

11-20-2009

Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2009-11-20

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee

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

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee, "Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2009-11-20" (2009). *All Committee Minutes*. 70.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/70

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, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
November 20, 2009
KU 211; 3:00 p.m.

Attendance

Present: Benson, Bickford, Donnelly, Frasca, Gallagher, Jain, Hess, Huacuja, White.

Guests: Dorion Borbonus (History), Ellen Fleischmann (History), Caroline Merithew (History), Margie Pinnell (Engineering/CAP)

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of October 30, 2009 were approved.

Announcements

Next meeting: December 11th, 2009 KU 211 at 3pm

Old Business: CAP

- P. Donnelly reported on the progress of the working groups (WGs) and distributed a handout summarizing each group's report and timeline for CAP. (Appendix A.)
 - First Year Humanities WG: each department is mapping existing courses with the seven student learning outcomes. History department proposes to revise History 103 and to create a small number of 200 level courses.
 - English 200 WG: submitted ENG 100 and ENG 200 courses to AAC, if approved will send to these courses on to the GE Committee for approval.
 - Arts WG: defined criteria for CAP arts courses, provided a list of courses to satisfy CAP arts component, and plans to develop a small number of new CAP arts courses in the future.
 - Social Sciences WG: considering a single course taught across disciplines, with special attention to the integrative nature of the course.
 - Oral communication WG: consulted across different units about tailoring courses to meet a variety of student needs.
 - Mathematics WG: consulted with department chairs about current offerings that address needs within different majors. Mapped current courses to the seven student learning outcomes.
 - Natural Science WG: rethinking INSS sequence, possibly using two semesters of lecture/lab courses. Consulting with Crossing Boundaries WG.
 - Crossing Boundaries WG: has approved criteria for courses within the two components of the Crossing Boundaries section of CAP: diverse faith traditions and practical ethical action courses. For these courses, the WG considered input on course criteria from the Departments of Religious Studies and Philosophy. The WG is now considering options for the inquiry course as project-based or a regular course, possibly team-taught. For the integrative component, the WG is deliberating on ways to define and measure degrees of integration. The WG is identifying course models and possible Study Abroad options.

- Major Capstone WG: analyzed their survey of department chairs and found that 60 majors already require a capstone, while only 12 departments/majors do not offer a capstone.

Comments/Questions: Donnelly explained that the Crossing Boundaries WG and Major Capstone WG have later deadlines of March 1st for their proposals.

Donnelly stressed the important need for all units to consider the Diversity learning outcome, especially in the First year humanities, arts and social sciences courses.

APC asked Donnelly questions pertaining to the general understanding within working groups of their assigned tasks. Donnelly affirmed the good progress of the working groups throughout October and November. The posting of all WG meeting minutes is facilitating conversation across groups. Donnelly stressed that, at this stage, working groups are articulating course criteria, not just course descriptions. This will aid the future process for reviewing proposals and evaluating courses to the Common Academic Program. All WGs are soliciting feedback and seeking consultation on their proposed criteria and course offerings. During Spring 2010, the UD community will review and offer feedback on a newly revised CAP proposal. This new proposal will address the administrative structures and will articulate a process for course approval.

- Timeline for CAP and APC Deliberations
 - February 1, the Task Force presents a revised CAP proposal to the UD community. The APC determined that it will gather community feedback on the revised CAP within the first two weeks of February, will analyze the CAP proposal, will summarize feedback and will present its findings to the Task Force by February 26.
 - The APC discussed ways to seek feedback from the UD community on the January 2010 revised CAP. During February the APC will host open forums to gather commentary and ideas on the *revised* CAP proposal. At least two APC members and one Task Force member will attend each forum. All four forums will be open to all UD community members including faculty, staff and students. In order to encourage the fullest participation, one forum will target students, another will target junior faculty.
 - The APC will summarize and present broad community feedback on this *revised* CAP to the CAP Task Force and the Academic Senate in February. The APC will provide directives to the Task Force on the development of CAP. The Task Force will continue to consult widely and develop any needed revisions to CAP throughout March. It is anticipated that a formal CAP proposal, including implementation plan, will be presented by the CAP Task Force to be discussed and acted upon at the April 23, 2010 meeting of the Academic Senate.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:38 p.m.

Minutes recorded by Nicole Benkalowycz.

Minutes submitted by Judith Huacuja, Chair – Academic Policies Committee.

