

University of Dayton

eCommons

Common Academic Program Committee
Minutes

Academic Senate Committees

2017

2017-05-05 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes

University of Dayton. Common Academic Program Committee

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

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Common Academic Program Committee, "2017-05-05 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes" (2017). *Common Academic Program Committee Minutes*. 133.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins/133

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 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

CAP COMMITTEE

Friday, May 5, 2017 | 1:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m.; Kennedy Union 312

Present: Brad Balsler, Lee Dixon, Serdar Durmusoglu, Heidi Gauder, Linda Hartley (*ex officio*), Keigo Hirakawa, Sawyer Hunley, Danielle Poe, Bill Trollinger, John White, Shuang-Ye Wu

Excused: John Goebel, Fred Jenkins (*ex officio*), Terence Lau (*ex officio*), Scott Segalewitz (*ex officio*)

Guests: Erin Holscher Almazan, Roger Crum, Judith Huacuja, Julie Jones, Joel Whitaker

- I. Four-Year Course Reviews:** This was the final of four meetings the committee had this week to hold departmental conversations concerning a total of 24 CAP courses that have gone through the four-year review process over the course of the academic year. As part of the review process, departments were asked to provide responses for each course to the following questions (the responses were added in the Course Inventory Management, or CIM, system):
- A. What specific course learning objectives or experiences are linked to this UD student learning outcome (*Habits of Inquiry and Reflection*)?
 - B. What criteria are/will be used to judge the student evidence for each specific course learning objective? (You may attach an assessment rubric or list of criteria.)
 - C. What evidence (e.g., student artifact or performance) is/will be used to demonstrate level of achievement for each course learning objective?
 - D. What were the results of your student assessment for each course learning objective?
 - E. If you have decided this course should address different CAP components from when it was originally approved, what changes are you proposing and why?
 - F. If you have decided this course should address different UD student learning outcomes (HIR) from when it was originally approved, what changes are you proposing and why?

As background information, it was noted that this is the first year to implement the four-year review process. A workshop was held in the fall for departments with courses up for review. Different methods were used to submit responses to the six questions above as a result of the CIM course proposal form being under revision as the four-year review cycle began.

The committee can take the following actions with respect to four-year review courses: a) re-approve fully for four years; b) conditionally re-approve for two years (in cases where an assessment plan has been developed but not implemented); c) not re-approve.

Based on discussion during four-year review meetings earlier in the week, the committee developed a list of recommended elements of a course assessment plan:

- A. System for administering assessment (e.g., rubric)
- B. Identify who will conduct the assessment
- C. Identify who will be assessed (i.e., sample or entire population)
- D. Frequency of assessment (if appropriate – depends on how often the course is offered)
- E. Metric for achievement
- F. Method for interpreting and using results from assessment

For the 11 Art and Design courses on the agenda, the plan is to focus on the macro level rather than discuss each course in detail. After the meeting, a summary of the committee's actions and any requested revisions will be outlined in CIM under the reviewer comments section for each course proposal. If no specific revisions were requested, the proposal should be updated as appropriate to reflect how the course will be taught going forward (e.g., revising course learning objectives, methods of evaluation/attainment, instructional methods). Following the meeting, it was communicated that

revisions should be completed in CIM by August 1, 2017. After the revisions are made, the AAC Executive Committee will review the proposals based on the outcome of the four-year review conversations with the CAPC.

1) VAF 104: Foundation Drawing

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Representative: Erin Holscher Almazan, as well as department chair Judith Huacuja.
2. Component (as originally approved): Arts
3. Student Learning Outcomes (as originally approved): Scholarship (introduced), Community (introduced)

B. Discussion:

1. A question was raised about how it's determined whether students are achieving the Community SLO. In response, an explanation was provided about the multi-step critique process used in studio courses. Students learn through the process how to engage with their peers in a professional fashion and interact as a supportive learning community. The process is structured to ensure active participation among all students.
2. The committee had positive feedback about the process and wondered if it could serve as a model in other courses to help students build these kinds of skills. It was noted, though, that there is a distinctive experience with studio courses because students also have a shared experience with creating their work prior to the critique process.
3. No changes are proposed for the CAP components and SLOs that were originally approved.
4. The committee did not request any specific revisions for the course.

