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I. CAPC Procedures
   A. Document: CAPC Procedures (11/02/2016 draft)
   B. Discussion
      1. The CAPC Procedures were previously revised this semester to include details of the four-year review process for CAP courses; the committee approved the document on October 13. The procedures were subsequently submitted to the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate for review and approval. The APC approved the procedures on November 1 pending minor revision. They requested the addition of language to reflect that the Humanities Commons will be reviewed as a program, not as individual courses – the same way that the initial approval was handled in November 2012. Language to this effect was added on page eight of the document. The APC chair was notified about the addition. Other than the requested revision, the APC raised broad questions about the four-year review process, such as how it is going so far.
      2. The CAPC approved a program proposal for the Humanities Commons in November 2012 at the same time it approved the individual course proposals: ENG 100, 100A, 100B, 200H; HST 103; PHL 103; and HST 103. The Course Inventory Management (CIM) system was not yet in place at that time. The program proposal needs to be uploaded into CIM.
      3. Assessment of the Humanities Commons courses will be conducted separately and the individual course proposals will be submitted through CIM for renewal. The Humanities Commons will be reviewed in its totality, though, in light of the program document. It’s not certain whether the departments will propose any changes to the program document. They will need to coordinate that all seven of the UD Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are being delivered. The CAP Senate Document (DOC-10-04) outlines that the Humanities Commons collectively must address all of the SLOs. However, the individual course proposals explicitly stated that each course would address all seven SLOs. That approach was a result of the Humanities Commons departments’ interpretation of the CAP Senate Document. It was suggested that it might be helpful for the chairs to submit a collective report on the state of the Humanities Commons at the same time the individual course proposals are submitted.
      4. Approval: A motion was made and seconded to approve the CAPC Procedures with the additional revision that the APC requested.
         a. Further discussion focused on how the Humanities Commons serves as a foundation for the rest of the Common Academic Program, how it delivers the seven UD Student Learning Outcomes, and the level of assessment that has been conducted over the past four years. It has been uneven among the four departments. For areas that haven’t been conducting assessment, how will they determine what has been successful or not and how will they provide a rationale for making any changes? Ultimately, the committee determined that continuing with conversation along these lines is premature when it’s still uncertain what changes the departments might propose for the Humanities Commons.
         b. Vote: The motion to approve the revised procedures passed by a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
II. HST 280/333: Making of the Modern Middle East

A. Discussion

1. HST 333 was previously approved for the following CAP components: 1) Advanced Historical Studies and 2) Diversity and Social Justice. History was considering the equivalent of cross-listing the course within the department in order to serve multiple constituencies. The department is developing a series of 200-level survey courses for majors would offer HST 280 for that purpose. HST 333 was intended to serve other programs, such as International Studies. International Studies initially did not want a 200-level course for its majors but recently withdrew that perspective. As a result, the Department of History intends to renumber HST 333 to HST 280 and deactivate the 333 course number. The content from HST 333 has already been transferred to HST 280 in CIM. This change will also benefit students preparing to be high school History teachers.

III. CIM Course Form Revisions

A. Discussion

1. The process to revise the course form began last spring. The revisions address feedback from the CAP survey in fall 2015 that was part of the two-year evaluation and also embed the four-year review process. It is anticipated that the revised form will be deployed in the near future. The developers need to complete coding the logic for CAP categories 1 and 2. The new CIM program form is already live.

2. A demonstration of the revised course form was given in test mode. Different aspects were highlighted for a new course proposal, editing a course proposal, and responding to the four-year review questions for CAP courses. The APC gave approval for the six questions to be in place until the next CAP five-year evaluation, which will take place in 2020. As previously discussed, now that the APC has approved the revised CAPC Procedures, letters will be sent to departments and programs to notify them about the four-year review process and provide their respective lists of CAP courses and the four-year review cycle for each course.

3. Committee members were requested to promote within their units that all course changes (e.g., changing prerequisites) need to go through the appropriate workflow in CIM.

4. Critical text has been added to the form in several place to provide instructions, rather than using “help bubbles.” Proposers will also be encouraged to use the help bubbles for additional information. It was suggested to add a help bubble to the field that asks if the course may be taken multiple times for additional credit. “No” should be selected for most courses. The additional credit option is for special topics or seminar courses that can be offered with different content.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen