1-27-2010

The Common Academic Program

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee

Proposal to the Academic Senate

Title: The Common Academic Program

Submitted By: The Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate

Date: January 27, 2010 (August 15, 2008)

Action: Legislative Authority

Reference: Art. II. B. 1.b

See also: DOC 81-02, DOC-03-08, DOC 07-02, DOC 06-09, CAP Comparison Chart, and
                             CAP Feedback Form

Dear Colleagues:

The 2010 revised draft document titled "The Common Academic Program" (CAP) is attached below. This document is a draft report from the Coordinating and Writing Task Force that reflects the efforts of faculty working groups charged with developing the different components of CAP.

CAP represents a multi-year, university-wide effort to create a common academic program that promotes more intentionally the distinctive student learning outcomes discussed in the University's document *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection* (2006). CAP embodies an exciting transformation of the general education program as well as the broader curriculum at the University of Dayton. After extensive consideration of numerous approaches to general education, a sub-committee of the Academic Policies Committee (APC) developed CAP as a draft proposal in 2008. The APC collected wide-ranging feedback on CAP from the university community during 2008 and 2009. Working towards further revision, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate appointed the CAP Coordinating and Writing Task Force (2009-2010) to coordinate the faculty working groups. The faculty working groups have consulted widely as they developed criteria and considered learning objectives for their contributions to CAP.

This draft proposal is still open for discussion, debate and possible amendment by the campus community and the Academic Senate. To facilitate the process, the APC

is soliciting feedback from the UD community on this newly revised CAP draft document. The APC invites all faculty, staff and students within the campus community to participate in a series of forums to share your feedback and ideas on the *revised* CAP document. The February 4 forum will gather feedback from students, the February 11 forum will hear from non-tenure and pre-tenure faculty, the February 5 and February 8 forums will hear from all members of the university community.

The APC forums will be held:

Thurs	**02/04**	**6-8pm**	**KU 331**	**Students**
Fri	**02/05**	**1-2:30pm**	**Science Ctr Auditorium**	**All**
Mon	**02/08**	**4-6pm**	**Science Ctr Auditorium**	**All**
Thurs	**02/11**	**12-1:30pm**	**Science Ctr Auditorium**	**non/pre-tenure Faculty**

The APC welcomes feedback in the form of general response, questions, and specific suggestions for revision. If unable to attend a forum, responses may be submitted to the Chair of the APC via email (jhp@notes.udayton.edu). The APC will summarize and present community feedback on this *revised* CAP to the CAP Task Force and the Academic Senate. (Feedback will be posted at the CAP quickplace.udayton.edu site.)

The APC will continue review of community feedback and deliberations on CAP. The APC seeks to have a revised document ready for debate within the Academic Senate by March 26, 2010.   It is anticipated that a formal CAP proposal, including implementation plan, will be presented by the CAP Task Force to be acted upon at the April 23, 2010 meeting of the Academic Senate.

The APC offers its appreciation to all involved in shaping this collaborative effort.

On behalf of the Academic Policies Committee,

Judith Huacuja, Chair of the APC

A Report on the Revised Proposal for the Common Academic Program

CAP Coordinating and Writing Task Force

Patrick Donnelly (Chair), Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work, Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate

Margaret Pinnell, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering

Danielle Poe, Department of Philosophy

January 27, 2010

I.   Introduction

This report describes the present status of the development of the Common Academic Program. It begins with a brief history of the development of the program by various groups over the past five years. The report places the University's efforts to revise its common curriculum for all undergraduate students in the context of recent developments at the University of Dayton and in higher education nationally. It then provides greater details of developments in the program recommended by the Coordinating and Writing Task Force (CWTF) and the nine faculty Working Groups. This report does not discuss issues related to the implementation of the program. After the Working Groups submit their reports in February identifying the resources required to successfully implement the CAP, the CWTF will prepare a report on implementation strategies that will address the necessary financial resources, faculty development efforts, structural implications related to workloads and student credit hours, and a timetable.

II.   Background

The current effort to develop and implement a new common academic plan dates back to February 2005 when the Marianist Education Working Group, with ten representatives of units across the University, was established to facilitate a campus-wide discussion about the purposes and substance of a Marianist education at UD. Based on an examination of numerous documents relating to Catholic and Marianist education and on extensive consultation, it presented recommendations about how a common academic program should express the ideals of university education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions. The Group's 2006 report, *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection: A Report on Education in the Catholic and Marianist Traditions at the University of Dayton* (HIR) identified key goals, a mission statement, and seven student learning outcomes of an education in the Catholic and Marianist tradition. It noted that these goals and outcomes should be developed in different ways, including in the major, in General Education and competencies, as well as in co-curricular and extracurricular activities. The Academic Policy Committee (APC) of the Academic Senate held numerous conversations and meetings on HIR with faculty across the campus and approved the HIR student learning outcomes in December, 2006. In December, 2007 the University Assessment Plan which adopted the seven

learning outcomes as guidelines for all units to follow when they design and assess their own student learning goals was approved by the Academic Senate.

The document of the Marianist Education Working Group, Senate DOC 06-09 Habits of Inquiry and Reflection: A Report on Education in the Catholic and Marianist Traditions at the University of Dayton is available at http://academic.udayton.edu/Senate/documents/senate%20documents/Documents.htm. The key aspects of HIR that provide important guiding principles and goals of the development of the academic plan include the following.

Accordingly, the common academic program for undergraduates should be guided by the following mission statement [section IV]:

> *Students educated in the Catholic and Marianist traditions at the University of Dayton pursue rigorous academic inquiry, in a sacramental spirit, and engage in vigorous dialogue, learning in, through, and for community. Guided by the purpose of transforming society for the ends of justice, peace, and the common good, the University's academic program challenges students to excellence in their majors, cultivates practical wisdom in light of the particular needs of the twenty-first century, and fosters reflection upon their individual vocations.*

The HIR document identified seven core student learning outcomes for the common academic plan.

> *The learning outcomes presented below are intended to function at the level of the common academic program. They could be promoted in different ways, through different structures and activities, in the student's major, in General Education and the Competencies programs, in co-curricular programming, and in learning experiences that transpire outside the formal curriculum. They are not to be regarded as the exclusive responsibility of a limited segment of the university community. Rather, they should shape all intentional planning for students' educational experience in every division of the university.*

> *The proposed outcomes do not necessarily map onto unique elements of the common academic program, and they do not exhaust the goals of the academic program for students.*

> 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.*

> 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.

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.*

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.*

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.*

5. ***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.*

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.*

In September, 2007, the APC charged the Subcommittee on the Common Academic Program of the Academic Policies Subcommittee with creating a draft proposal for a common academic program based on the seven learning outcomes in HIR. The nine-member Subcommittee presented its Draft Report, The Common Academic Program in August 2008.

The CAP sought to: provide a more developed understanding of the Catholic and Marianist traditions explicated in HIR; structure a developmental program that built the learning outcomes over the students' years at UD; provide integration of general education with the major; provide significant interdisciplinary experiences throughout the undergraduate experience; and promote reciprocity of learning between the College and the professional schools. The full text of the Draft Report, Senate Document 08-01can be found on the Academic Senate Documents web page (../Academic%20Senate%20Documents%202008-2009/DOC%2008-01.doc).

During the Fall of 2008, the APC solicited feedback to the CAP draft proposal. The complete responses to proposal is also located at the Academic Senate Documents web page (http://academic.udayton.edu/Senate/documents/senate%20documents/Documents.htm) Recognizing the need to build on the momentum of the CAP proposal and the constructive suggestions of all those who submitted feedback to the draft report, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate appointed and charged the Coordinating and Writing Task Force (CWTF) in May 2009.

> *In sum, a substantially revised draft of the CAP proposal is called for that a) establishes a common academic program based on the seven student learning outcomes in Habits of Inquiry and the approved University assessment plan; b) weighs the constructive proposals and concerns presented in the extensive feedback provided last fall by individuals, departments and units; c) incorporates appropriate concrete proposals from affected units for revitalizing and revising contributions to general education that meet the University's assessment outcomes for student learning; and d) results in a formal proposal, including implementation plan, that can be discussed by the Academic Senate and the university community beginning at the Senate meeting of March 26, 2010.*

To accomplish this task, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate appointed and charged a three-person coordinating and writing task force. The task force is chaired by Dr. Patrick Donnelly and includes Drs. Danielle Poe and Margaret Pinnell. The task force was charged to do the following:

1. *Familiarize itself with: the original Habits of Inquiry and Reflection document (which references assessment material); assessment material pertaining to the current general education system housed in the CAS Dean's office; the CAP report; the responses to the CAP report submitted by individuals, departments and units; and curricular developments and discussions already underway that have an impact on a revised CAP (Summer 2009);*

2. *Solicit any additional needed commentary from the University community on the strengths and weaknesses of the CAP proposal and create a more extensive and detailed summary of the responses to the CAP proposal to be shared with the Academic Senate and University community at the September 25th Senate meeting (Summer 2009);*

3. *Using the assessment of feedback from the CAP proposal, the other sources in 1), and the seven student learning outcomes, create a list of tasks to be completed by groups in the broader academic community and develop a statement of work to be completed by each group, including specific charges and a timetable. This list should be shared with the Senate early in the Fall 2009 semester (Summer-early Fall 2009);*

4. *Work with these groups as they generate their proposals, coordinating efforts among them (Fall 2009);*

5. *Provide monthly updates on progress to the Academic Policies Committee, the Executive Committee, and the Senate as a whole.*

6. *Use its assessment of the materials listed in the first bullet point and the proposals created as a result of its charges to produce a plan for revising the current general education system that:*
   - *creates a common academic program that promotes more intentionally the distinctive student learning outcomes of the University assessment plan, and;*
   - *includes a list of required resources and proposes an implementation plan (including pilot programs).*

The Task Force carefully reviewed the feedback provided by various units, programs and individuals and solicited additional feedback and clarification from the deans and representatives from other programs. The Task Force presented its Summary of this feedback to the Executive Committee of Academic Senate in August 2009. Based on the HIR outcomes, the CAP Draft, and the feedback to the CAP, the CWTF developed a Work Plan identifying both the tasks necessary to develop the CAP and the appropriate groups to undertake those tasks. Both of these documents, the Summary of Responses to the Common Academic Program and the Work Plan for the Development of the Common Academic Program, are available on the Quickplace for the Common Academic Program on the Academic Senate Documents web site http://academic.udayton.edu/Senate/documents/senate%20documents/Documents.htm

The Work Plan presented by the Task Force proposed maintaining those features that are central to the University mission and that were supported by the University community. The Work Plan sought to maintain a number of distinguishing guiding principles of the CAP, including the following:

> The central feature of CAP is the developmental nature of the program which begins in the first year and builds towards a more sophisticated appreciation of the learning outcomes over four years, both in the CAP courses and the major…

> An education in the Catholic and Marianist tradition emphasizes the unity of knowledge and seeks to develop integrative thought across disciplines. The Catholic intellectual tradition calls for collaborative efforts across disciplinary bounds. The Marianist approach to education promotes linking theory and practice, and liberal and professional education through integrative learning and living in community. The CAP seeks to build on this tradition and approach.

The Work Plan also maintained two structural aspects of the curriculum that were proposed in 2008 Draft Plan: the first year introductory Humanities courses in Religious Studies, Philosophy, History and English, and; the elimination of the current General Education cluster requirement

The Work Plan also proposed a number of significant changes to the 2008 Draft Plan. While the full Work Plan describes all of these changes in detail, this report highlights a few of those changes.

1. The 2008 CAP Draft Plan proposed the student learning outcome related to diversity be met in at least two ways:

   Diversity – 3 credit hours or equivalent experience; second or third year. All students will participate in an initial discussion of diversity that will take place in the six-course CAP-Core. In addition, each department will be responsible for ensuring that all students majoring in the department receive an additional significant experience relating to the diversity outcome.

Feedback to this proposal supported the inclusion of the diversity outcome in first year Humanities CAP courses but questioned the departmental responsibility saying that it was too vague and open to a wide of interpretations. After reviewing the feedback and additional consultation, the Task Force concurred with these ideas. It proposed:

… that the University adopt a diversity-across-the-curriculum approach. We initially assign the task of developing this diversity outcome to most of these first and second year CAP courses. It is only after the goals of the diversity outcome are established and assessed in these courses that the diversity goals or desired outcomes for upper level CAP or major courses can be clearly established. We recommend that the implementation of the second CAP diversity requirement-- that all departments develop a significant course or experience for their majors-- be postponed until the diversity outcomes for the first and second year CAP courses have been developed and assessed.

2. A second recommended change to the 2008 CAP Draft Plan related to the proposal that all departments integrate a service-learning experience into their curriculum for their majors. This could be a credit or non-credit experience. While many units indicated that they either already have or could develop such an experience for majors, a significant number of units reported that it would be very difficult to find placements or experiences for major-related experiences. Others were concerned that that tracking and assessing the worthiness of service-learning experiences for all undergraduates would be a daunting experience.   Given the concerns of various academic units and the recent proposal to establish the UD Office of Service Learning to facilitate service-learning experiences, the Task Force recommended that this requirement be tabled at this time and reconsidered once the status of the Office of Student Learning is determined.

3. A third recommended change in the Task Force Work Plan relates to the Oral Communication requirement. The 2008 Draft Plan stated the requirement this way

> **Communication** – Unit and/or department plans must demonstrate how communication development within the major is addressed. Communication skills may be developed in a particular course and/or by experiences spread through a sequences of courses.

This proposal eliminated the current General Education oral communication course requirement for all students. While there was some support for this proposal in the feedback, many more respondents felt that the Department of Communication should design and offer a course for all students as part of the CAP.   They suggested that the Department of Communication is uniquely capable of developing and developing communication competency.

The Department of Communication presented a rationale and a preliminary proposal to fulfill the communication requirement. The Task Force recommended that a new three credit course be developed by the Department of Communication to be included in the CAP.

4. The 2008 Draft Plan proposed a highly integrated set of first year courses in Religious Studies, Philosophy, History and English and second year courses in the Arts and Social Sciences (described as the CAP-CORE). Recognizing that disciplinary-based knowledge is absolutely necessary in the student's formation in practical wisdom, the Draft Plan suggested that students' understanding flourishes when a student has to engage across disciplines. The Draft Plan proposed that common connections between the courses be based on questions emerging from the seven student learning outcomes of HIR and on common CAP addresses. This proposal drew considerable feedback. While there were several positive statements about the general idea of a connected set of Humanities courses in the first year, many respondents expressed major concerns about the underlying philosophy behind the proposal and the practical implications of the proposal.

Based on this feedback, the Task Force recommended that the current Humanities Base Committee be charged as the Working Group that would develop the four first year courses. These courses would introduce all first year students to the seven HIR outcomes and further elaborate a more limited set of the outcomes in a manner consistent with the content and focus of the particular disciplinary course. Recognizing the challenges of the current General Education Humanities Base in maintaining some common elements or themes across all courses and sections, the Task Force charged the group to explore and identify a common element to link at least two of these four Humanities courses together.

5. The Task Force Work Plan also varied from the 2008 CAP Draft in addressing the Arts and Social Science components. The Draft Plan proposed a single interdisciplinary course in each of these two areas to introduce all students to these areas. Feedback to this proposal suggested that developing a single course would be

difficult given the range of units in each division. It was also suggested that depth would be sacrificed in favor of breadth. The Task Force amended the proposal for these components recommending that the Arts and Social Science units consider either the single course option or a small number of introductory courses across the disciplines in each unit.

6. The Task Force recommends that the current University policy regarding the acceptance of transfer and AP credits to satisfy GE requirements remain in place for the CAP.

A full description of the proposed CAP as provided in the Task Force Work Plan and in the Working Group Reports is provided below in Section IV.

III.   Context

This revision of the common curriculum for all undergraduate students is a response to the both internal and external changes. Significant changes have occurred at UD and in higher education at a national level in recent years. The UD document, Habits of Inquiry and Reflection (2006), represents the most recent explication of the nature of a Catholic and Marianist education. Drawing from an extensive study of the literature, existing UD documents and widespread consultation, the Marianist Education Working Group identified key goals of an undergraduate education, a mission statement, and student learning outcomes of an education in the Catholic and Marianist tradition. Over the last several years, the University of Dayton has hired many outstanding new faculty who bring to campus strong teaching and research skills, as well as new ideas, specialties, energy and enthusiasm. At the same time, many tenured faculty are developing exciting new curricular and co-curricular programs and experiences. The development of a new common curriculum provides the opportunity for UD to integrate newer faculty into the life of the campus and to provide support for the new initiatives, new and innovative pedagogy, and the rigorous and integrative educational experiences essential for excellence in undergraduate education. A revision that is focused on student learning outcomes,

not only provides exciting and synergistic opportunities for both new and tenured faculty, but also a distinct and powerful learning experience for students that will enhance and embrace the holistic approach to education that is embodied in the Marianist tradition.

Enrollment trends in higher education in general, and in particular in private universities, call on universities to establish and maintain strong and distinctive programs. In addressing the Working Group chairpersons, Provost Saliba indicated that the cost of private higher education must be worth the investment of students and their parents. He stated that developing an innovative, distinct and highly effective general education program was necessary for UD to remain strong in an increasingly competitive environment. He indicated that we cannot afford NOT to have a strong, distinctive program.

