

3-19-2010

## Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2010-03-19

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_cmte\\_mins](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee, "Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2010-03-19" (2010). *All Committee Minutes*. Paper 103.  
[http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_cmte\\_mins/103](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/103)

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](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu).

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON  
APPROVED MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE  
OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE  
March 19, 2010  
LTC (Studio 41), 3 – 5 PM

Attendance: Benson, Bickford, Donnelly, Frasca, Gauder, Hess, Huacuja, Jain, Liu, White.

Guests: Amin, Cadegan, Carlson, Inglis, Kinnucan-Welsch, Masthay, McGrew, O’Gorman, Pair, Palermo, Pestello, Pierce, Potter, Yocum.

1. Approved minutes of APC meeting March 10, 2010.

The APC received a report from the sub-committees that were assigned at the end of the March 10 meeting. These groups have developed further definition for the Diversity and Social Justice Requirement and the Upper Level Humanities Requirements as reflected in the March 15, 2010 CAP proposal. The report also included the English Department’s proposal to alter the Arts Requirement.

2. Announcements: The next meeting of the APC will take place Tuesday April 13 from noon to 1:30 pm at LTC TeamSpace. (NOTE: this is a reschedule of the April 16 meeting.) You are welcome to bring a bag lunch; drinks and dessert will be provided.

3. Old Business: CAP Review – At the March 15 ECAS meeting discussion covered procedures for facilitating CAP conversation at the March 26 full Academic Senate meeting. Since the focus will be a “sense of the Senate” discussion, ECAS strongly prefers that if there is widespread desire for changes to the proposal, then written amendments be requested. There is concern that the meeting focus will be thwarted if too much time is spent at the March 26 voting on proposed amendments. However, it will be helpful to know by the end of the full Senate meeting where proposed substantive changes are likely to be made, so that the APC can have a chance to review prior to the April Senate meeting. It was suggested that an online site/space be created where proposed changes and itemized amendments can be posted, and where Senators can also share in advance their substantive concerns.

Donnelly noted that the March 15 CAP proposal was written as a Senate document, not as a complete curriculum proposal; as such, it is shorter and more concise, albeit incomplete, as the Crossing Boundaries section is unfinished. It was observed that within the Natural Sciences section the 1 credit hour lab requirement is no longer tied to a 3 credit hour class, and that clarification was likely needed. Line 309 includes English as part of the Arts component; in light of APC’s decision not to entertain the English Department’s proposal to include literature within the arts, the statement might be clearer if it were amended to identify creative writing specifically. Benson noted that the document identifies the departments associated with the Arts component, and so is fine to leave as is.

Jain raised concerns about the number of credit hours covered within the CAP proposal: how will these credit hours be allocated without going over? Will students be able to graduate in 4 years? It was noted that there are double- and triple-counting possibilities. Degree requirements will vary for all; at this point in time, there are no concrete courses associated with most of the CAP components. It is difficult to articulate the courses that could provide double- and triple-counts.

Carlson submitted the criteria for the Inquiry course and the Integrative experience. It was noted that the Inquiry definition is ambiguous. Frasca identified a particular concern for Economics, in that it is a discipline within the social sciences, but is part of SBA; what will students take for an Inquiry course? The phrase “outside discipline” was a change and will revert back to the original language. There were additional concerns about the feasibility of students taking an upper level Inquiry course that concerns methodologies when students have not likely been exposed to such discipline-related methodology up to that point. Introductory courses focus on content, not ways in which scholars investigate their fields. It was pointed out the Honors Program’s Engineering Systems Design course is an example of a successful Inquiry course. It was noted that 100-level classes will need some degree of transparency to prepare students for the Inquiry course. It was called into question whether the Inquiry course needed to be an upper level course, particularly if the professional schools were to be actively involved. It might also be helpful in a developmental sense for students to take such a course in their second year.

Clarification was sought as to why the Inquiry course would be an elective; the course will be elective only in the sense that a course would be chosen from a list of approved courses. The Natural Science requirements will not likely double-count as the Inquiry course, as this approach misses the point of the Inquiry component objectives.

