

11-7-2007

Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2007-11-07

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee, "Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2007-11-07" (2007). *All Committee Minutes*. Paper 68.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/68

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 All Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu.

APC Meeting 07 November 2007—approved minutes

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

Present: Benson, Cook, Darrow (chair), Diestelkamp, Duncan, Eggemeier, Frasca, O’Gorman, Patterson, Penno

Excused: Bickford, Bowman, Clark, Jipson, Larson, Saliba

3. Approval of minutes from meeting of 24 October.

Minutes approved without changes.

4. Announcements

Meeting with former WG members on Friday 2 November.

The chair reported that he and subcommittee chair Pair had met with three and one half of the other forty-two former working group members (Anderson, Cardilino and Schramm—Duncan was in and out between advisees). Subcommittee chair Pair took copious notes and answered questions. The attendees main concerns were a) that the developmental model as applied to things such as service learning and education abroad not be applied without consideration of individual students’ developmental levels and b) that some sort of priority be given to the first year experience.

5. Old Business

Report from Subcommittee

In addition to the meeting with the former working group members, the chair reported that subcommittee chair Pair is continuing the process of consultation with subcommittee members and other campus groups.

The APC suggested the following more suitable acronym for the subcommittee:

CAP Subcommittee (Common Academic Program)

Review of Proposed Assessment Plan

There was a consensus in the committee that any changes in the seven learning outcomes resulting from Senate actions could be addressed by revisions to the assessment plan. There was also a consensus that the spirit of the plan was sound,

although one member did express some fear that units might simply choose to assess that which is already performing well. After approving the assessment plan unanimously, the committee asked the chair to draft a statement in favor of Senate concurrence with the assessment plan.

6. New Business

Review of DOC 1-07-03 “Guidelines for the Development of Course-Based Graduate Certificate Programs”

Discussion began with the posing of three questions:

- a) Does the university want to be in the business of granting graduate certificates?
- b) Should the Senate endorse all three of the proposed types of certificates?
- c) Will there be a transcribing process that follows best practices?

Associate Dean Eggemeier then proceeded to provide an overview of the proposal and address these three questions. He noted an increase in public interest for such programs, as well as increasing departmental interest in having existing concentrations transcribed or creating new ones that might prove attractive to potential students. One committee member noted that several area employers were ending tuition support for employees seeking graduate degrees, but might still be willing to support employees seeking certification in a more specific area.

Associate Dean Eggemeier assured the committee that students accepted into any free-standing certificate program would be required to meet the same graduate school and departmental criteria as student applying to a regular graduate program. He also agreed to add language to the “Admission Requirement” section of the document to make this more clear (“should” in second to last line of paragraph changed to “must”; add sentence “Admission standards for free-standing programs must be consistent with those for admission into graduate degree programs in associated academic units.” to end of paragraph).

Dean Eggemeier also noted that the transcribing process, in line with that followed at other institutions, would contain multiple levels of verification. After the certificate coordinator informed the academic unit that a student had completed the certificate requirements, the unit would then audit this itself. Before passing it along to the grad school and registrar for additional auditing and awarding of the certificate.

Based on the presentation and discussion (and the additional language), the committee unanimously agreed that the University should have graduate certificates of all three varieties. The APC also concluded that the proposal provides a uniform process for evaluating the merits of graduate certificate offerings that will make it possible to transcribe the certificates, and that the

proposed transcribing process corresponded with best practices. The committee asked the chair to draft a statement in favor of Senate concurrence.

7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:10 a.m.