

University of Dayton

eCommons

Common Academic Program Committee
Minutes

Academic Senate Committees

2014

2014-10-20 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes

University of Dayton. Common Academic Program Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Common Academic Program Committee, "2014-10-20 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes" (2014). *Common Academic Program Committee Minutes*. 47.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins/47

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

Minutes of the Common Academic Program Committee (CAPC)

Date: October 20, 2014

Location: KU 310

Present:

Juan Santamarina (Chair)

Sawyer Hunley

Lee Dixon

John White

Jim Dunne

Fred Jenkins (ex-officio)

Joan Plungis

Riad Alakkad (ex-officio)

Jennifer Creech

Joe Mashburn

Kathryn Kinnucan-Welsch (ex-officio)

Terence Lau (ex-officio)

Don Pair

Absent:

Elias Toubia

Guests:

John Erdei, PHY; Messay Kebede, PHL; John Inglis, PHL; Danielle Poe, PHL

A. Old Business

1. Regarding the CMM 100 course previously reviewed - the proposers requested that one of the four stated SLOs, Community, be removed. The remaining SLOs are Scholarship, Diversity, and Critical Evaluation of Our Times.
 - a. This change has been made in CIM.
2. Minutes of previous meetings will be sent to the Committee members in advance of the next meeting. Members are asked to be prepared to review the minutes on Oct. 27.

B. Review of PHY 206: General Physics I - Mechanics

1. Proposal details:
 - a. Dr. John Erdei represented the proposal author, Leno Pedrotti, who was unable to attend.
 - b. This is a revised course for Natural Sciences.
 - c. The course is designed to achieve the following UD SLOs: Scholarship, Practical Wisdom, and Critical Evaluation of Our Times.
2. Discussion/comments:
 - a. Q: Is there a plan to add a lab for this course?
A: There is already a lab associated with PHY 206.
 - b. Q: The CAP requirements include challenging students' understanding about scientific methods. Where in this proposal is specific reference to scientific methods as it relates to course content and description?
A: Theory-testing is covered in class discussions and connected to relevant activity in the lab. Taken together, these constitute substantive coverage of scientific methods.
3. Vote:
 - a. Motion and second motion made to approve PHY 206 as submitted.
 - b. 9-0-0 (for, against, abstained) – course approved as submitted.

C. Review of PHL 370 - Political Philosophy

1. Proposal details:
 - a. Drs. Messay Kebede and John Inglis presented the proposal.
 - b. The course is designed to achieve the following UD SLOs: Scholarship, Diversity, and Critical Evaluation of Our Times.
2. Discussion/comments:
 - a. Q: In the section on Course Goals is a reference to “modern and contemporary” political thought. Aren’t these one and the same?
A: In the study of Philosophy these terms refer to two separate time periods.
 - b. In the section on Course Objectives, a suggestion for a correction:
 - Current: “...assess the arguments opposing modern political ideologies...”
Correct to: “...assess the arguments of opposing modern political ideologies...”
 - The presenters agreed to this change.
 - c. In the section on Statement of Need/Rationale, a suggestion for a correction:
 - Current: “...internationalism in a globalized word...”
Correct to: “...internationalism in a globalized world...”
 - The presenters agreed to this change.
 - d. A Committee member commented that PHL 370 sounds like a very good course for our students. In previous reviews the Committee discussed whether, in sections related to course content and achievement of goals, sufficient text demonstrated a connection to the SLOs listed in the proposal. There appears to be a lack of connection in this proposal.
 - The presenters realized that this connection would be a requirement after submitting the proposal online. Therefore, Dr. Kebede brought to this meeting a printout of the text he wished to insert into the proposal to satisfy this requirement.
 - This text was given to Jennifer Creech, and she inserted it into the proposal during the meeting.
 - e. The presenters were asked to speak briefly about how Political Philosophy integrates the Catholic, Marianist tradition without including discussion of Augustine?
 - The course addresses the historical elements that are currently included in Catholic education classes.
 - Catholic philosophers historically don’t talk about Catholic, Marianist intellectual traditions, although this is a gray area due to the various definitions and interpretations of these traditions.
 - This course is quite innovative in that it does include discussion of how Catholic philosophers have partitioned such relevant topics.
 - In many ways, philosophy is the embodiment of the Catholic intellectual tradition.
 - f. Follow-up question: So how would a course titled “Political Philosophy” at a state-run college differ fundamentally from a like-named course at a Catholic institution? How would this course description lead to an understanding that our course is different from one taught, for example, at Wright State?
 - For students enrolled in PHL 370, it’s a “teachable moment” due to the developmental nature of this course.
 - We are studying the evolution of ideas, and since most of our students are, indeed, Catholic, the Catholic faith is woven into course discussions.
 - g. Q: The proposal refers to an “advanced” level of understanding of the SLOs. With only one prereq (PHL 103), can the students actually achieve such a level, or should this be downgraded to “elevated” level?