Frasca asserted that it was wrong to reject the Crossing Boundaries working group request to combine the Inquiry and Integrative courses. He observed that both courses were very much the same but for the hands-on work or project required of the Inquiry course, and that the definition is too ambiguous (see March 15 CAP proposal, Line 411). It should be noted that the Inquiry and Integrative course criteria submitted today does not replace the examples identified at the start of line 417. Yocum noted that every course has elements of inquiry and that maybe the wrong question is being asked in terms of specificity of criteria. She suggested that faculty ask what kind of innovation in faculty teaching can enlighten and illuminate for the student the thinking and methodology in one’s own discipline. It was noted that existing courses could be more easily redesigned into Inquiry courses, but the Integrative courses would be tricky, as they require more interdisciplinary work and collaboration. Benson expressed concern that collapsing the two courses would mean that fewer faculty would be able to participate. Clarification was again sought as to whether students would be taking courses that crossed discipline or unit boundaries, as some disciplines are very similar. The final draft will specify that courses will cross divisions **OR** units.

It was noted that CAP reflects the advantages of a comprehensive university within the limits of undergraduate courses.

Pair noted that the First Year Humanities working group had questions relative to p. 9 of the March 15 CAP proposal. They want to know the process for submitting editorial and content changes; does a process and a timeline currently exist for submissions? Submit all changes in writing to the APC by Friday, March 26. Huacuja stated that although written comments will be accepted, the March 15 CAP proposal will not be revised prior to the March 26 Academic Senate meeting; changes to the document will be made after the meeting. Pair also raised a question about line 267 regarding integrative knowledge. There is sense of importance for integrative knowledge, but there are no significant examples. There are concerns about the vagueness of the “significant examples” phrase; what is being introduced and what is being integrated?

Pestello noted that the Social Sciences working group had concerns about the language and intent of line 322. This group will be sending text to the APC that more clearly articulates the proposed course.

Potter noted that the English Department is committed to interdisciplinarity but is concerned about the lack of literature within the March 15 CAP proposal. She observed that ENG100/200 focus on rhetoric and composition, while creative writing is an appropriate Arts study course. How might the English Department articulate in the March 15 CAP proposal the value of literature in a liberal arts education? Benson observed that all Liberal Studies B.A. degrees in the College require a Literature course, and that the Crossing Boundaries courses offer opportunities for Literature courses. It is not as if Literature was written out of the document, per se. Rather, the Department should consider the proposal possibilities as ripe for inclusion. If the Department feels a “Tragedy of the Commons,” it is perhaps an exaggerated analogy.

Pair raised a question on behalf of the ENG100/200 working group. This component has a “stand alone” nature, but there were questions as to whether ENG200H will be directly connected to the rest of the First Year Humanities sequence. [Most students will take ENG100 in their first year, which will be tied to the First Year Humanities sequence, and follow up the second year with ENG200; it is the first-year ENG200H courses that raise concern about connections to the First Year Humanities sequence.] Donnelly acknowledged that in trying to condense the language related to ENG100/200 for the March 15 CAP proposal, some points of interest were likely removed. The question remains, however: for those students taking ENG200H, to what extent will this course be tied to the Humanities Base? Benson inquired if there was support for ENG200H to be pulled out of the First Year Humanities component. There needs to be support from the Humanities chairs for pulling ENG200H out of the First Year Humanities sequence, as it is a procedural issue that affects the outcomes of other working groups.

Amin noted that line 312 is unclear. This line will be amended to note that “historical studies courses” will also include language to the effect that there will be a creative process component within any new proposed courses. It was noted that Literature is not

present in spirit, but it was desirable to include in the document, ENG100/200 notwithstanding. The Languages Department likewise shared concern about the absence of any Languages component.

Jain asked if it were possible to create a chart highlighting the difference between the current GenEd distribution requirements and the distribution of credit hours for the proposed Common Academic Program, as listed on p. 8. Donnelly responded that such an undertaking would mean identifying all the courses faculty are considering for CAP inclusion, along with stated outcomes, at a point where none exist.

4. New Business: Review of the 2011-2012 Academic Calendar – It was noted that there is confusion over the procedures related to the calendar process; normally, ECAS refers the matter to the APC. It was suggested that clarification to the process is needed. The committee made the following observations:
  - a. A later start in January is favorable.
  - b. School will be out of session when MLK day is observed. Care should be taken not to overlook programming for MLK day, including scheduling events on the day after.
  - c. There are no study days in the current calendar iteration. In the past, however, the study days were not used as such.
  - d. Shortened Spring Break affects Immersion programs. Campus Ministry is moving efforts to the January break.

There were no objections to the proposed calendar.

The APC adjourned at 4:59 PM.

Minutes submitted by Heidi Gauder