly introduce the student to the complexities of the business or technological world. Sounds like a series of random presentations with little coherence. DROP THE REQUIREMENT

16. I am sure I can think of a worse example, but “. . . a Mechanical Engineering faculty member might provide an address on design and production of a coffee maker.” is so trivial and uninteresting as to what technology is about. How about something relevant, like alternative energy, or the distribution of different fractions in a barrel of oil, or the time cost of money, or how banks interact with each other and the Federal Reserve? I can’t imagine an engineering faculty member who would be willing to give 30 lectures per semester on coffee pots, or any other topic. DROP THE REQUIREMENT

17. “A single interdisciplinary course in the Arts” Does that mean a large number of faculty will have to become knowledgeable in music, theater, and visual to teach 30 sections per semester?

18. “Each of the three Arts disciplines . . . offers much in the way of understanding the contemporary world and its problems.” I can not think of one problem the arts helps mankind solve, unless it is used as a propaganda tool. To me being involved in the arts is more of a past time, a pleasure, like sports. On the other hand, business and technology is obviously needed to understanding and solve the problems of the world. Is it more important to understand historical elements of art compared to why there is an ominous energy crisis or an obvious financial crisis?

19. “A single interdisciplinary course in the Social Sciences . . .” Again I see that a large number of faculty will have to become knowledgeable in a wide variety of topics over all of the social science disciplines. Is this reasonable to expect from the faculty? Personally, I would rather see a choice from several courses that go in depth on various social justice topics. Some of these courses already exist.

Table 1. Comparison of General Education plus Competencies versus CAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education + Competencies</th>
<th>Common Academic Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 REL/PHL</td>
<td>1 ENG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 illustrates that GE + Competence (@ 42 cr. hr.) has grown to CAP (@ 51 cr. hr.), plus 24 CAP-Core Addresses, plus an unspecified Service Learning requirement. For a student requiring 120-128 cr. hr. to graduate, CAP is 40-43% of his or her course requirement.

Dan Fouke
Department of Philosophy

*I am responding with comments to the proposal for the new CAP in one of the ways that David Darrow informed us was acceptable*

Historical knowledge and analytic skills provided by a number of courses in history and philosophy are necessary conditions for meeting the goals of “Practical Wisdom” and “Critical Evaluation of Our Times.” These goals simply can’t be met without distribution requirements that ensure that students have several courses in history and philosophy.

I have serious questions about whether it is even possible to implement the kind of program described in CAP. It would require major re-engineering of buildings, extensive revision of how course-loads are determined if there is extensive team teaching or invited lectures, and massive coordination of efforts across schools as well as across departments. From my experience, team-teaching does not really divide the labor in half, and it is only effective if both teachers are together in the class-room most of the time.

From experience I know that the university is not set up in ways that enable it easily to financially support interdisciplinary coordination between schools.
Service-learning, if done as community-based research or otherwise integrated into the academic content of the course, is very labor-intensive for instructors, since partnerships and projects have to be set up in advance for every semester. I have found this to be very difficult, although I have succeeded at it. I doubt that most professors are really capable of doing this.

If implemented in its current form, CAP is going to require firing a lot of faculty in philosophy, history and other disciplines. In addition, those faculty who are retained are not all likely to be well-suited for the kind of approach to teaching envisioned in the CAP. I applaud the goals of the proposed CAP. In fact, it represents just the kind of vision that I have been trying to implement in my classes, including the experimental courses ASI 343 & 346, Undergraduate Research in Environmental Sustainability which I co-teach with Professor Sidhu in Engineering and UDRI, and the development of which was funded by a Humanities Fellowship. However, in its current proposed form I think it is too ambitious, would require too many major and unsettling changes in direction, and is not rigorous enough in its distribution requirements to achieve its stated goals.

Joe Mashburn  
Chair, Department of Mathematics

I have worked on the department response and the science chairs response, and I find myself with an inadequate amount of time to give my response, but I'll mention a couple of things. The proposal seems to complex and expensive to carry out. And I am saying this as an outsider because mathematics at the CAP level is not much affected. It seems that we are really only concerned with scholarship, for which I thank you very much. But the first two years look like they would be impossible to pull off without resources that the university will be unable or unwilling to give. I think that the connections which are attempted in the first two years and the addresses make things more difficulty than they need to be in order to deliver the learning outcomes. It seems to me that we are trying to achieve an unnecessary amount of interdisciplinary integration at that level, but I may be misreading the document.

The committee recommends against allowing students with AP, PSEO, and other forms of credit to skip some CAP classes. I think this is a mistake. We will need to use the promise of credit to attract good students to UD.

The prospect of trying to devise meaningful service for mathematics majors is daunting. We have tried to arrange tutoring with Dayton schools in the past without success. I think it is a mistake to require the service to be related to the major. Besides being difficult to find meaningful service of this type, we are overlooking very meaningful service students can do which is not related to their major.

It will be very difficult to keep track of service and diversity, unless there are designated classes that students take to fulfill these requirements. And even then I think it could be difficult to determine how seriously students took it and whether they got from the courses the things that we wanted them to get, unless we just want them to experience some service and learn about a different culture. And I don't see how you truly assess vocation at all.
We have thought about a capstone in the past and have always rejected the idea. I am not sure that it is a good thing to implement across the board. In the case of mathematics the only outcome it would usually get you is scholarship, and they are getting plenty of that in their regular courses.

Finally, we might want to take this as an opportunity to revisit the idea that our curriculum should be driven by the seven learning outcomes. If this is the best way to deliver them, perhaps they should either be reworked, or given a less prominent role in our curriculum.

This is all that I have time to say. It is not said well and I am sure does not really convey what I mean. But it is an approximation, anyway. I wish that I had some constructive things to say, but I have not had time, nor really the ability, to come up with my own proposals. I know that you had a huge job on this subcommittee. I appreciate your work and dedication and am not at all sure that I would have created anything better or as good.