APPENDIX A

Report from the Coordinating and Writing Task Force to the APC November 20, 2009

(For full updates on the Task Force and Working Groups, see notes and updates on Senate Quickplace site for CAP.)

First Year Humanities Working Group: The WG reviewed the May 2009 Humanities Base questionnaire and responses, and the original base REL, PHL, HST, and ENG documents. Each Department completed a mapping of the HIR student learning outcomes on to the existing HB courses. HST has proposed to revise the content and focus of HST 103 and to create a small number of 200-level courses.

ENG 200 Working Group: The proposed ENG 100- ENG 200 courses have been submitted to the College AAC for approval. If approved, they will be forwarded to the University GE Committee. The goal is to offer official pilots in 2010-2011. The group has already mapped the relationship between ENG 200 and the learning outcomes.

Arts Working Group: The group is making progress in developing a proposal which describes the nature of learning in the arts, common elements across CAP arts classes, and connections with the learning outcomes. They are examining current offerings that might be modified for the CAP as well as model courses taught at other institutions. They plan to develop a number of courses that might satisfy this CAP component.

Social Sciences Working Group: The group is considering the relative merits of a single course that would be taught by faculty in the different disciplines versus a number of different courses with significant common elements including common learning outcomes.

Oral Communication Working Group: The group has consulted widely across academic units. Different units would prefer different emphases in oral communication courses for their majors (e.g., explaining complex concepts to non-experts, offering persuasive presentations).

Mathematics Working Group: The group has examined current offerings in terms of addressing the learning outcomes and the needs of various majors. They have mapped the courses to the learning outcomes.

Natural Science Working Group: The group is considering the range of majors and degrees that the Science courses must serve and the appropriate number of science courses and labs. They are considering various models for INSS alternatives, including two semesters of laboratory science followed by a capstone modeling/synthesis requirement. They are consulting with the Crossing Boundaries WG.

Crossing Boundaries Working Group: This WG has reviewed and approved criteria for the diverse faith traditions and the practical ethical action courses. Input on the criteria from the Departments of Religious Studies and Philosophy was considered. The group is continuing its discussion of the inquiry and integrative courses. They have discussed whether the inquiry course might be a project-based course or a more general course. They have discussed the practical implications of various aspects of these courses, including team-teaching and the role of the professional schools.

Major Capstone Working Group: The group has analyzed the results of the survey of department chairs. Respondents indicated that 60 majors currently require a capstone. Departments may have different conceptions and definitions of 'capstone.' It appears that the capstone is only one major offered by the professional schools does not include a capstone. Eleven majors in the College do not currently offer a capstone experience. Those majors that do not offer a capstone offer a number of explanations: lack of faculty, difficulty fitting in another requirement, questions about the public presentation component, and concerns about CAP infringing on major.

Coordinating and Writing Task Force: The CWTF addressed concerns raised about the course approval process. The specific issue was raised by the Crossing Boundaries WG about what role REL would have in the review process for courses proposed for the diverse faith traditions component. A draft of the CAP structure and Review Process was discussed at the Meeting of WG chairs and TF. It was noted that the review process proposed for CAP would be similar to the current GE. Courses proposed would need to be approved by unit curriculum committees (e.g., College AAC) and by the University-wide CAP Committee.

The CWTF asks the APC to consider the following process for review of the CAP. The dates for these actions are tentative. However, these proposed dates and actions push back the dates given to the Task Force by ECAS. It is possible that some of the work will be completed before these dates.

By December 15: WG reports are due. Some reports may be formal proposals and recommendations while other reports may be progress reports. The Crossing Boundaries and Major Capstone proposals are not due until March 8.

By January 15: The CWTF reviews the reports and maps the proposals with the learning outcomes. The CWTF identifies outcomes that are not adequately addressed in the proposals and may consult with WGs to on the feasibility of incorporating certain outcomes in their proposals and other issues.

By February 1: The CWTF submits a draft proposal incorporating material from all WGs to the APC and to all WG members. WGs submit their resource and assessment plans.

By February 15: Each WG reviews its proposal in light of the proposals from the other groups. The APC reviews the document, invites feedback from the University community, identifies necessary changes, and directs the CWTF to prepare a revised document.

By March 8: The Crossing Boundaries and Major Capstone WGs submit their final recommendations.

By March 22: The CWTF consults as necessary with these WGs and develops a revised proposal to submit to the APC.

March 26 Academic Senate Meeting: Detailed report to Senate

March 29- April 16 APC facilitates faculty input on proposal.

April 23 Academic Senate Meeting: Discussion and action