Higher education in the United States has experienced other significant changes in recent years. These changes involve both pedagogy and content. In 1995 Robert Barr and John Tagg published "A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education" describing the transformation from a more traditional teaching paradigm to a learning paradigm. In the teaching paradigm, the mission of the college is to teach while in the learning paradigm, the mission is to produce learning. Over the last decade higher education has experienced a change resulting in greater focus and emphasis on student learning rather than on instruction. The development of student learning outcomes that are tied both to the mission of the institution and to the particular fields of study are increasingly the norm. The focus of assessment programs across the country are now on the attainment of student learning outcomes rather than the number of hours and type of instruction that is offered.

A 2009 report of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) revealed that almost 90 percent of the 433 universities and colleges in their sample were in some stage of reviewing or assessing their general education programs (Hart, 2009). Only15 percent of the colleges and universities use a cafeteria- style set of distribution requirements for their general education programs. More than two-thirds of the colleges use a model that combines

various integrative features along with some choice of courses. Over three-quarters of all universities have a common set of outcomes for all undergraduate students.

The study also examined the relationship between general education programs and the major. Less than half of the institutions reported that their general education program was either very well or fairly well integrated with students' major requirements. The study cites a 2004 report of college students that reported a criticism of general education courses because they lacked relevance to their area of study. The survey findings show that many institutions feel that they should be more effective in linking general education courses to majors and areas of concentration and that their universities should be more effective in communicating the benefits of general education to students.

In another report, the AACU identifies ten high impact educational practices that offer significant educational benefits to students (Kuh, 2008). The report provides evidence that these programs enhance student engagement in their educational journey while also significantly increasing retention. One high impact practice is a common intellectual experience such as a set of required courses or a vertically organized general education program that included advanced integrative courses. Other high impact programs include: first year seminars or experiences; learning communities that integrate learning across courses; writing intensive courses, undergraduate research, collaborative projects and assignments, courses and programs that help students explore cultures and life experiences other than their own, service learning, community-based programs, internships, and capstone or culminating experiences.

IV. Overview and Components

The August 2009 Work Plan for the Development of the Common Academic Program established nine working groups to develop courses or criteria for courses that would comprise the Common Academic Program: the First Year Humanities Working Group, the ENG 200 WG, the Arts WG, the Social Science WG, the Natural Science WG, the Mathematics WG, the Oral Communication WG, the Crossing Boundaries WG, and the Major Capstone WG. The

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and the Provost consulted with deans and department chairs in identifying 70 faculty and staff representing all undergraduate academic units to serve on these working groups.. The membership of the Working Groups can be found in Appendix B. The detailed charges to each of the working groups can be found on the Common Academic Program Quickplace site on the Academic Senate Documents web page. http://academic.udayton.edu/Senate/documents/senate%20documents/Documents.htm

Overview of the Proposed Common Academic Program

The CAP curriculum is designed to be developmentally integrative. Skills and content introduced in foundational courses will be reinforced and broadened in subsequent courses. A brief listing of CAP courses and experiences is given in this section. Detailed descriptions follow, as well as a chart illustrating the relationship between the proposed CAP and the current General Education program. That chart notes where the Working Groups recommend a change from the plan proposed here.

1. First Year Humanities Courses – 12 total credit hours

   The four first year CAP courses are English 100, and introductory courses in Religious Studies, Philosophy and History. These courses may keep their present course numbers but will be revised to address the goals and outcomes of CAP.

2. English 200 – 3 credit hours; second year. This course will emphasize rhetorical analysis and a process-approach to writing effective academic arguments.

3. Social Science – 3 credit hours; first or second year. This course will introduce students to the nature of the social sciences and will be taught by faculty in anthropology, economics, political science, psychology and sociology.

4. Arts – 3 credit hours; first or second year. The Arts component will recognize the arts as significant manifestations of diverse cultural, intellectual, aesthetic, and personal experiences. It might include courses from the Departments of Music, Visual Arts, English and the Theater Program. It would include studio and performance courses as well as historical studies courses. Students could satisfy the three course requirement with one three credit course or a combination of one and two credit courses.

5. Faith Traditions –3 credit hours; second year. The second course on religious traditions is designed to offer a comparative approach that allows students to reflect on and place their own religious belief and experience in a broader historical or cultural context.

6. Natural Sciences – 6 total credit hours. Students will take these courses in the semesters appropriate for their major. Students with different majors can satisfy this requirement in ways consistent with needs in the major.

7. Mathematics – 3 credit hours. Students will take this course in the semester appropriate for their major. Students with different majors can satisfy this requirement in ways consistent with needs in the major.

8. Oral Communication – 3 credit hours. Most students will take this course in their first year. This course will replace the current three one-credit modules.

9. Practical Ethical Action– 3 credit hours. Students will take this course in the semester appropriate for their major. All students will be required to take one such course selected from among a group of approved options.

10. Inquiry Elective – 3 credit hours; third year or fourth. All students are required to explore a topic of intellectual interest outside of their academic division.

11. Integrative Course – 3 credit hours, third or fourth year. All students will take one course that transcends disciplinary boundaries and explicitly examines significant social issues or problems in a multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary framework.

12. Disciplinary Capstone Course – 3 credit hours; fourth year. This course will be the culminating experience of the CAP.

Over the past five months, each working group met to discuss its charge and to work towards fulfilling its charge. Seven working groups were asked to complete significant portions of the charge by December 15 while two working groups, the Crossing Boundaries and the Major Capstone Working Groups, had March deadlines because of the complexity of their tasks. All groups submitted reports in December describing their work. This section of the report describes the proposals and recommendations from each of the working groups. The full report of each working group is available on the Quickplace site for the Common Academic Plan which is accessible on the Academic Senate documents web site.
http://academic.udayton.edu/Senate/documents/senate%20documents/Documents.htm

First Year Humanities Working Group

This group was charged with establishing criteria for the Humanities component that incorporate the appropriate student learning outcomes and disciplinary objectives and proposing first-year CAP introductory courses in Religious Studies, Philosophy, History and English that create a foundation for student success in the rest of the Common Academic Program and their majors. All seven HIR student learning outcomes should be introduced to first-year students while the diversity outcome and other discipline-appropriate outcomes should be developed further in these courses. Some common elements in at least two of the courses should be explicitly developed in order to allow students to see how different disciplines can examine similar material or issues.

The WG indicates that the existing humanities base courses do promote the HIR student learning outcomes. The group will focus its attention on identifying ways that the existing courses could be better connected to the student learning outcomes. This effort is presently being done at the department level. The working group recommends the development of common elements that would be addressed in all four of these first year humanities courses. One of the common elements would be the question "What does it mean to be human?" that is used as the central question in the current Humanities Base courses. The group will continue work on developing other questions, outcomes or themes that would be common across these courses.

Two new courses that would be proposed for the new CAP, ENG 100 and ENG 200, have been approved to be offered as pilots in the current GE Program in the Fall 2010. ENG 101 and ENG 102 or ENG 114/198 will be replaced with ENG 100 and ENG 200. The development of these courses was based on a review of the literature on writing, an assessment of UD students' writing experiences, and an examination of outcomes and skills identified in HIR. Most students would take ENG 100 in their first year and would emphasize expository writing, analysis of argument, and a process-based approach to academic writing and research. The Department of English outlined clear connections between specific learning outcomes and the HIR outcomes.

1.   Critically think, read, listen, and write;
Scholarship, community, practical wisdom, critical evaluation of the times, and vocation

Critical thinking, reading, listening, and writing enables students to conduct scholarship, to engage others in community, to interrogate theoretical concepts and consider their application in practical contexts, to critically evaluate their contemporary context, and to consider the relationship between work and calling.

2.   Understand their personal literacy histories and current literacy practices;
Diversity, community, vocation

By coming to an understanding of their own literacy histories and how their literacy practices have been shaped by context and community, students are prepared to consider the differences in reading, writing, and speaking practices of others as also contextually shaped. Students also become sensitive to the fact that literacy expectations and practices are community specific. Finally, students become aware of their own literacy practices. This ability enables them to consider their strengths as readers and writers and the relationship between those strengths and calling.

3.   Rhetorically analyze a variety of texts and arguments, including scholarly ones;
Scholarship, diversity, community, and critical evaluation of the times

The ability to analyze a variety of texts and arguments with rhetorical sensitivity (which is to say a sensitivity to audience and strategy) helps students to conduct scholarship across disciplinary boundaries, to engage the texts and arguments of diverse people and communities in serious and sensitive ways, and to consider thoughtfully contemporary controversies.

4.   Understand and thoughtfully respond to various viewpoints, including those with which they do not agree;
Scholarship, diversity, community, critical evaluation of the times

This outcome enables students to conduct scholarship that takes opposing viewpoints into account, to respond to diverse people with whom students may disagree, to develop community within the context of significant differences, and to consider alternative responses and solutions to contemporary issues.

5.   Locate and evaluate scholarly sources using the library catalog and databases;
Scholarship, critical evaluation of the times

The ability to conduct library research is crucial for engaging in scholarship generally and, more specifically, for researching questions pertaining to contemporary issues.

6.   Write persuasively, using rhetorical moves appropriate to academic work;
Scholarship, practical wisdom, critical evaluation of the times

Achieving the ability to write persuasively with rhetorical sensitivity to the academic context makes it possible for students to communicate the results of their scholarship and to convey the significance of their research to relevant audiences.

7.   Adopt a process approach to writing;
Scholarship, practical wisdom

With a process approach to writing, students can reliably produce professional texts to convey the results of their research and to communicate the significance of ideas and concepts in any context.

8.   Explore the Humanities Base themes through the lens of literacy;
Diversity, vocation

Thinking and writing about the relationship between literacy and the human condition encourages students to develop sensitivity to the ways in which even very different kinds of people share fundamental faculties as human beings. Additionally, exploring the centrality of writing and literacy for human existence enables students to consider the role of writing in their own lives and the ways that they make meaning of their world.

9.   Learn concepts linked to academic integrity, such as plagiarism and proper documentation;
Scholarship, community

This outcome delivers fundamental skills students must have to engage in and share scholarship. It also provides awareness of community standards and expectations for producing scholarship. Finally, it lays the groundwork for ethical conduct in any community context.

10.   Learn how to recognize what various rhetorical contexts demand and to write appropriately in response;
Scholarship, community

The ability to write strategically and appropriately across varying contexts is essential for scholarship, especially in the context of different disciplines. Further, writing that is sensitive to rhetorical context has the ability to build community.

11.   Write well-crafted essays, using structure, style, and grammar as appropriate to the purpose and audience of the text;
Scholarship, community

The ability to write well-crafted essays appropriate to the purpose and audience of the text enables scholarship to be communicated and to build community within the academy and elsewhere.

12.   Synthesize and rhetorically analyze multiple scholarly sources;
Scholarship

This outcome provides the foundation for scholarship because scholarship depends upon consulting multiple sources.

ENG 200 Working Group

The ENG 200 course proposal was approved to be offered as a pilot in the current GE Program starting in the Fall 2010. ENG 200 will replace the current ENG 102 and build on the skills and concepts developed in ENG 100. The course, if adopted by the University, would be a required, themed writing seminar in the liberal arts tradition, focusing on academic research and argumentation. The Department of English outlined clear connections between specific learning outcomes and the HIR outcomes.

1. Critically examine one theme from various disciplinary perspectives;
Scholarship, diversity, community, practical wisdom, critical evaluation of our times, vocation

By critically examining one theme from various disciplinary perspectives, students learn that disciplines with significantly different approaches and methodologies nevertheless inquire into similar questions and objects of study. Thus, they learn that disciplines are and ought to be in conversation with one another and that they have much to learn from each other. Coming to this awareness prepares students for their future scholarship, which is likely to be increasingly interdisciplinary. Moreover, it enables them to appreciate the different disciplines so that they can engage not just their own discipline but also a wider and diverse academic community that engages in discussion from significantly different perspectives that often contest one another. In addition, by recognizing that the various disciplines share certain concerns even as they inquire into them in different ways, students will learn that in the end scholarly inquiry provides practical wisdom for contemporary concerns. Further, by recognizing the benefit of scholarly conversation across disciplines, our students will be able to appreciate the enhanced value of critically evaluating our times from different disciplinary perspectives. Finally, such interdisciplinary examination will initiate students into the question of what disciplinary perspective(s) best suit their questions and modes of inquiry as they consider their life vocation.

2. Learn to recognize and analyze texts from various disciplines and thoughtfully write about and with those texts;
Scholarship, diversity, community, critical evaluation of our times, vocation

This student learning outcome is closely related to the previous outcome and further enhances students' abilities to engage in scholarly conversation within and across disciplines and diverse academic communities. As students analyze and write about texts from various disciplines on a single theme, they learn in concrete and specific ways how disciplines construct knowledge, support claims, and produce evidence. They also learn how to put the arguments and insights from various disciplines to work for their own interdisciplinary arguments on a theme. By analyzing and writing with texts from a variety of disciplines, students gain the abilities named

above (scholarship, diversity, community, practical wisdom, critical evaluation of our times, vocation) in a more intense way since writing about and with texts demands significant intellectual engagement with them.

3.   Rhetorically analyze arguments from a variety of perspectives;
Scholarship, diversity, community, critical evaluation of our times

This outcome concerns students' ability not only to understand that arguments are constructed from a variety of perspectives but also that those perspectives (with their distinctive histories, foci, methods, and aims) have different purposes and use varying strategies. By becoming able to recognize and engage arguments with sensitivity to purpose, audience, and strategy, students will become less inclined to reject an argument because it sounds strange or uses unfamiliar evidence or employs different methods than the student understands. Instead, students will be able to listen better for the value of even a seemingly strange argument and, thereby, give it a fairer hearing. As with the previous outcomes, so too this one will enable students to engage in their own scholarship better as they learn the rhetorical conventions of their discipline as well as participate more productively and ethically in a broad scholarly community that includes diverse perspectives and arguments. Again, with awareness that different perspectives yield different kinds of evidence and conclusions, students ultimately will be prepared to produce more creative solutions to the issues and problems of our times.

4.   Conduct deep research on a theme of interest;
Scholarship, vocation

Of course, conducting deep research on a theme of interest in ENG 200 will introduce students early to the challenges and pleasures of scholarly work. As students learn how to construct a research question, seek knowledge as offered by different disciplines, apply that knowledge to their question, and consider possible answers to their question, they will develop crucial abilities that they will use in all of their future scholarship. In the course of their research process, they will learn that effective research strategies make it possible for us to inquire into any question of our choosing. Thus, students will be encouraged to think about the place of deep research in their developing vocation.

5.   Write researched arguments using multiple sources;
Scholarship

All scholarship demands the use of multiple sources. Thus, this outcome develops a fundamental ability required for all future scholarship. Moreover, when students learn how to use multiple sources, they are also learning how to discover relevant sources, how to understand their claims and evidence, and how to structure their own arguments and cases in light of those sources. All of these abilities that are involved in the use of multiple sources are crucial for scholarship.

6.   Write to inform and persuade;
Scholarship, diversity, community

Scholarship always involves the purposes of informing and persuading. Scholars inform whenever they invite the audience of their work into a particular view of the world, and they persuade whenever they call upon their audience to accept their conclusions about that world. By learning to write to inform and persuade, students will be prepared to produce scholarship that can effectively convince scholarly audiences. Also, because writing with purpose should involve audience analysis, students will also become more sensitive to the importance of being sensitive to diversity within and among audiences and to speaking to community through scholarship in ways that make significant meaning.

7.   Write well-crafted essays, crafting structure, style, and grammar as appropriate to the purpose and audience of the text;
Scholarship, community

To succeed in producing scholarship and, especially, scholarship that addresses a community in meaningful ways, students must learn how to write well-crafted essays that take into account the rhetorical context for their scholarship. This ability is crucial for enabling students' scholarly work to be heard and engaged by a broad range of scholarly and other communities.

8.   Become rhetorically aware of discourse conventions, including multiple citation styles;
Scholarship

For student research and scholarship to become public, it must respond effectively to the discourse conventions of scholarly communities. As students become rhetorically aware of varying discourse conventions (including multiple citation styles), they acquire a fundamental ability that will make it possible for them to meet those varying expectations.

9.   Explore the Humanities Base question, "What does it mean to be human?" using the Humanities Base text as chosen by the department.
Diversity, vocation

In ENG 200-H sections (offered to first-year students who place in ENG 200), students will study the Humanities Base text. Thinking and writing about the relationship between literacy and the human condition encourages students to develop sensitivity to the ways in which even very different kinds of people share fundamental faculties as human beings. Additionally, exploring the centrality of writing and literacy for human existence enables students to consider the role of writing in their own lives and the ways that they make meaning of their world.

Arts Working Group

The charge to the Arts Working Group was to establish criteria for an Arts component that incorporate the appropriate student learning outcomes and disciplinary objectives and to

propose a small number of courses in each area of the Arts that would be geared toward first and second year students.

The Arts Working Group does not believe it is feasible or desirable to propose a small number of arts courses for the CAP. It suggests that given the diversity in both form and content of the arts, it is unrealistic to identify narrow common themes within the arts area. The Arts component might include courses from the Departments of Music, Visual Arts, English and the Theater Program. It would include studio and performance courses as well as historical studies courses. It would be possible to satisfy the three course requirement with one three credit course or a combination of one and two credit courses.

The working group proposes the following as the common element across any Arts course in the CAP.