C. Committee's Actions:

1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to re-approve the course fully for four years. There was no further discussion.
2. Vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

2) VAF 203: Drawing Through Process

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Representative: Department chair Judith Huacuja was present.
2. Component (as originally approved): Arts
3. Student Learning Outcome (as originally approved): Scholarship (introduced)

B. Discussion:

1. No changes are proposed for the CAP components and SLO that were originally approved.
2. The committee did not request any specific revisions for the course and did not have any feedback.

C. Committee's Actions:

1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to re-approve the course fully for four years. There was no further discussion.
2. Vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

3) VAF 225: Painting for Non-Majors

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Representative: Department chair Judith Huacuja was present.
2. Component (as originally approved): Arts
3. Student Learning Outcome (as originally approved): Scholarship (introduced)

B. Discussion:

1. No changes are proposed for the CAP components and SLO that were originally approved.
2. The committee did not request any specific revisions for the course and did not have any feedback other than noting that limiting the SLOs to Scholarship makes sense.

- C. Committee's Actions:
 - 1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to re-approve the course fully for four years. There was no further discussion.
 - 2. Vote: 9-0-0 (for-against-abstention).

4) VAF 242: Ceramics II: Wheel Throwing

- A. Course Proposal Information:
 - 1. Representative: Department chair Judith Huacuja was present.
 - 2. Component (as originally approved): Arts
 - 3. Student Learning Outcome (as originally approved): Scholarship (introduced)
- B. Discussion:
 - 1. No changes are proposed for the CAP components and SLO that were originally approved.
 - 2. The committee did not request any specific revisions for the course. An observation was provided that there are a lot of course learning objectives embedded in the proposal. In addition, it was noted positively that the methods of evaluation are very specific.
- C. Committee's Actions:
 - 1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to re-approve the course fully for four years. There was no further discussion.
 - 2. Vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

5) VAH 101: Introduction to the Visual Arts

6) VAH 201: Survey of Art I

7) VAH 202: Survey of Art II

8) VAH 203: Survey of Art III

- A. Course Proposal Information:
 - 1. Representatives: Roger Crum was present, as well as department chair Judith Huacuja.
 - 2. Component for all four courses (as originally approved): Arts
 - 3. Student Learning Outcomes (as originally approved):
 - a. VAH 101: Scholarship (introduced), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (introduced)
 - b. VAH 201: Scholarship (introduced), Faith Traditions (introduced)
 - c. VAH 202: Scholarship (introduced), Faith Traditions (introduced)
 - d. VAH 203: Scholarship (introduced), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (introduced)
- B. Discussion:
 - 1. These four proposals were discussed together. For all four, no changes are proposed for the CAP component and SLOs that were originally approved.
 - 2. For VAH 101, it was noted that discreet steps are provided to determine how students achieve the SLO of Critical Evaluation of Our Times. The instructor finds it essential to break down research projects into incremental parts. The course was designed with first-year students in mind, but students can take the course at any point. From a developmental perspective, it was noted that students begin building writing skills in ENG 100 but don't get to more formalized research papers until ENG 200, which is typically taken in the second year. The Library can assist to provide resources in cases where mostly first-year students are taking the course.
 - 3. For VAH 201 and 202, the four-year review responses indicate that there is "no established review process of course work" for the Faith Traditions SLO. The committee requested clarification. It was explained that the department has since discussed developing a process to collect and review student papers and will formalize the process over the summer and fall. In support of this process, it was noted that the Marian Library could be a valuable resource. The new director is interested in making the collection more accessible.