Tom Morgan
Department of English

My most important response to the CAP document is as follows: the deadline needs to be pushed back to better create the space for reviewing and assessing both the response to the document and the subsequent revisions of the document itself. According to the timeline on page 33-4, the CAP Proposal will be seeking approval by March, and looking to appoint a Director by April. I think both dates are completely unrealistic, and, to be perfectly honest, such a timeline scares me senseless; one good way to actually indicate that feedback from the university was genuinely and sincerely sought would be to inform the university that such a timeline is off the table and is being pushed significantly back. Otherwise, it looks overly prescriptive and borders on making the committee look insincere.

1. What in your domain (e.g., unit, department, or committee) is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or in part with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

My name is Tom Morgan, and I am in the English Department. However, I am responding here as an individual. As well, I am also only responding to what I see as my most pressing problems with the document—since I am assuming that you will be getting a whole bunch of these, I’ll try to keep it brief.

2. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?

[no response]

3. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?
1) The diversity component of the document, while well-intentioned, is flawed. It is trying to do too much without readily defining how such outcomes will be achieved. It needs to more cohesively and more rigorously map out how diversity will be applied in the first couple of years of the program (so as to prevent it from falling through the cracks of curricular planning, or being applied as a retrogressively constructed “add-on” model), and also more comprehensively define and determine what types of diversity learning outcomes the university is interested in achieving for students through such a requirement, as well as clearly demarcating the explicit means through which such outcomes will be assessed. Leaving it up to departments to construct the guidelines by which the “Diversity Learning Requirement” may be fulfilled (page 27, termed “significant,” and/or the second paragraph of the “Detailed Description and Content,” which states that states “each department is responsible for ensuring that all students majoring in the department fulfill a Diversity Learning Requirement”) again leaves the space for diversity to just conveniently disappear—it is far too open of a policy, and leaves the space for diversity to be disregarded by different departments. Thus, the statement in the third paragraph in this section, “assuming diversity has been infused throughout the curriculum” is left as a pretty big if, given that departments can define this in their own terms without any sense of larger student learning outcomes or competencies to drive such a definition. To address this, there needs to be more clearly defined student learning outcomes for diversity within the document, and/or a defined Diversity Competency that can be materially assessed something along the lines of the following (from Jack Ling):

Assessment of Diversity Competency must accompany each proposed “diversity eligible CAP course”. Assessment should demonstrate competency in

1. **Comprehending (cognitive, critical and contextual thinking skills)**
   - Diversity/Cross-Cultural/Intercultural and Inclusion issues in the U.S. and abroad (global);
   - How the uneven distribution power and privilege embedded in the culture (including structural, institutional components) and history impact the social status of Diversity and inclusion;
   - How the inclusion of diverse perspectives enriches and enhances quality decision-making and practices in business, education, government etc.; and
   - Why and how an Ethic of Diversity and Inclusion should "drive' societal, organizational, and personal thinking and behavior;

2. **Readiness to Engage (behavioral and communication skills)**
   - Different peoples (racial, cultural, social economic, abilities, religion etc). Each discipline will need to frame these items in a meaningful way. For example, in Clinical psychology, an ability to make contextual diagnosis and provide culturally sensitive intervention skills can be operationalized into measurable behavioral learning outcomes. Second, I would strongly argue that the committee consults with Jack Ling, the Executive Director of Institutional Diversity and Inclusion, to better develop the diversity components of the CAP document, particularly since he was not consulted on this document.

2) The document seems to stress values over learning outcomes; in this, it feels overly
prescriptive in determining and asserting what types of people the university should create from an ideological perspective rather than the types of learning and cognitive outcomes we would like for our students. Or, to put it in more polemical terms, it feels like it is being driven by an evangelical Catholic perspective rather than Marianist perspective.

3) Timeline. Please see above.

4. What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?

[no response]

5. What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

[no response]

6. What resources and changes would be needed to make that development possible?

[no response]

7. In particular, what if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

[no response]

8. What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered before moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?

I would repeat my three points from above: most importantly, timeline. Second, more thoroughly integrate diversity into the larger CAP document—don’t leave it so open to being disregarded. Third, limit the inclusion of value-directed outcomes.

**Bill Richards**
Philosophy Department
Comments on the Common Academic Program (CAP) proposal, November 17, 2008

I want to make a few comments on the CAP Core courses. I will restrict my comments to the CAP ENG 101/CAP PHL courses that are proposed for first-year students. This proposal is very poorly conceived. The proposal makes several of the same mistakes that were built into the Humanities Base and the Thematic Cluster programs. These two programs don’t work as well as desired because they are overly ambitious. They both were designed, top-down, to be implemented across the entire College. The principal mistake was a failure to appreciate the importance of SCALE. Faculty tend not to identify with these programs, and compliance is poor.
The CAP-Core course proposal resembles the design of the CORE program, and I think whatever plausibility the former enjoys derives from its similarity to the latter innovative pedagogy. However, CORE works because it is small scale! In CORE, there are a few, especially committed and talented faculty from several disciplines who enjoy working cross-disciplinarily, and who put in more than the average amount of time/effort making it work. They give each other frequent feedback, they make frequent adjustments in schedules and course content, and they interact closely with students. If the scale were larger, and if the structure of the program were dictated from top-down, then CORE wouldn’t work. CORE-on-a-large-scale, imposed top-down, is a contradiction in terms.

The CAP proposal states:

There must be strong commonality among the various sections of the CAP-Core courses within the same discipline. Yet, individual instructors should retain flexibility in how they address those common components. The CAP-Core Addresses will help to reinforce and enhance commonality between courses. A common syllabus and some common readings (not necessarily all readings) should be established for each course. Such commonality need not be in conflict with individual faculty creativity. In order to deliver the HIR outcome critical evaluation of times, CAP-Core courses should deal, to some extent, with modernity or the underpinnings of modernity.