- A: "Advanced" refers not to the level of understanding students enter the course with, but the expected level of understanding they will achieve by the end of the course. Measurements of achievement are recognized and monitored throughout the course.
- h. The main questions about revising this proposal are:
1. Does the language of the text that has been inserted into the proposal fit with the course content?
A: Yes.
 2. Is this revision accepted and approved by the Committee?
A: Yes.
 3. Will people understand the newly inserted text, both in content and intent?
A: Yes.
 4. Does the Committee agree that this is a minimal revision that can be accomplished within this meeting?
A: This is a substantial change to the content, which will go back to the Executive Committee of the College. As a member of that committee, Don Pair feels the revision will be approved.
3. Vote:
- a. Motion and second motion made to approve PHL 370, pending approval of the revised and inserted text by the Executive Committee of the College.
 - b. 9-0-0 (for, against, abstained) – course approved and rolled back to Don Pair for unit review of revision.

D. Review of PHL 374 - Philosophy and the City

1. Proposal details:
 - a. Dr. Danielle Poe presented the proposal.
 - b. This is a new course proposed for Advance Study Philosophy.
 - c. The course is designed to achieve the following UD SLOs: Diversity, Community, and Practical Wisdom.
2. Discussion/comments:
 - a. Q: Considering the fact that this course involves periodic changes to content, can students take this course multiple times for credit?
A: Yes, provided that the content has, indeed, changed. The content focus can shift between global, regional, even down to the UD campus community within the themes listed in the Course Topics or Outline section. The department chair in consultation with the Dean's office will review and approve requests to take PHL 374 multiple times for credit.
 - c. Q: How would enrollment be tracked, to ensure that students don't take the same content for credit more than once?
A: Enrollment will be tracked by faculty and the department.
 - d. Q: How often will the course be offered?
A: Likely once a year.
 - e. Q: Will course content be collaborated between the Philosophy and Sociology departments?
A: No, the course will be taught strictly as a Philosophy course, although there is interest in partnering with non-academic units such as the Fitz Center.
 - f. A comment was offered that the course reads almost like an applied ethics course.

- g. The frequent issue of connecting the expressed content and goals with the achievement of SLOs was raised again.
 - John Inglis brought a paragraph of text explaining the connection between the Community SLO to Catholic, Marianist tradition and the Catholic intellectual tradition.
 - This text was given to Jennifer Creech, and she inserted it into the proposal during the meeting.
- h. Suggestion to fix a typo in the list of texts:
Current: "...texts are PHL The Twentieth Century and Beyond;..."
Change to: "...texts are The Twentieth Century and Beyond;..."
- 3. Vote:
 - a. Motion and second motion made to approve PHL 374, with minor correction explained in item 8 above, and pending approval of the revised and inserted text by the Executive Committee of the College.
 - b. 9-0-0 (for, against, abstained) – course approved and rolled back to Don Pair for unit review of revision.

E. New Business

- 1. With regard to the upcoming Philosophy course proposals to be reviewed, the Committee suggests that any additional text required be inserted into the proposal prior to review.
 - John Inglis will look into this and update Don Pair and Sawyer.
- 2. Jennifer Creech and Tim Wilbers are working to create standardized descriptions of pre-requisite courses in the course catalog.

The meeting adjourned at 3:25pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jeanne Zeek