4. The committee requested revisions for VAH 201 and 202 for the assessment plans to be more fully developed and documented with respect to the Faith Traditions SLO. For VAH 101 and 203, the plans can be refined as needed. For all four VAH courses, the department should begin to implement the assessment plans.
 5. For these four VAH courses overall, the department may have some data in support of the SLOs, but it is not necessarily from a formalized process. It was also noted that the studio courses discussed earlier have been gathering data and have a rubric for evaluating it because those steps are part of the already established critique process and not specifically related to the four-year review process. It was clarified that two-year conditional re-approval reflects that work is needed to fully develop an assessment plan and collect data based on the plan; it doesn't mean that there are deficiencies in the course. It was further clarified that the committee will not need to review assessment data. It is up to the department to determine what the data mean to them.
- C. Committee's Actions:
1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to conditionally re-approve VAH 101, 201, 202, and 203 for two years, with the understanding that the proposals will be revised in CIM along the lines noted above.
 2. Vote: 10-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). (Another committee member arrived prior to the vote on these four proposals.)

9) VAH 330: Arts of Asia

- A. Course Proposal Information:
1. Representative: Department chair Judith Huacuja was present.
 2. Component (as originally approved): Crossing Boundaries-Integrative
 3. Student Learning Outcomes (as originally approved): Scholarship (expanded), Faith Traditions (introduced), Diversity (expanded)
- B. Discussion:
1. No changes are proposed for the CAP component and SLOs that were originally approved.
 2. A question was raised if the department considered including the Arts component as well. It was explained that it wasn't certain that the two components could be combined at the time the proposal was developed. In addition, it was noted that the department has a range of Arts courses and fewer Integrative courses.
 3. The committee did not request any specific revisions for the course.
- C. Committee's Actions:
1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to re-approve the course fully for four years. There was no further discussion.
 2. Vote: 10-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

10) VAP 100: Darkroom Photography for Non-Majors

11) VAP 200: Digital Photography for Non-Majors

- A. Course Proposal Information:
1. Representatives: Julie Jones and Joel Whitaker were present, as well as department chair Judith Huacuja.
 2. Component for both courses (as originally approved): Arts
 3. Student Learning Outcomes for both courses (as originally approved): Scholarship (introduced), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (introduced)
- B. Discussion:
1. No changes are proposed for the CAP component and SLOs that were originally approved for these two courses.
 2. The committee did not request any specific revisions for either course.

3. As background information, it was noted that the department typically offers 3-4 sections of the courses per semester. The department maintains a shared server where faculty can find syllabi, assignments, etc.
 4. For VAP 200, a question was raised how class Tumblr blogs are utilized. It was explained that students post images and edited images to the class Tumblr account. Students can also view past students' work. They gain experience managing social media in addition to critiquing work.
- C. Committee's Actions:
1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to re-approve both courses fully for four years. There was no further discussion.
 2. Vote: 10-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

Follow-up comments about Art and Design courses: The committee expressed appreciation for the department's leadership and commitment to the Common Academic Program through early and ongoing development of courses, as well as the thoughtfulness that has gone into their course development.

II. Four-Year Review Process: Committee Debrief

- A. The committee had a follow-up conversation about the four-year review process based on the meetings held over the course of the week and the feedback from departments that have gone through the process. The following are highlights from the discussion.
1. Is there a way to embed the recommended elements of a course assessment plan (refer to the first page of the minutes) into the four-year review questions, or instructions for responding to the questions?
 2. It was recommended to remove the four-year review questions from CIM and have departments submit responses separately. If the questions are maintained in CIM, will previous responses be overwritten when a course goes through subsequent review cycles? If the review questions are removed from CIM, departments will still need to make revisions to proposals in CIM. In general, committee members expressed support for streamlining the process however possible.
 3. Committee members expressed support for continuing the practice to offer a workshop in the fall for departments with courses going up for review.
 4. Should the committee develop a rubric for evaluating four-year review proposals?
 5. The committee recognized that it will need to address logistical challenges with the review process as the number of courses up for review will increase significantly in a couple of years.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen