University of Dayton

eCommons

3-28-2012

Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2012-03-28

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 2012-03-28" (2012). *All Committee Minutes*. 74.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/74

Approved
Minutes of the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate
3/28/12
SJ325
Present: Paul Benson, Deb Bickford, Jim Dunne, Vinod Jain, Emily Kaylor, Laura Leming, Leno Pedrotti, Carolyn Phelps, Tony Saliba, John White
Absent: Megan Abbate, Joe Castellano
Guests: Sawyer Hunley, Juan Santamarina
Announcements: The amendment to Doc 10-01 which was approved at the last meeting of the Academic Senate will be brought up for an additional amendment at the Senate meeting on 4/13. B. Duncan noted that the wording regarding "double counting" could be misleading because not all Bachelor's Plus Master's programs allow for double counting. He will request an amendment that will remove that wording from the Bulletin.
Old Business:
CAP form. J. Santamarina presented the changes that have been made to the CAP Approval form. Several points were made regarding clarity of the document. Leming noted that Santamarina's verbal explanation of Category 2 was clearer than the written explanation and suggested that the phrase "do not violate" be used rather than "not explicitly designated." It was also suggested that wording be changed to indicate that the student learning outcomes mentioned in the document refer to University of Dayton Student Learning Outcomes or University Student Learning Outcomes. The developmental desciptions were highlighted by White who indicated that in addition to being used for assessment purposes, the questions would encourage faculty to examine how their courses fit into the developmental model of the CAP. It was also pointed out that, for course proposals in which course topics and content can vary, sections 6.1 and 6.2 need to be very well explained, whereas sections 6.3 – 6.6 can be more open, depending on the type of course proposed. Other comments were provided to Santamarina regarding the flow of the document
There was discussion about the use of the form for non-CAP courses, and Jain pointed out that the form is optional for non-CAP courses. He pointed out that this should be a unit choice. Hunley, Benson, and Santamarina pointed out that the use of the form, which is designed for use with CourseLeaf would assist in data collection and assessment. For this reason units should consider ways in which they could integrate their current course approval practices/forms with this CAP form. Although changes to the form can be made at a later time, there will be a cost incurred by the change. Those costs should be evaluated prior to moving forward with the electronic form.
Department Proposal Policy. Changes to the Department Proposal Policy, based on discussions from the APC meeting of 3/7, were discussed. Minor wording changes were proposed and the policy was approved with those changes.
The next APC meeting will be on 4/11 from 8:30-10:30 in SJ 325. The Committee will consider changes to the CAP approval form.
Respectfully submitted by C. Phelps