These proposals are entirely unrealistic. Consider the Humanities Base program today. There are common readings in the introductory PHL, REL, HST, and ENG courses, but there is in fact very little actual “commonality,” either within or between disciplines. Reaching a decision on a common syllabus for all PHL sections could be accomplished only by fiat. Would instructors actually teach the materials that they don’t identify with, and may not even understand? The question answers itself. About the CAP-Core Addresses – anyone who thinks that a sizable percentage of CAP instructors (let alone students) would attend the addresses hasn’t been paying attention to Humanities Base-sponsored activities in the recent past. Even if the Addresses were made available online, very little of the relevant content would find its way into CAP classrooms.

The CAP ENG 101/CAP PHL courses are each supposed to deal with the “underpinnings of modernity.” That sounds like a philosophical concept. I spent an entire summer term recently carefully investigating the concept of “post-modernism.” I came to the conclusion, which was supported by many prominent scholars, that there really is no such thing as post-modernism. I suspect the same is true of modernism. At best, it’s a social construct. Insisting that the underpinnings of modernity be taught in the CAP-Core courses would certainly not promote “strong commonality” among the various sections. Doing so would promote discord among the faculty and confusion among the students.

In addition to the above negative remarks, I’d like to make a couple of constructive suggestions. I strongly endorse all seven of the Habits of Inquiry’s learning objectives. I think that the College should aim to increase every undergraduate’s understanding and participation in all seven objectives, and I think that a Catholic, Marianist university is especially well-positioned to effectively accomplish all of these objectives. I view these learning objectives as virtues, in the classic sense. However, the classroom is not the most effective environment in which to accomplish these learning objectives. The adage, “virtue cannot be taught,” makes this point.
Scholarship, obviously, is one of the objectives best accomplished in the classroom, broadly conceived. Other learning objectives, e.g. practical wisdom and vocation, can be promoted better in other venues. For example, I am teaching a section of ASI 150 this semester as well as serving as faculty advisor to the 20 students in the course. I have had some very productive conversations with these students in my office, in my role as advisor rather than instructor. I talk to students about their career objectives, their experiences in high school, etc. In this advisor setting, I am able to reach them in a way that isn’t possible in a classroom. This is one type of non-classroom setting in which we can teach the virtues of practical wisdom and vocation (and the other five virtues, as well).

Not only are all seven virtues teachable in non-classroom settings, trying to teach them in the classroom (with the exception of scholarship) is generally counter-productive. Students can be easily turned off by classroom instruction in connection with virtues. This is more of the “same old, same old” they’re used to in high school and (sometimes) parental settings. They expect scholarship in the classroom, and that’s what I think they deserve, without hidden agendas. The classroom is only one dimension of our academic community. I recommend increasing support for faculty advising and other dimensions of the UD community such as living-learning communities, international study options, service opportunities, student development organizations, and the like, as ways of promoting the objectives of Habits of Inquiry.

Sean Wilkinson
Visual Arts, Graul Chair

NOTES ON THE COMMON ACADEMIC PROGRAM PROPOSAL

PART ONE: PROBLEMS

CAP, HIR, & UDSP
The purpose of the Common Academic Program (CAP) Committee was to propose “a common academic program for University of Dayton students based on the seven learning outcomes in Habits of Inquiry and Reflection (HIR).” In my view, the Committee would have done well to define this proposed academic program not only in terms of HIR but also, and more fundamentally, in terms of the University of Dayton Strategic Plan (UDSP). The UDSP and HIR were written almost simultaneously, but unfortunately, in my opinion, they were not developed in concert with one another. As a result, they have come to be seen as independent, rather than integrated and mutually supportive, documents. I believe the Committee has missed an important opportunity to correct this mistake.

It is telling that, in the “University of Dayton Documents” section of Appendix B, i.e. the bibliography of the CAP document, the UDSP is not even mentioned. Yet the first Tactic of the first Strategic Initiative in support of Goal 1 in the UDSP is, “Renew and revitalize the common curriculum as the academic core of a University of Dayton education.” It is logical to look to HIR as a principal framework for implementing this tactic, but there are many other aspects of the UDSP that should also be incorporated in “a common academic program for University of Dayton students,” and the current CAP proposal is poorer for its failure to include them. As it
stands, the CAP proposal and HIR make no reference to, and they certainly do not take advantage of, the broadly inclusive invitation provided by the UDSP for all members of the University community to work together toward a common goal. The President and the Provost conclude their introduction to this document with the following: “We invite everyone who cares about this institution to use this Strategic Plan as our common guide toward building a University of Dayton that fulfills our collective potential to become an exemplar of excellence in American higher education.” The proposed CAP stands to play a key role in this building project. It follows that both the CAP and the University as a whole should therefore be in alignment.

Insofar as a new common academic program, a replacement for the venerable template of General Education, is to become a critical contributor toward building this University, it should reflect as many of the goals, initiatives, and tactics contained in the UDSP as it reasonably can. For example, one of the five goals of the UDSP is to, “Advance international and intercultural citizenship and engagement.” It therefore seems important for a proposed CAP to incorporate this within its architecture. Indeed, there are several references within HIR itself to this topic. And it is obviously critical to “diversity,” “practical wisdom,” and the “critical evaluation of our times.” Yet there is very little on this major priority in the CAP proposal, aside from the limited conflation of international with service learning, which seems to suggest the perpetuation of an unfortunate, colonialist sort of mentality rather than an enlightened awareness of how much we have to learn from and about the world beyond our own campus. Of course service learning is important, and this importance is reflected in the UDSP as it is in many other UD documents, but it is hardly sufficient as an exclusive focus of international learning, as the CAP appears to suggest.

Many other examples of a failure to link the CAP with the UDSP could be cited, but this is not the place to spell them out. The UDSP is, of course, not a blueprint for a common academic program, but such a program should, I believe, be clearly and explicitly structured in ways that are consistent with that document and that seek deliberately to advance the goals it articulates. HIR is a logical place to begin that process, but it should not define the limits of what such a program might include.

The World and the Academy
One of the stated, central premises of the CAP is that, “A truly interdisciplinary learning experience in a common academic program mirrors the complexity of the world in which UD students will work and live in community.” This sounds like a splendid idea until one recognizes that one of the most distinctive features and greatest strengths of academic institutions is precisely that they dismantle the complex components of the world outside the academy in order for us to examine them more closely. There are good reasons why universities do not, in fact, mirror the world around them. If this were their purpose, they could not justify their existence. It is exceedingly difficult even as an individual to be immersed in “the complexity of the world” and to cultivate “habits of inquiry and reflection” at the same time. The challenge for this and for any other university is to enable students to employ the latter toward an enlightened and constructive engagement with the former. One of the things that make a university education particularly valuable is the creative tension between these two conditions, so it would be unwise to seek to focus on one at the expense of the other, especially the one that is least suited to a university environment.
Learning Living Communities
Perhaps I missed it in the CAP proposal, but I did not find any reference to Learning Living Communities (LLCs). Is this because the Committee determined that these have not been successful? That they are not suited for contributing to the goals of the CAP? That the CAP will replace the purposes they were designed to serve? I have no knowledge of how the LLCs are working, but it seems to me that, at least in theory, they should provide exactly the sort of opportunities that would be needed to bring together, at least to some degree and under narrowly defined and highly qualified circumstances, “the complexity of the world” and “habits of inquiry and reflection.” I refer again to Goal 1 of the UDSP, and particularly the statement about “the University of Dayton’s distinctive ideal of transformative education through learning and living in community.”

Gen Ed Redux
If the seven learning outcomes from HIR are the ground upon which all is to be built in creating the CAP, it would seem appropriate to begin by asking how the University can best generate learning around those outcomes. Instead, the CAP appears to be in large measure an awkward effort to adapt the existing General Education (GE) structure to fit the HIR outcomes, while adding a few new requirements that the old system could not readily accommodate. In effect, the CAP retains the Humanities Base and much else largely intact while pretending to invent something altogether new. The seven learning outcomes from HIR are, after all minimally content-specific and minimally skill-specific. They can be addressed from many different disciplines and perspectives across the University. Yet the structure of the proposed CAP seems to suggest that the foundation of this program must be addressed exclusively through particular courses in ENG, HST, PHL, and REL. If we are seeking to do something new, this is a very curious coincidence. It would be more honest, interesting, and very possibly more fruitful to set to one side implicit assumptions about the inherent value of the Humanities Base and about Core, and even about the existing model of academic disciplinary divisions as intrinsically valuable and/or inescapable. The reality, however, is that 25 years of General Education have populated the University with several very large departments, and work must be found for the abundance of fine faculty in these departments. Even more compelling is the fact that inertia nearly always trumps change. But since we are fond of the idea of change, we tinker with existing ways of doing business, make a few adjustments, call the result something else, and imagine that we are doing more than we are. And if we can get enough people to talk about this, we can persuade ourselves that significant and substantive change is actually taking place, even when we are doing little more than rearranging the furniture and applying a fresh coat of paint.

Developmental Integration
According to the proposal, “The CAP curriculum is developmentally integrative.” It is seen as especially important for the CAP-Core courses to be developmentally integrative in order to establish a model for all that follows. This would require close, active, and ongoing collaboration amongst faculty across all the CAP Core disciplines, which is to say pretty much the entire College, minus the Sciences and Languages. (Is it not a problem to exclude these areas just as much as it is a challenge to include all the rest in genuine collaboration?) The sheer number of faculty involved in delivering the CAP-Core courses would overwhelm this plan long before anyone could actually address issues of content, pedagogy, integration, and all the rest. Many
major programs are not themselves developmentally integrative, i.e. students are not obliged to take courses in a deliberate sequence in which one builds upon another logically to develop skills and understanding, culminating in a capstone course that brings this sequence to a focused conclusion. Would it not be absurd if the CAP were to follow this path but a student’s major did not? Perhaps before we go too far with the CAP, or at least in concert with its development, some effort should be made to ensure that the major programs in all departments are themselves developmentally integrative. If this were to occur, the mutual reinforcement of this idea between CAP and major programs could be a powerful aspect of a UD education. But it makes little sense to create a very broadly diverse program that is developmentally integrative while major programs avoid responsibility for doing the same thing.

**CAP and Core**

Core is clearly and by declaration the model of choice for the CAP. This is understandable because Core has been so notably successful in generating good learning and cultivating good teaching. But Core is an instrument for delivering GE. It does not necessarily follow that it is the best instrument for delivering the CAP, unless, of course, we acknowledge that the CAP is actually GE in a new outfit. But the problem with Core as a model is much greater than this. Core is successful because it is small, because students choose to be in it, because faculty choose to be in it, and because the Core faculty agree to work together intensively in order to make it succeed. Some things can be scaled up successfully; others cannot. Core cannot. That which is possible with a relative handful of students and faculty becomes impossible with as many as two thousand students and scores of faculty. That which is selective and voluntary and carries with it a sense of status, honor, and privilege will no longer carry any of those qualities when it is mandatory and universal. It will not work to scale up Core. What might work is to learn from Core that size, focus, and identity are key elements in its success. It would follow that, instead of throwing away these elements by making Core bigger, we should concentrate on devising ways to replicate these elements in other structures that address the larger challenge of generating good learning through a variety of different means. In other words, we should avoid a Core monoculture and pursue instead an academic version of biodiversity in which many different life forms flourish. One logical place to look for opportunities would be the Learning Living Communities (LLCs), to which I referred earlier. These may be imperfect in their current form, but this is not surprising with a new experiment. They do, however, offer advantages of student selection, small size, a focused purpose, and a sense of identity.

It should also be noted that many students apparently choose not to complete the Core program. This can happen without serious consequences as long as they have a larger, conventional curricular structure upon which to fall back. If the rigor of Core is maintained – and there is little point in using Core as a model if this is not done – and everyone is obliged to enroll in a mammoth version of Core, and there is no other option for them, are we not creating a situation in which we essentially drive students from the University? If this is part of a larger plan to raise our academic standards, that is one thing, but if this is not the case, we need to look at this idea very carefully.

**PART TWO: RETHINKING THE CAP**
The seven learning outcomes of HIR are cultural, not curricular. They express broad and noble aims, yet the approach of the CAP seems to be to address them through the predictable and narrow academic expedient of a specific set of courses. I would argue that these aims are not amenable to being “delivered” though any set of courses, no matter how that set might be fabricated and made to appear as a coherent whole for the sake of fulfilling a rhetorical ambition, and regardless of how worthy that ambition might be. In keeping with my earlier argument in favor of building a replacement for Gen Ed on the wider vision of the UDSP, I would argue here that we need to focus on ways in which the culture of the institution might be changed. Then the ask would become one of determining how the CAS might most fruitfully contribute to such change. HIR and the seven learning outcomes need to be understood and acted upon within the broader and richer context of refashioning much more than a few courses and forcing them into a contrived alliance. So perhaps the question to ask is: How might the University “deliver” the seven learning outcomes?

Scholarship
Every single course at the University of Dayton should hold students accountable to the demands of good scholarship – as this is understood within each discipline – and enable them to meet these demands. This is not the responsibility of a few departments. It has to be pervasive. We therefore need to focus on ensuring that all faculty are aware of what is expected of them in this area and we need to give them the support they need in order for them to ensure that this goal is being met. This in turn requires good and sustained assessment. It is not as though we have failed to have countless discussions around these topics, just that we have not followed through on them effectively. Supposing that the proposed CAP will somehow solve this problem is a distracting fantasy.

Faith Traditions
This is the only learning outcome for which primary responsibility probably should be identified with a single department. There are some opportunities outside of REL, and these should be cultivated and, where feasible, linked to the core elements of the curriculum delivered by REL. But it makes sense that a Catholic, Marianist University that is committed to a learning outcome focused on faith traditions should turn to this department as its primary resource.

Diversity
We should encourage the development of courses that address this topic and promote and support courses that already address it, but the primary focus should be on building a diverse University community. We learn about and value diversity more effectively by living and working in a diverse environment than we do by taking courses in the subject. This is also an area in which Goal 4 of the UDSP – international and intercultural citizenship and engagement – should be featured prominently. In other words, foreign language study, education abroad, and the cultivation through a variety of means of global awareness on campus – in ways that are not limited to a few particular courses – should all play a part.

Community
As with diversity, community is not, nor should we attempt to make it, something to address through a few selected courses. Community is something in which we participate,
something from which we benefit and to which we contribute. Ideally, this would be part of the experience of every course, but in order to understand the phenomenon more deeply, it must be experienced in other contexts. In my opinion, the two most promising areas in which to “develop and demonstrate understanding of and practice in the values and skills necessary for learning, living, and working in communities of support and challenge” are LLCs and through a comprehensive relationship between the University of Dayton and the City of Dayton. As with the matter of diversity and international and intercultural citizenship and engagement, this is not the place to spell out details, but the chief point remains clear and simple: This is not a course-specific issue. Curriculum can and should support it, but it is not the primary means through which it should be addressed.

**Practical Wisdom**
If we are serious about this we need to make an institutional commitment to co-op education and internships. In other words, we need to ensure that all our students participate in some form of work apart from their academic studies. The language of this particular learning outcome is particularly vague and remote from that which it seeks to endorse. If it is possible for students to work in an area related to their major academic interests, that should be encouraged, but it should not be required or even necessarily expected. The intrinsic value of accepting responsibility for a task and being held accountable for one’s performance in ways that academic work rarely parallels is of a very high order, and by definition it cannot be experienced or fully understood in the classroom. If we are serious about the importance of practical wisdom as an essential element of a UD education, we are obliged to provide means through which it can be obtained and require that students obtain it. And they cannot do so through curriculum. Courses may be able to provide them with the preparation they need to engage in such work, and they can offer opportunities for reflection upon it after the fact, but the fact of work itself – the crucible in which practical wisdom is most often formed – is something altogether different.

**Critical Evaluation of Our Times**
“Catholic Social Teaching” can certainly contribute to a student’s ability to evaluate our times critically, but the language of this learning outcome appears to place this contribution in such a central role that it has the effect of making all other aspects of critical thought seem to be somewhat subsidiary. As with scholarship, critical thinking should be pervasive across the curriculum. Even to suggest, however obliquely and perhaps even unintentionally, that learning the practice of critical evaluation can be left to one or two departments, is a serious error. Of course the outcome makes reference to “multidisciplinary study” and “historical, social, technological, economic, and ecological challenges,” but the point seems to be to bring that “multidisciplinary study” and all the other areas into evaluative focus through a lens that is largely designed by “Catholic Social Teaching.” More to the point, I think, would be for the University to establish ongoing forums through which faculty from all disciplines could address ways in which they cultivate critical thinking generally and specifically how they address the practice of critically evaluating our times through their courses. If the University provides incentives and support for this sort of exchange, the learning outcome will be addressed organically across the curriculum without setting it apart and defining it as necessarily adjunct to “Catholic Social Teaching.”

**Vocation**
This is related directly and most naturally to the issue of “developmental integration.” Of course it is something that will often arise in the context of community, scholarship, faith traditions, diversity, practical wisdom, and the critical evaluation of our times. (Perhaps this is a good place to note something the HIR would have done well to emphasize, i.e. that the seven learning outcomes should be understood as different ways of looking at an integrated, organic whole, and that each one can and should be seen not only as connected with the others but actually as just another way to view the same educational experience and process that has as its goal the formation of an enlightened and engaged whole person.) The great majority of UD students seek a university education in order to become employable in some way that will make it possible for them to belong to the American middle class. This is clearly not what HIR has in mind when it addresses vocation. But students are most likely to attend to the issues HIR has in mind if they are contextualized within the framework of their pragmatic ambitions. For this reason, developmentally integrated major programs should help students understand dimensions of vocation that go beyond employability, while other areas of study, including service learning, should help them to deepen and expand that understanding.

Summary of Parts One and Two
The CAP project appears to have originated entirely outside the framework of the University of Dayton Strategic Plan, a document that would have been helpful in defining the larger institutional goals, strategies, and tactics within which the CAP should almost certainly function. This oversight has prevented the Committee from recognizing and taking advantage of opportunities for framing its work in the broad and deep context of commitment to institutional change. As it stands, the CAP proposal can too easily be understood as a modest retooling of General Education rather than a genuinely creative and progressive rethinking of what a University of Dayton education could mean to future generations of students. It misses a key point with regard to “developmental integration” and it makes a critical error in seeming to believe that it is possible – or even desirable – to scale up Core to the size of the entire incoming class.

We seek to construct a curriculum, a set of courses to replace GE, because that is what we are most familiar with doing, but it is not the best answer to the goals we seek to fulfill. Teaching a course is not always the best solution to a problem. We are not so much in the business of designing and delivering courses as we are in the business of providing an education that must be conceived as much more inclusive and holistic than any course or even set of courses can deliver. The University of Dayton is sufficiently large and diverse to provide a very broad spectrum of expertise and experience, while at the same time it is small and focused enough to function as a coherently designed and managed laboratory capable of conducting enlightened and progressive experiments in education. The current CAP proposal is trying hard to do something we shouldn’t be doing in the first place, i.e.

designing a curricular response to a set of goals that cannot be adequately addressed through curriculum alone. Our attention should be focused instead on changing the culture of the University and through that process, on changing the cultural environment in which our students live and study and work at UD in ways that will enable them to take that experience with them when they leave and translate it into terms that are relevant to wherever they live and work beyond UD. The most important issue is this: The seven learning outcomes of HIR are cultural, not curricular. The fulfillment of these outcomes cannot be achieved by rearranging existing
courses, adding new courses, or awkwardly cobbled courses together in order to make them fit a formula that is based on noble but vague concepts.

PART THREE: WHAT TO DO?
Focus on academic excellence and ensure, through building a coherent and compelling vision of the University’s singular identity and purpose, that this excellence is made manifest in ways that are consistent with that vision. Academic excellence would include serious scholarship, rigorous and diversely informed inquiry, creative work of genuine merit, and other forms of achievement appropriate to a university that seeks to be, and to be regarded as, an outstanding educational institution. This requires across-the-board support for and insistence on excellence. It requires sound assessment and appropriate follow-through based on assessment. We have ventured tentatively down this path many times, but we have never committed to it fully, thereby rendering our modest efforts useless. Excellence will not be achieved by focusing undue attention on a uniform set of courses through which all students are obliged to march.

At the same time, some basics make sense. Most students need to improve their reading and writing skills along with their ability to comprehend and respond to texts, visual information, and questions asked of them. Most of them have a poor understanding of ethics, science, art, history, and religion as well, along with social issues, politics, and economics. So it IS important to do what we can to educate them in all of these areas. But we have to rely on more than a lineup of courses to accomplish this. Courses are, however, fundamentally important to this enterprise. Resolving these two realities would seem to be the heart of the problem that CAP seeks to solve, but it falls short of doing so. Let us acknowledge that we are committed to the continued employment of faculty in the departments of English, History, Philosophy, and Religious Studies in numbers that substantially exceed the need to matriculate majors in those departments. Let us therefore continue to take advantage of their expertise by continuing to have them offer courses that all students are required to take. Within this context, as well as the context of HIR and the essence of the CAP proposal, we should reconsider what these courses address and how they are delivered. How, for example, might they be woven into the LLCs? How can each of the both explicitly and implicitly support one or more of the seven learning outcomes?

Perhaps we should not entirely abandon the idea of clusters, however flawed they have been in practice. Instead we might refashion them from the ground up. We could consider linking them with LLCs. We could encourage groups of faculty to collaborate on creating and delivering clusters without any requirement that they survive beyond a single offering of each of the courses involved. Clusters that really work for both faculty and students would be likely to continue and improve. Those that don’t would disappear, as they should.

The CAP proposal is clearly based on excellent intentions. It identifies worthy goals, real problems, and well-meant solutions. But it tries too hard and ends up seeming to regiment and codify much that should be organic and, to some degree, improvisatory. This does not mean without limits. It means that the limits provide a field in which everyone knows and respects the basic concept, but creativity can thrive. Yes, it is desirable that students develop “increasing sophistication…from year to year.” They should be doing this already, and most of them do. Can we help them do this better and more rapidly? I am sure we can. But I am not at all
sure that the proposed CAP is the best way to go about this. I agree that the seven learning outcomes should be addressed developmentally and that they should be understood as elements to be integrated into a broadly inclusive education. It does not follow, however, that, “The seven student learning outcomes are most fully accomplished through a developmental and integrative approach…” This is to confuse the goal with the method for achieving it, a problem that seems endemic to the proposal in general.

In short, I believe the premises of the CAP proposal are flawed. This leads to unfortunate consequences throughout. I find it too prescriptive, unrealistic, unnecessarily complex, and a distraction from what I think is the more important challenge: creating an institutional culture that is focused on academic excellence and that provides content and context for the development of informed thinking and acting around the concepts articulated in the seven learning outcomes. In spite of these criticisms, there is a great deal to commend in the ambition and hard work that have given shape to the proposal. In spite of my misgivings, I am grateful for the impetus it provides for examining what we do, how we do it, and why we do it. If the proposal succeeds in fostering a sustained dialogue through which we can continue to learn and grow, and if such dialogue, learning, and growth lead ultimately to changing the institutional culture in positive ways, it will have served a purpose of great value to the University.

Sean Wilkinson December 2008

CAP-CORE ARTS COURSE: CONCERNS
I begin by questioning the opening premise of the proposed CAP Arts Course. The first sentence of the “Brief Description” is: “A single interdisciplinary course in the Arts should introduce students to the arts, the arts ‘way of thinking’ and looking at the world.” This is almost identical to the first sentence about the proposed Social Sciences course. I think it is problematic in both cases, but I will address only the arts. Why is it believed that a single course in the arts should of necessity be interdisciplinary? It is not possible for a student to gain a great deal of understanding about the arts from a single course in any case, but to require a single course to be interdisciplinary virtually guarantees that the student’s experience will be superficial. An entire semester focused on drawing, for example, will not produce an accomplished draftsman, but it will give a student a much stronger grasp of what it means to connect seeing with mark making, which is a fundamental element of visual art. And the student will most definitely learn from this experience.

The phrase “the arts ‘way of thinking’ and looking at the world” strikes this particular artist as very peculiar indeed. It suggests a singularity that simply does not exist. It also seems unpleasantly reminiscent of the days when “art appreciation” was in vogue. The same phrase is used in the Social Science Course description, where it seems equally inappropriate, but I note that it does not appear in the Natural Sciences description, or indeed in any other area. There is no reference, for example, to a science of a humanities “‘way of thinking’ and looking at the world.” What is it about the arts and the social sciences that make them seem amenable to this sort of reductive categorization? If students arriving in an Arts Course (and a Social Science Course) will have taken paired ENG/PHL courses and paired HST/REL courses – and might these combinations be different, or will they be fixed? – and if the basic idea is developmental integration, isn’t it essential for those teaching the Arts (and Social Science) Course to know
about and be prepared to work with the contents and contexts of those course pairs? How will this come about? Is this even possible or actually desirable? The “complexity of the world” rarely offers such tidy and convenient relationships. According to Appendix D of the CAP proposal, the Arts Course is expected to address, at a minimum, five of the seven learning outcomes. Five! Only the First Year CAP-Core, a combination of four courses representing four disciplines over two semesters is expected to address more (six). One might reasonably ask: If the arts are considered capable of delivering more learning outcomes than any other area within the College, should they not be the pre-eminent feature of the CAP, or at least a model that all other areas should emulate? Since it is virtually certain that the initial CAP-Core courses will be, for the most part, traditional, text-based, academic, lecture/discussion courses for which students will write papers and take written exams, shouldn’t the emphasis of the Arts Course (and perhaps the Social Science Course) emphasize practice, experience, and other modes of learning that would complement and differ from the conventional academic modes?

History, theory, and criticism in the arts could provide a link, but it seems they should not be the primary modes if the point is to be developmental. (This touches on another issue, specifically the apparent absence from the CAP proposal of any commitment to “experiential, inquiry-based learning” and “innovative pedagogies,” both of which phrases are taken directly from HIR. The arts are among the disciplines most obviously suited to offering these assets, yet the way in which the Arts Course is defined suggests an effort to keep them at a minimum. This communicates the idea that the Committee seeks to perpetuate the long tradition of distrust and misunderstanding – or perhaps the all-too-clear understanding – with which traditional academics respond to the arts, i.e. that they are nor entirely respectable, that they are possibly anarchistic, and that they are certainly too difficult to reconcile with the rest of the academic community. It is best, therefore, to keep them in check and to insist that they behave themselves when they are allowed a place at the table.) The directive that the Arts Course should explicitly “embrace both the practice/experience of the arts AND their history/criticism” suggests that these elements are typically separated. While it is true that few art history courses engage students in the practice of making art, it should be clearly understood that studio courses, i.e. courses in which students actually make art, include theory, history, and criticism. These are, in fact, essential elements in all studio classes at the University of Dayton. (So relax!) It is even more important to be emphatic on one other key point: The making of art, especially within the context of a university course is in itself a form of learning, just as reading and writing and discussion are forms of learning. It is a mistake to assume that practice can have educational validity only if it is supplemented by let alone subservient to, more traditional academic forms. In purely pragmatic terms, if UD accepts approximately 1,800 new students each year over and above the number of majors in the arts, there would be roughly this number of students seeking to take an Arts Course in their second year. If they divided equally amongst offerings in Music, Theatre, and Visual Arts, a most unlikely circumstance, each of these units would be teaching approximately 600 students each year, or about 300 per semester, in addition to their own majors. Who will deliver courses for this number of students? Where? How?

Summary of Concerns
The proposed Arts Course is conceptually and logistically problematic in many ways. It reflects a poor understanding of the arts, it seeks to impose upon the arts inappropriate directives and limitations, and it fails to take into account the ways in which most arts courses are taught.
CAP-CORE ARTS COURSE: AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH
If we want our students to know something about the arts, we should require them to take an arts course. But the menu of courses from which they would select, and the content and pedagogy of those courses, should be left to those responsible for delivering them. It is a mistake to impose interdisciplinarity and require a false sense of “balance.” That said, serious logistical problems remain to be solved in order to implement anything like a mandatory Arts Course for all students. In addition, we should ask once again if that is a good idea in the first place. More importantly still, we need to reckon with the role of the arts at this University generally, rather than focusing all our attention on a required course.

Sean Wilkinson December 2008

Chris Wittmann, S.M.
Campus Ministry

Common Academic Programs Draft, Individual Feedback

1. What in your domain (e.g., unit, department, or committee) is currently being done that already is aligned in whole or in part with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

Campus Ministry organizes and supports a variety of cross-cultural immersion programs and service projects which could potentially be developed more fully for Diversity experiences and Service Learning Requirements. Members of the Campus Ministry staff have expertise that may lend itself to collaboration with professors on the Religion Courses and the Course in Practical Ethical Action informed by Catholic Social Teaching.

2. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered strengths and worth pursuing?
   a. I appreciate the inclusion in both HIR and the CAP draft of what I have called “Catholic literacy” – “Students will be familiar with the basic theological understandings and central texts that shape Catholic beliefs and teachings, practices and spiritualities.” (HIR) I am glad to see that attempts are made to do this. (More comments later on the structure of the faith courses.)
   b. Attempts to make the CAP curriculum “developmentally integrative” sound good.
   c. Sequence of courses, in general, sounds pretty good.
   d. I agree with the subcommittee’s recommendation that students not be permitted to test out of CAP requirements (Curricular Challenges c. and d., p.36.) This will have to be addressed also as 2 Plus 2 College entrance programs from community/junior colleges increase, etc.

3. What elements of the CAP proposal should be considered weaknesses and should be significantly rethought or discarded?
My chief concern with the CAP draft is that it is very weak on supporting the first commitment of A Vision of Excellence: “Strengthening our Distinctive Catholic and Marianist Identity.” (Admittedly, this concern of mine is also a concern I have about the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection document, which serves as a foundation for the CAP draft.)

I do believe that interdisciplinary, liberal arts-based general education is in fact a characteristic of Catholic, Marianist education, and the CAP draft is a good attempt to put new flesh on those bones. But it is a derivative or secondary characteristic of Catholic, Marianist education. What seems to be missing is a more robust engagement with a primary characteristic of Catholic, Marianist education: a thorough exploration of the Catholic Intellectual Tradition across majors and disciplines.

The academic dimension of Catholic identity cannot be carried by a few courses which are largely the responsibility of one or two departments and seem to exist in only three classes. (Despite the good statement in the CAP draft on pages 11, I do not see in the plan how the “faith traditions” learning outcome of the HIR will be embraced broadly across departments. It seems to fall almost entirely to Religious Studies and maybe Philosophy. Appendix D also points out that, far from being the first priority (as listed in the Vision of Excellence) “Faith Traditions” are addressed only three times, the least of all the learning outcomes, in the proposed CAP curriculum.

4. What does the CAP proposal miss that should be considered and perhaps added to the proposal?

The CAP should include broad, interdisciplinary engagement with the Catholic Intellectual Tradition as a key goal of general education at UD.

UD has had in the past vigorous conversations about the Catholic Intellectual Tradition, but it seems that these have been dropped from recent documents, notably the HIR and the CAP draft. I believe that a common academic program which fails to promote engagement with the Catholic Intellectual Tradition broadly will fail to strengthen the university’s Catholic Identity, and will in the long run weaken it substantially. Without broad academic engagement in the CIT, Catholic identity tends to be seen as being carried by signature departments (Religious Studies, Campus Ministry, The Fitz Center, the Center for Catholic Education, etc.) and derivative characteristics or methods of educating (Living/ Learning Communities, General Education, etc.) but this is insufficient to maintain Catholic identity throughout the university, much less strengthen it. The center of gravity in a university is its academic life. If mission and identity aren’t carried by this academic heart of the university, they will soon be dropped. Signature programs and derivative methods, no matter how good, are not sufficient to strengthen our distinctive Catholic and Marianist identity.

Part of the problem is the language of the HIR, which reduces the Catholic Intellectual Tradition to “basic theological understandings and central texts” (essential, of course, but not sufficient), and says nothing about Catholic Intellectual Traditions in history, language, science, mathematics, art, music, the social sciences, and other areas. A further problem is that the HIR reduces the Catholic Intellectual Tradition from a privileged reference point and source of wisdom (as it should be at a Catholic university) to one among many “Faith Traditions” which students should be able to engage with “intellectually informed, appreciative and critical inquiry.” (I am not arguing that students should not be able to
examine the CIT with critical inquiry, but rather that they are unlikely to really be exposed to
it in any depth as it is presented in the CAP draft.)

When the seven student learning outcomes from the HIR are brought forward into the
CAP draft, explicit Catholic/Marianist identity questions disappear entirely (see, for example:
“Figure 1. CAP-Core Guiding Questions,” p. 16). (Adding to this problematic
situation is this: in the HIR and in the CAP draft, for the most part, “Vocation” is discussed
without any reference to God or to a calling from God; “Community” is mentioned without
any reference to faith, forgiveness, love, discipleship or the common good; and “Faith
Traditions” are discussed with passing reference to Catholicism and with no mention of
Jesus. In other words, the categories all get secularized very quickly. Further, the discussion
of “sacramentality” in the HIR, while a necessary ingredient in the CIT (and one place that
Jesus Christ is mentioned in these documents), doesn’t seem to get picked up at all in the
CAP plan and, even if it were, it is not sufficient to carry Catholic identity. The way it is
stated in the HIR it could easily be watered down to mean any thorough engagement of a
field of study.

5. What in your domain would need to be developed to align with the provisions of the
   CAP proposal?

   See question #1, above.

6. What resources and or changes would be needed to make that development
   possible?

   Not sure.

7. In particular, what if anything, might it be necessary for us to stop doing in order to
   align with the provisions of the CAP proposal?

   Not sure.

8. What are the general concerns or questions that need to be addressed or answered
   before moving forward in any significant way on the revisions to the CAP proposal?

   a. How will the Catholic Intellectual Tradition be engaged broadly across the
      curriculum, not just in theology/religion classes?

   b. How will the theology/religion classes do justice to the riches and depth of
      Catholic theology and provide a decent introduction to other major world
      religions in only two or three classes?

   c. Is there a better way to organize the Religion Courses, especially the CAP-
      Core Religion and the 200 Level Religion Course?

      Putting Catholic theology into the CAP-Core Course and the study of major
      religious traditions other than Catholicism/Christianity into the more advanced
      200 level course strikes me as something like a simplistic high school curriculum:
      “get the boring requirement out of the way, then move on to the more exotic
      content that students will be interested in.” Concerns about:
Who will teach the 200 level courses, and what will their quality be.

In my reading of it, neither the HIR nor certainly the Vision of Excellence says that the Catholic Faith Tradition should receive equal or lesser academic attention than Other faith traditions, but that seems to be the practical impact of this part of the plan, when these courses are combined with the emphasis on diversity which is (appropriately) also in the draft.

The sequence could be reversed, with Catholic tradition being the 200 level course. Or both courses could be better integrated to address Catholic theology and practice in comparison with other major religions, rather than the either/or approach.

Or some other approach.