> Students in all CAP arts courses will recognize the arts as significant manifestations of diverse cultural, intellectual, aesthetic, and personal experiences and as evidence of engagement and interaction in community. In the context of articulating both conceptual and contextual understanding of the arts, students will apply critical thinking skills to the examination of the work of past and present artists, of their own work, and of the interpretations that scholars have brought to bear upon the arts. Finally, for both those students who satisfy the arts component of the proposed CAP with the production of art and those who study the history and creation of art by others will demonstrate dedication and self-discipline through the practice of creative production and/or scholarly research and writing.

In addition, the Arts Working Group identifies four common outcomes for all Arts courses:

> Students will develop skills and acquire experiences that enable them to understand, reflect upon, and value the creative process within the context of the arts.

> Students will engage in critical analysis and articulate informed aesthetic and conceptual judgments related to the arts.

> Students will develop the ability to identify basic concepts, theories, and developments in the arts.

> Students will be able to ask questions and seek answers appropriate to modes of inquiry that are relevant to the arts.

The Working Group identifies numerous courses that might be suitable as CAP Arts courses and shows the relationship of possible courses to the HIR student learning outcomes.

Social Science Working Group

The charge to the Social Science Working Group was to establish criteria for a CAP Social Science component that incorporated the appropriate student learning outcomes and disciplinary objectives and to determine whether this component should be a single course offered by faculty from all the social science disciplines or whether it would be more appropriate to offer a single course in each of the social science disciplines that would share a significant common element across all sections of the course.   This course would be geared toward first and second year students.

The Working Group proposed that the CAP social science component address the following criteria (and the related HIR student learning outcome.   Students should be able to:

1. Critically examine a human issue or problem from at least three social science disciplinary perspectives. [Scholarship and Critical evaluation of our times]

2. Describe social science methods and social theory as applied by the social sciences to the humanly constructed world, distinguishing between the inductive and deductive approaches to addressing social science research questions. [Scholarship]

3. Find and identify arguments in empirical research literature and/or data in the social sciences. [Scholarship]

4. Describe an aspect of human diversity with regard to the selected issue or problem by incorporating concepts addressing difference and positionality to understand the complexity and contradictions of selected issues or problems. [Diversity]

5. Engage in and reflect upon one experience outside the classroom that exposes students to an aspect of human diversity. [Diversity]

6. Explore how the social sciences lay an intellectual foundation for understanding community life, through critical readings and reflection on the selected issue or problem. [Community]

7. Critically evaluate through a writing assignment or other intellectual product the selected issue or problem based on social science literature. [Scholarship and Critical evaluation of our times]

8. Analyze and demonstrate factors that contribute to and create barriers for human flourishing with regard to the selected issue or problem. [Scholarship, Community, Practical wisdom, Critical evaluation of our times]

The Working Group considered a number of options and is still considering the adoption of one of two models. The first model is of a single thematic social science course that would be offered by faculty across five disciplines (anthropology, economics, political science, psychology and sociology) and would be taken by all students. There would be common learning objectives and experiences across all sections but individual faculty would have the opportunity to select the particular theme. Each section of the course would present materials or readings from at least three of the social science disciplines. The second model involves the reconfiguration of the current introductory courses to each of the social science disciplines. The introductory courses to each of the five disciplines would be revised to contain some common elements which might be coverage of a common topic or theme, common speakers or extracurricular activities. The Working Group suggests that the common element across the courses might be about 25 percent of the course.

Oral Communication Working Group

The Oral Communication Working Group (OCWG) was charged with proposing a three credit hour introductory course for all students and with proposing a means of helping departments enhance the oral communication of their majors. The foundational course would replace the current three one-hour modules with a class that is designed specifically to support and advance *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection* (*HIR*) and its learning outcomes.

The Working Group consulted widely across campus to determine the needs of various units for their students. Based on this input as well as a careful reading of HIR, the working group proposes that the new course be grounded in concepts of dialogue and debate, with the goals of engaging in constructive mutual dialogue in conversations and meetings; developing the ability to publicly articulate, analyze, and defend a position in a public forum; understanding the differences between dialogue and debate; and understanding relative advantages and disadvantages of each mode of communication. As essential parts of engaging in both of these

forms of communication, students will focus on issues both of critical analysis of argument and of explaining complex ideas to non-experts, as well as some fundamental aspects of public communication, such as effective use of presentational aids and managing speech anxiety.

While the group believes that the course might contribute to all seven HIR student learning outcomes, it suggests that community, diversity and critical evaluation of our times would be more fully developed by this course. The ability to engage in conversation that advances understanding and the skills of dialogue and sensitivity to the audience are important skills related to diversity and community in any conversation. The final debate and dialogue project that will be required in the class will be an exercise in critical evaluation of our times.

Natural Science Working Group

The charge to the Natural Science Working Group included the following:

> a) Establishing criteria for the natural science component that incorporate the appropriate student learning outcomes and disciplinary objectives;
>
> b) Developing a minimum of two courses in the Natural Sciences that meet these criteria to serve as the natural science course requirement within the CAP. The particular courses will vary based on the students' major and will be taken in the semesters appropriate for that major.

Consistent with its charge, the Natural Science Working Group proposes different types of courses for students in different academic units. The group examined its current role and offerings in the General Education program as it related to students in the College Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Fine Arts programs, the School of Education and Allied Profession, the School of Business Administration, and STEM majors. It reviewed the strengths and weaknesses of the current science offerings. The proposal specified a number of criteria for the science component with a brief rationale for each criterion.

1. The science component of the Common Academic Program will actively engage students in "reading the science of the times" by challenging them to explore the scientific dimensions of complex, controversial or unresolved problems facing human society.

2. Science CAP will support a robust and substantive foundation for scientific inquiry by developing an enriched understanding and respect for the integrity of the distinct scientific disciplines while building a foundation of scientific knowledge to be applied to

interdisciplinary problems. Students will be challenged to understand both the commonality and the diversity of the scientific disciplines by emphasizing the ways that those disciplines approach problem-solving.

3.   The Common Academic Program in the Sciences will cultivate scholarly development and practical wisdom by challenging students to achieve an enriched understanding of the scientific method through applying it to real issues of broad public interest. In doing so, the Common Academic Program in the Sciences will emphasize the broad, unifying themes of *Practical Wisdom* and *Critical Evaluation of the Times*.

4.   The science component of the Common Academic Program will ensure that all students will engage in experiential, team-based learning through laboratory experience at some point in their passage through the science curriculum.   Through hands-on laboratory experience, students will develop practical wisdom in applying scientific reasoning and experimentation while simultaneously developing an appreciative understanding of the scientific conception of community through working together in teams. To assure exposure to scientific laboratory experience, we strongly recommend that CAP expand the current General Education requirement in the sciences to seven hours in order to include at least 1 semester hour of laboratory experience. We suggest that the requirement be stated as follows: "Students must take two lecture courses in the physical or life sciences or computer science, at least one of which should be accompanied by a corresponding laboratory section." Finally, to assure full integration of the learning experience in science, we strongly recommend that inquiry-based learning in laboratory courses be co-requisite or integrated with corresponding lecture sections. Exceptions to this recommendation should be approved only with compelling pedagogical or logistical justification.

5.   In order to enrich student understanding of the diverse disciplinary perspectives and dynamic interplay of the sciences, the Common Academic Program should assure that each student is exposed to at least two of the five disciplines: Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geology, and Physics. Additionally, it is assumed that all students will gain basic exposure to Mathematics through the Mathematics component of the Common Academic Program.

6.   The science component of the CAP will support the development of quantitative skills by exposing students to the application of quantitative methods to solve scientific problems.

7.   The Common Academic Program in the sciences will demonstrate both the power and the limitations of science by revealing the diverse aspects of public issues that either can or cannot be resolved through application of quantitative or scientific methodologies. In doing so, we aspire to free students both of unfounded fear and unquestioning awe of science.

8.   To support an integrative view of the sciences, we welcome (but do not require) interdisciplinary faculty collaboration in delivering CAP-Science courses in two different ways: modular teaching or team-teaching. In either case, new administrative mechanisms need to be put in place to accommodate this kind of collaboration.

The Working Group proposes that the science component of the CAP would focus on different HIR outcomes address based on the student audience. Science courses for non-STEM majors, regardless of the target audience (B.A., Education, Business or other professional programs) will focus primarily on Scholarship, Community, Practical Wisdom, and Critical Evaluation of our Times. Due to the nature of the Science courses for STEM majors, the Scholarship, Practical Wisdom and Critical Evaluation of the Times still pertain. However, due to the particular importance for these students to develop an understanding of community and vocation within the context of their own majors, CAP science courses for STEM majors will also contribute to these HIR outcomes.

The Working Group also recommended the inclusion of Computer Science in the CAP in a way that does not detract from the exposure of students to the Natural Sciences. It supported this recommendation by noting its importance in contemporary society and the inclusion of Information Literacy as one of the General Competencies. The Group questioned the grouping of Computer Science with the Natural Sciences in that it is a fundamentally distinct discipline.

Mathematics Working Group

The Mathematics Working Group was charged to identify or design a single three-credit MTH course that will serve as the CAP requirement for mathematics and which will meet the QRC requirements. The particular course will vary based on the students' major and background in mathematics and would normally be taken in the first or second year of study (or in the semester appropriate for their major).

The Working Group surveyed departments and programs across campus and determined that current mathematics offering were addressing units' needs. The Working Group recommends that the current offerings be maintained in the CAP. The mathematics courses are most closely related to the HIR outcomes related to scholarship, practical wisdom and critical evaluation of our times.

Crossing Boundaries Working Group

This is one of the two working group that was given until March to complete its report because of the complexity of the tasks. This group was asked to develop criteria for four components of the CAP. These components challenge students and faculty to link aspects of their own lives, majors, and careers to a broader world within and outside academia. These components are not closely connected to any current University requirements. The charge to the group included the following items:

Develop criteria for a set of proposed CAP courses relating to diverse religious traditions, practical ethical action, and Inquiry and Integrative courses that will challenge students and faculty to link aspects of their own lives, majors, and careers to a broader world within and outside academia. These courses should strengthen the Catholic intellectual tradition in significant ways. This tradition in Catholic and Marianist higher education emphasizes the centrality of theology and philosophy, the importance of linking faith and reason, the integration of knowledge, and the application of that knowledge to personal and social situations in the world today. The student learning outcomes related to faith traditions, diversity, practical wisdom, critical evaluation of our times, and vocation are particularly important for this set of courses.

Develop criteria for a second course on religious traditions designed to offer a comparative approach that allows students to reflect on and place their own religious belief and experience in a broader historical or cultural context;

Develop criteria for a practical ethical action course designed to bridge the theoretical and the practical and the liberal arts and the applied fields. Such a course should offer an opportunity for faculty to cross the boundaries of their own disciplines to dialogue with faculty from other disciplines in ways that enrich their own understanding of important ethical issues and that enrich the courses they offer to students;

Develop criteria for an Inquiry course that requires students to select a course outside their own division to better understand the ways of knowing found in other academic specialties. Students in the professional schools may benefit from a range of courses in the College that expand their horizons and inform their views of the social world or their own professions. Students in the humanities, arts, social and natural sciences may benefit from courses in the professional schools or outside their own units in the College. While the possibilities are numerous, some suggestions offered from the professional schools in their feedback include courses related to physical health and wellbeing from the School of Education and Allied Professions, systems design from the School of Engineering, and financial and economic literacy from the School of Business Administration.

Develop criteria for an Integrative course that requires faculty to develop, and students to select, courses that transcend disciplinary boundaries and explicitly examine significant social issues or problems in a multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary framework. Faculty from

numerous departments could develop new courses or redesign existing courses to explicitly incorporate a broader multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary perspective. Courses that provide for collaborative or team-teaching, that link foreign language study with culture or history, that incorporate study abroad, immersion or service-learning experiences are all possible ways to facilitate integration.

The report from the Crossing Boundaries Working Group suggests that the practical ethical action course is most closely relate to the HIR outcomes related to practical wisdom and critical evaluation of our times. The group suggests the following as partial and provisional criteria for this course:

a. Engage students in thick description and analysis of ethical issues via concepts central to the study of ethics (such as "justice," "rights," "natural law," "conscience," "forgiveness," etc.) by instructors who are adequately trained to guide ethical argumentation. (When necessary, this can be accomplished creatively by means of the Jigsaw model or via team teaching, etc.) The "thickness" of discussion will arise from both relevant special interdisciplinary knowledge as well as awareness of the professions, economic institutions and practices, political institutions and practices, or cultural institutions and practices.

b. Provide sufficient normative content from which reflection on value judgments and ethical reasoning can begin and in light of which students can be directed in how to apply them. Said differently, this course aims to extend student learning to those steps that follow the making of moral decisions. For example, students in education need to move from thinking about advocacy of children to learning how to be advocates for children to actually practicing advocacy.

A number of existing courses that might satisfy these criteria are provided in the full report.

The working group suggests that courses dealing with diverse faith traditions would most closely relate to the HIR outcomes related to faith traditions and diversity. The group has also developed partial and provisional criteria for the course:

a. Any course which either (a) places religious traditions within their historical context; or (b) examines their philosophical foundations or the internal logic of religious thought, language, and practice; or (c) compares religious traditions by examining their philosophical foundations, historical origins, artistic expressions, canonical texts, and/or storied practices; or (d) examines at least one religious tradition with which students are unfamiliar (e.g., World Catholicism, Christian Ecumenism, or a non-Christian tradition) by examining its philosophical foundations, historical origins, artistic expressions, canonical texts and/or storied practices.

b. Course must resonate with the content of REL 103. For example, REL 103 might serve as the basis for comparison and contrast.

c. 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.

A number of existing courses that might satisfy these criteria are provided in the full report.

The Crossing Boundaries Working Group has had considerable discussion regarding the Inquiry and Integrative courses. Defining the nature of the Inquiry course (which would require students to take a course outside of their own division) and the Integrative course (which would require faculty to develop integrative, interdisciplinary courses) and establishing criteria for the courses have proven to be more challenging. Discussion has focused on several issues including the value of such courses for the students, logistical concerns relating to the ability of the professional schools ability to offer courses for non-majors; the time commitment to develop and implement collaborative or team-taught courses; administrative and financial support for the development and offering of such courses. The working group report also indicates that a concern was raised by the professional schools about increasing the number of hours in the CAP above what is currently required in the General Education Program.

Based on the issues presented above, the Crossing Boundaries Working Group proposes combining the Inquiry and Integrative courses into a single course or experience. All such courses would relate to the HIR Scholarship outcome, and depending on the particular nature of the courses or programs developed, other outcomes would likely be addressed.   The criterion proposed for this course or experience is:

Students will pursue a problem-based, interdisciplinary study in a field outside of their majors.

The working group provides numerous examples of existing or possible courses, programs or experiences that might satisfy this requirement.   It might be a team-taught course on student research projects; a course that pursues inquiry into the nature of a discipline outside a student's division by pursuing (a) a project or (b) smaller tasks which applies the methodologies of that discipline; a course that links either participation in an international experience or service learning with an inquiry into the nature of a discipline outside a given student's division by

pursuing a project which applies the methodologies of that discipline; an experience of participating in an international experience, either education abroad or an immersion or service learning experience, that links foreign language study with an immersion into the culture and history of the same region; a course that looks at themes or problems in your own discipline from another disciplinary perspective; fulfillment of an interdisciplinary major or minor; participation in a disciplinary course with an associated Mini-Seminar from the perspective of another discipline; participation in a Jig-Saw style course which focuses on student research projects. A "Jig-Saw" is two or more classes scheduled at a common time which share a common theme or problem which they approach from different disciplinary perspectives. Periodically the courses meet together to hear a common speaker, to have students present work, or engage in another activity.

The Crossing Boundaries Working Group identified a number of concerns about the approach, time frame and resources necessary to successfully implement the CAP.

Major Capstone Working Group

The charge to the Major Capstone Working Group included the following:

Develop general criteria (a template) for required senior capstone courses or experiences in all majors that:

Reflect 'best practices' for capstones courses at other universities;
Reflect departmental and unit consultation by the members of the Working Group;
Consider and transcends the logistical challenges to the requirement faced by larger departments and programs;
Recognize that the nature of the Capstone will vary across majors, that it might involve such things as a research project, creative endeavor, thesis, internship or practicum, and that it can take the form of an individual or group project.
Provide an opportunity for students to engage, integrate, practice and demonstrate the knowledge and skills they have developed in their major courses and CAP curriculum;
Provide an experience for students to engage in scholarship in their major field, integrate what they have learned, further their understanding of their vocation or profession, and publically present their work.

The Working Group distributed a survey to all department chairs, program directors and academic coordinators relating to capstones. The survey identified the units which already had courses or experiences that might be considered capstones. For units that did not have such a

course or experience, the survey inquired about the reasons that there was not a capstone. The survey revealed that 60 majors already had a capstone experience in place. The nature of the capstone experience varied considerably across disciplines. Eleven departments in the College and one program in the professional schools did not have a capstone in place. Most of the capstone courses or experiences appear to address the HIR scholarship outcome and a number of other outcomes which vary considerably across units.

The Working Group proposed the following set of criteria for capstone courses or experiences:

1. A major capstone course/experience will provide students the opportunity to engage, integrate, practice, and demonstrate the knowledge and skills they have developed in their major courses and which reflect learning outcomes associated with the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection.

2. Course/experience provides students the opportunity to engage in the scholarship, activity and/or practice of their major field.

3. Course/experience furthers the students' understanding of their chosen vocation, career or profession.

4. Course/experience requires students to present their work in a forum appropriate to their major.

Summary Mapping of CAP Components and HIR Outcomes

Each of the Working Groups was asked to identify the HIR outcomes that would be addressed by the component(s) it proposed. Given the early stage in the development of each of the components, groups could only identify possible or likely outcomes for the components. A number of groups noted that their component might address a number of outcomes but in varying degrees and depths. With those caveats in mind, the following table offers a very broad view of where the CAP would address the HIR outcomes.

	Scholarship	Faith Traditions	Diversity	Community	Practical Wisdom	Critical Evaluation	Vocation
Religion[1]	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Philosophy[1]	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
History[1]	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Eng 100	x		x	x	x	x	x
Eng 200	x		x	x	x	x	x
Arts[2]	x	x	x	x		x	x
Soc Science	x		x	x	x	x	
Nat Science	x			x	x	x	
Nat Science	x			x	x	x	
Oral Comm			x	x		x	
Mathematics	x				x	x	
Faith traditions		x	x				
Practical ethics					x	x	
Inquiry	x						
Integrative	x						
Capstone[3]	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

1. REL, PHL, and HST mappings refer to existing HB courses.
2. Some Arts courses (Pre-modern art and music history courses) cover the faith traditions outcome well; most other Art courses do not address this outcome.
3. Depending on their nature, capstone experiences can meet one or more of the HIR learning outcomes and can vary across majors and even between students in the same major."

Comparison of Current GE Courses with CAP Work Plan Proposal

This table summarizes the framework for the two programs.   Courses which appear on the same line are not the identical courses in the two programs as the purpose, goal, content and learning outcomes of the courses may be different.

Current GE	Work Plan CAP Proposal
REL 103 (3 hrs)	REL 1xx (3 hrs)
PHL 103 (3 hrs)	PHL 1xx (3 hrs)
HST 103 (3 hrs)	HST 1xx (3 hrs)
ENG 101/114/198 (3 hrs)	ENG 100 (3 hrs)
ENG 102 (3 hrs)	ENG 200 (3 hrs)
REL/PHL (3 hrs)	Faith Traditions (3 hrs)
REL/PHL (3 hrs)	Practical ethical action (3 hrs)
Social Science (3 hrs)	Inquiry course/experience[1]
Arts Study (3 hrs)	Integrative course/experience[1]
History (3 hrs)	Social Science (3 hrs)
Natural Science (3 hrs)	Arts (3 hrs)
Natural Science (3 hrs)	Natural Science (3 – 4 hrs)[2]
Oral Communication (3 hrs)	Natural Science (3 hrs)
Mathematics (3 hrs)	Oral Communication (3 hrs)
	Mathematics (3 hrs)
	Major capstone course/experience[3]

1. The Work Plan proposed an Inquiry course and an Integrative course. The Crossing Boundaries Working Group recommends combining two courses, the Inquiry and Integrative courses, into a single requirement. The group recommends that there be no established credit hour requirement for this component.

2. The Work Plan proposed a six hour Natural Science requirement. The Natural Science Working Group proposes adding one hour to the proposed 6 hour requirement so that all students in the University would take at least one laboratory course. The group also recommended the inclusion of a Computer Science course in the CAP.

3. Many departments offer a capstone course or experience as part of their existing curriculum. Other departments may be able to develop a capstone course or experience within the framework of their existing curriculum without adding hours to their program. The Major Capstone Working Group recommends that majors may determine the credit hours assigned to their capstone course or experience.

V. Administrative Structure

The proposed committee structure for the administration of the Common Academic Program is similar to the current structure for the General Education Program. Each school and College would establish its own Common Academic Program Committee. A University Committee on the Common Academic Program and Competencies would be established to replace the current University General Education and Competencies Committee. Primary responsibility for administration of the Common Academic Program would be shifted from the College of Arts and Sciences to the Office of the Provost. An Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Plan would be created to facilitate, implement, and assess the Common Academic Program. The Assistant Provost would work closely with the Associate Dean for Integrated Learning and Curriculum of the College of Arts and Sciences in these efforts to assure the integrity and quality of the Common Academic Program.

School/College Common Academic Program Committees

The College and the Schools will each establish committees or specify a committee to assume responsibilities for the Common Academic Program. The size, composition, and selection procedure of each of these committees will be determined by, and based on, the needs of each of these academic divisions. The responsibilities of these Committees shall be the following:

1. Propose and/or review proposals for courses or experiences in the CAP originating from that College of School. Courses or experiences that involve faculty or staff from more than one unit would be proposed and reviewed by the authorized committees in all applicable units. If the Committee judges that a proposal meets the purposes of the CAP and that it would be an appropriate for students in that division, the Committee will submit the preliminary proposal to the University Committee on Common Academic Program and Competencies. If it does not reach this judgment, the Committee will return the proposal to the appropriate faculty group with an explanation of its decision.

2. Periodically review approved courses and experiences relative to their appropriateness for students in that academic division.

3. Recommend policies and procedures relative to the CAP.

4. Through communication with faculty and students in that academic division, facilitate an understanding of, and appreciation for, the Common Academic Program.

University Structure for the Common Academic Program and Competencies

The Committee on the Common Academic Program and Competencies will be a standing subcommittee of the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate. In consultation with the provost and deans, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will appoint the members of the Committee on the Common Academic Program and Competencies. Membership on the Committee must be a representative cross-section of the various components of the University: The College of Arts and Sciences and the professional Schools as well as faculty, students, and administrators.

The Committee will be composed of a minimum of eight (8) members plus three *ex officio* members. The ex officio members are the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program, an Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; and the Registrar or designate. Membership shall be designated as follows:

1. Three faculty members: one each from the three professional schools of Business Administration, Education and Allied Professions, and Engineering.

2. Three faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences with one each from the humanities, the social sciences, and the sciences.

3. Two student members from the Academic Policies Committee, or from the Common Academic Program Committees of the Schools or College, or from the Academic Senate.

4. At least three of the eight members must come from the Academic Senate, preferably from the Academic Policies Committee. At least one member must come from the Academic Policies Committee.

5. Each undergraduate dean has the option to serve or to appoint a designate as an *ex officio* member.

All the members with the exception of the students shall have a three-year term of office. Student members shall have a one-year term of office, but may be reappointed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

The responsibilities of the University Committee on the Common Academic Program and Competencies shall be as follows:

1.   Review courses and experiences that form the components of the Common Academic Program

2.   If the Committee judges that a proposal meets the purposes of the Common Academic Plan and that the proposal appears feasible in terms of staffing and other resources, it shall approve the proposal and notify the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program, the proposer, the appropriate departments and College or School CAP Committee. If the Committee does not judge that the proposal meets the purposes of the Common Academic Program, the Committee shall notify each of these parties of its judgment with an explanation of its decision.

3.   Facilitate communication and collaboration among faculty proposing courses and experiences.

4.   Instruct the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program to identify and promulgate, at least once a year, courses offered by the various units of the University that will meet the Common Academic Program.

5.   Keep a file of documents for approved courses in the CAP under the auspices of the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program.

6.   With the assistance of the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program, monitor and evaluate courses and experiences in the CAP to insure that the CAP requirements can be satisfied by students in a timely and systematic fashion.

7. Consider course proposals that would satisfy more than one component of the Common Academic Plan or would be less than the normal three credit offering for specific programs as long as the goals of General Education would be served adequately.

8. With the assistance of the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program and the Associate Dean, conduct evaluations of the Common Academic Program and make recommendations to the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate for strengthening the Common Academic Program. A thorough and systematic evaluation of the Program must be

conducted every five years to assess the extent to which students are achieving the specified goals.

The Committee shall select its chairperson at the first organizational meeting each year. The Committee shall develop its own procedures for performing its duties and such procedures shall be submitted to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for its approval.

The CAP Leadership Team

The CAP Leadership Team will serve as advocates for the CAP Program during its implementation on campus and as an advisory body to the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program. Team members will be selected by the Academic Policy Committee in consultation with the academic deans to serve a two academic year term. The team will be comprised of one faculty representative each from humanities, arts, mathematics and the natural sciences, social sciences, and the professional schools (Business Administration, Education, and Engineering).

The Team members will work as a group to

4. Promote faculty understanding and participation in the Common Academic Program across the university,
5. Serve as CAP liaisons within their individual units;
6. Develop criteria for CAP Innovation Awards
7. Establish two deadlines and review periods and distribute a Request for Proposals for CAP Innovation Awards.
8. Review and award grants to proposals that will significantly advance the development, implementation and continued vitality of the CAP.

Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program

An Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program will be appointed by the Provost after consultation with the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate. The Assistant Provost will be responsible for the administration of all aspects of the implementation

of all approved elements of the Common Academic Program. The Assistant Provost will be responsible for assuring that the Common Academic Program policy is implemented by the Committee on the Common Academic Program and Competencies and will work with the Associate Dean and for facilitating University-wide conversations concerning the integral role of the Common Academic Program to the University's mission. Among other responsibilities, the Assistant Provost will:

1. Lead planning efforts for the initial implementation of the CAP including faculty professional development activities related to CAP.

2. Develop and implement a plan to communicate details about the CAP and its implementation to the entire University community, including faculty, advisors and students and facilitate an ongoing discussion among administrators, faculty, and students concerning the role of general education in the mission and vision of the University.

3. Promote faculty interest in and development of CAP course proposals and serve as a resource for faculty with questions about proposal development.

4. Work with the College and professional schools to coordinate CAP logistical issues.

5. Work with the College Associate Dean and professional schools to implement procedures for effective assessment, review, and evaluation of the Common Academic Program by assuring that assessment and reviews are conducted in a manner consistent with established University policy.

6. Work with the Associate Dean to identify and pursue possible outside funding sources for the Common Academic Program.

Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

Because of the significant role of the College of Arts and Sciences in the Common Academic Program, an Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences will play an important role in the implementation and administration of the Program. Among other roles, the Associate Dean will:

1. Promote faculty interest in and development of CAP course proposals and serve as a resource for faculty with questions about proposal development.

2.   Work with the Assistant Provost to address logistical issues related to CAP and to implement procedures for effective assessment, review, and evaluation of the Common Academic Program. The Associate Dean will assist in implementing assessment and for reporting the results of that assessment to the various constituencies including the Committee on the Common Academic Plan and Competencies and the University Assessment Committee.

3.   Work with the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program to identify and pursue possible outside funding sources for the Common Academic Program.

VII. Bibliography

Barr, Robert B. and John Tagg. "From Teaching to Learning: A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education. " Change 27 (Nov-Dec 1995): 12-25.

Hart Research Associates. Trends and Emerging Practices in General Education. Washington, D.C.: Hart Research Associates, 2009.

Kuh, George. High Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter. Washington, D.C: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2008.

Appendix A   Charge from the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate to the Coordinating and Writing Task Force, April 2009

CAP2: Moving the Process Forward

Recognizing the need to build on the momentum created by the CAP Draft Report, submitted to the APC last August, and the constructive suggestions of all those who submitted and reviewed it, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate notes the following:
1. That significant work in this process has been completed by both the CAP subcommittee and the university community as a whole;
2. That the feedback on the CAP report indicates a general acceptance of the seven student learning outcomes contained in the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection and in the approved University assessment plan;
3. That the feedback also indicated a general acceptance of many of the themes highlighted in the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection document and the CAP proposal, including integrated learning, diversity and international/intercultural education;
4. That there is a need to provide the University community with a more extensive summary of both the feedback to the CAP proposal, and to then construct a path for future development of the proposal and a clear process for completing the task of general education reform;
5. That there needs to be greater involvement of the University community in the development process. The CAP feedback indicates that there are existing groups ready to move forward with the process of developing concise and concrete proposals for revitalizing and revising contributions to general education to deliver an academic program common to all students that meets the University assessment outcomes and builds upon the philosophical foundations of the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection;
6. That a process needs to be developed over the summer that will organize the efforts of existing groups, identify other areas in need of exploration and development, and include deadlines.

In sum, a substantially revised draft of the CAP proposal is called for that a) establishes a common academic program based on the seven student learning outcomes in Habits of Inquiry and the approved University assessment plan; b) weighs the constructive proposals and concerns presented in the extensive feedback provided last fall by individuals, departments and units; c) incorporates appropriate concrete proposals from affected units for revitalizing and revising contributions to general education that meet the University's assessment outcomes for student learning; and d) results in a formal proposal, including implementation plan, that can be discussed by the Academic Senate and the university community beginning at the Senate meeting of March 26, 2010.

To accomplish this task, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate has appointed and charged a three-person coordinating and writing task force. The task force will be chaired by Dr. Pat Donnelly and include Drs. Danielle Poe and Margaret Pinnell. The task force is charged to do the following:

1. Familiarize itself with the original Habits of Inquiry and Reflection document (which references assessment material); assessment material pertaining to the current general education system housed in the CAS Dean's office; the CAP report; the responses to the CAP report submitted by individuals, departments and units; and curricular developments and discussions already underway that have an impact on a revised CAP (Summer 2009);

2. Solicit any additional needed commentary from the University community on the strengths and weaknesses of the CAP proposal and create a more extensive and detailed summary of the responses to the CAP proposal to be shared with the Academic Senate and University community at the September 25, 2009 Senate meeting (Summer 2009);

3. Using the assessment of feedback from the CAP proposal, the other sources in 1), and the seven student learning outcomes, create a list of tasks to be completed by groups in the broader academic community and develop a statement of work to be completed by each group, including specific charges and a timetable. This list should be shared with the Senate early in the Fall 2009 semester (Summer-early Fall 2009);

4. Work with these groups as they generate their proposals, coordinating efforts among them (Fall 2009);

5. Provide monthly updates on progress to the Academic Policies Committee, the Executive Committee, and the Senate as a whole.

6. Use its assessment of the materials listed in the first bullet point and the proposals created as a result of its charges to produce a plan for revising the current general education system that:
   o creates a common academic program that promotes more intentionally the distinctive student learning outcomes of the University assessment plan, and;
   o includes a list of required resources and proposes an implementation plan (including pilot programs).

This document must be submitted to ECAS by March 10, 2010 to be placed on the agenda for the March Senate meeting.

Appendix B. Membership of Task Force and Working Groups

<u>Coordinating and Writing Task Force</u>

Patrick Donnelly (SOC)[*]
Margaret Pinnell (MEE)
Danielle Poe (PHL)

<u>Arts Working Group</u>

Sharon Gratto (chair, MUS)   James Farrelly (ENG)
Judith Huacuja (VAR)   Eric Street (MUS)
Joel Whitaker (chair, VAR)   Sean Wilkinson (Graul Chair in Arts & Languages, VAR)*

<u>Crossing Boundaries Working Group</u>

Paul Becker (SOC)   Connie Bowman (Teacher Ed.)
Mary Carlson (HST)[*]   Andria Chiodo (LNG)
Jim Globig (ET)   Dan Goldman (GEO)
Brad Kallenberg (REL)   Dan Fouke (PHL)
Jayne Whitaker (VAR)   Janet Greenlee (SBA)

<u>English 200 Working Group</u>

Brian Bardine (ENG)
Sheila Hassel-Hughes (chair, Department of English)*
Susan Trollinger (ENG)

<u>First Year Humanities Working Group</u>

Julius Amin (chair, HST)   Maura Donahue (director, Program/ Christian Leadership)
Myrna Gabbe (PHL)   Sheila Hughes (chair, ENG)
Bill Richards/John Inglis (chair, PHL)[1] Patricia Johnson (Alumni Chair in the Humanities, PHL)
Caroline Merithew (HST)   Laura Hume (HST)
Don Pair (Associate Dean for Integrated Learning and Curriculum)*
Lori Phillips-Young (Writing Program Coordinator)
Anthony Smith (REL)   Susan Trollinger (ENG)
Cari Wallace (Director of New Student Programs)
Sandra Yocum (chair, REL)   Bryan Bardine (ENG)

---

[*] Denotes chairperson(s).
[1] Dr. Inglis was on sabbatical in Fall 2009. During this time, William Richards served as interim department chair and member of this working group.

Major Capstone Working Group

Janet Bednarek (HST)   John Clarke (VCD)
Heidi Gauder (Library)   Elizabeth Gustafson (ECO)
Carissa Krane (BIO)   Art Jipson (director, CJS Program)
George DeMarco (HSS)   Phil Doepker (MEE)
Steve Wilhoit (ENG, LTC)*   David Wright (BIO, LTC)*

Mathematics Working Group

Joe Mashburn (chair, MTH)*   Art Busch (MTH)
Becky Krakowski (MTH)

Natural Science Working Group

Rex Berney (chair, PHY)   Dale Courte (chair, CPS)
Said Elhamri (PHY)   Carl Friese (BIO)
Aparna Higgins (MTH)   Mark Masthay (chair, CHM)
Allen McGrew (chair, GEO)*   Jayne Robinson (chair, BIO)
Mike Sandy (GEO)   Jennifer Seitzer (CPS)
Shawn Swavey (CHM)

Oral Communication Working Group

Lou Cusella (CMM)   Jon Hess (chair, CMM)*
Heather Parsons (CMM)   Sam Wallace (CMM)
Kathy Watters (CMM)

Social Science Working Group

David Biers (chair, PSY)   Kristen Cheney (ANT)
Ralph Frasca (ECO)   Nancy Martorano Miller (POL)
Fran Pestello (chair, SOC)*   Jason Pierce (chair, POL)
John Rapp (interim chair, ECO) Carolyn Roecker Phelps (PSY)

* Denotes chairperson(s).