

University of Dayton

eCommons

Common Academic Program Committee
Minutes

Academic Senate Committees

2018

2018-02-26 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, "2018-02-26 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes" (2018). *Common Academic Program Committee Minutes*. 147.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins/147

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

Monday, February 26, 2018 | 12:15-2:30 p.m.; Kennedy Union 331

Present: Brad Balser, Lee Dixon, Chuck Edmonson, Heidi Gauder, Peter Hansen, Linda Hartley (*ex officio*), Fred Jenkins (*ex officio*), Michelle Pautz, Danielle Poe, Scott Segalewitz (*ex officio*), Randy Sparks (*ex officio*), Bill Trollinger, Diandra Walker, John White

Excused: Shuang-Ye Wu

Guests: Viorel Pâslaru, Rebecca Whisnant, Chad Painter, Peggy Strain, Andy Slade, Dustin Atlas, John McCombe, Annette Taylor, Daniel Thompson

- I. **Course Reviews:** The chair noted that the committee may ask for documentation in the CIM proposal if clarification is needed concerning how the course will be delivered. The request for documentation will be for the sake of posterity.

1) PHL 330: Philosophy of Science

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Proposer: Viorel Pâslaru was present, as well as department chair Rebecca Whisnant.
2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry, Advanced Philosophical Studies
3. Institutional Learning Goals: Scholarship (expanded), Community (expanded), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (expanded)

B. Discussion:

1. Majors of students likely to take the course include natural sciences, pre-med, health sciences, engineering, and social sciences, as well as some humanities. Humanities students would not be able to fulfill the Inquiry requirement with this course.
2. Related to the Inquiry component, the proposer described opportunities students will have to compare and contrast methodologies of their major discipline with those presented in the class. Students will have assignments which ask them compare/contrast the philosophical take on an issue with that of their major discipline.

C. Committee's Actions:

1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
2. Vote: 8-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

2) PHL 366: Afro-Caribbean Philosophy

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Proposer: Ernesto Velasquez could not attend. Department chair Rebecca Whisnant was present.
2. Components: Advanced Philosophical Studies, Diversity and Social Justice
3. Institutional Learning Goals: Faith Traditions (expanded), Diversity (advanced)

B. Discussion:

1. The committee provided feedback that the course fits the requirements of the selected components.
2. ASI 110 and ASI 120 will be added to the prerequisites, along with PHL 103 and REL 103.

C. Committee's Actions:

1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
2. Vote: 8-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). The CAP office will make the revision to the prerequisites in CIM on the proposer's behalf.

3) CMM 432: Media Law

- A. Course Proposal Information:
 - 1. Proposers: Chad Painter and Annette Taylor were present.
 - 2. Component: Crossing Boundaries-Integrative
 - 3. Institutional Learning Goals: Practical Wisdom (expanded), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (expanded), Vocation (expanded)
- B. Discussion:
 - 1. The committee noted that exams are included as one of the methods of attainment for most of the Course Learning Objectives. While this is an acceptable method, the committee advised, in terms of assessment and preparing for the Four-Year Review process, to parse out sections of the exam that address each CLO. This advice would apply to other methods of attainment as well. The proposers noted that other methods of attainment, such as small group work and papers, will be more focused.
- C. Committee's Actions:
 - 1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
 - 2. Vote: 8-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

4) REL 267: Holocaust

- A. Course Proposal Information:
 - 1. Proposer: Dustin Atlas was present, as well as department chair Daniel Thompson.
 - 2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Faith Traditions, Diversity and Social Justice
 - 3. Institutional Learning Goals: Faith Traditions (expanded), Diversity (expanded), Vocation (expanded)
- B. Discussion:
 - 1. A question was raised concerning differentiation between this course and REL 366: The Holocaust: Theological & Religious Responses. It was noted that the department plans to deactivate REL 366, which does not have CAP designation. The department will be reviewing and making decisions about a series of their CAP courses that are in a similar situation with older courses.
 - 2. The committee provided positive feedback about the proposal overall, including that it was very well done.
 - 3. The proposer provided clarification about Havruta sessions that are included under Instructional Methods. The sessions are interpretive exercises involving two people of different persuasions.
- C. Committee's Actions:
 - 1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
 - 2. Vote: 8-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

5) REL 380: The Masters of Suspicion: Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud on Religion

- A. Course Proposal Information:
 - 1. Proposer: Dustin Atlas was present, as well as department chair Daniel Thompson.
 - 2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry, Advanced Religious Studies
 - 3. Institutional Learning Goals: Faith Traditions (advanced), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (advanced)
- B. Discussion:
 - 1. The committee provided positive feedback about the proposal overall, including that the Course Learning Objectives were well developed and are clearly mapped to the Institutional Learning Goals.

C. Committee's Actions:

1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
2. Vote: 8-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

6) ENG 114: First-Year Writing Seminar

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Proposer: Peggy Strain was present, as well as department chair Andy Slade. Co-proposer Patrick Thomas could not attend.
2. Components: First-Year Humanities Commons, Second-Year Writing Seminar
3. Institutional Learning Goals: Scholarship (introduced), Faith Traditions (introduced), Diversity (introduced), Community (introduced), Practical Wisdom (introduced), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (introduced), Vocation (introduced)

B. Discussion:

1. The department chair explained how UD has handled composition placement by test scores. With the proposed courses, if students only need to take one composition course because of placement, they will take ENG 114 or ENG 198 (for Honors students). If they need to take more than one, they will take ENG 100 and ENG 200. The department will ultimately deactivate ENG 200H. The committee expressed support for this approach.
2. If ENG 114 and ENG 198 are approved, the effective date will be Fall 2018. The department will update the composite accordingly and will follow up with Deans' Offices about first-year choices and communicating with advisors about placement. In addition, the Registrar's Office will copy prerequisite test scores from ENG 200H into these courses.
3. The department will prepare a one-page advising sheet prior to the advising period next Fall. The CAP Office can assist with communication as needed.
4. The ENG 114 statement of rationale includes the following: "While long understood in the field of Composition Studies to be an unreliable indicator of student success in writing courses, the Office of Enrollment Management and Marketing, with the assent of the Department of English, uses ACT/SAT scores or similar measures to determine high proficiency and, consequently, placement in this course." This statement was included to acknowledge that UD's current practices don't reflect larger practices and provide a starting point for future conversations beyond the CAP Committee.

C. Committee's Actions:

1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
2. Vote: 8-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

7) ENG 198: First-Year Honors Seminar

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Proposer: Peggy Strain was present, as well as department chair Andy Slade. Co-proposer Patrick Thomas could not attend.
2. Components: First-Year Humanities Commons, Second-Year Writing Seminar
3. Institutional Learning Goals: Scholarship (introduced), Faith Traditions (introduced), Diversity (introduced), Community (introduced), Practical Wisdom (introduced), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (introduced), Vocation (introduced)

B. Discussion:

1. ENG 198 was developed to provide something distinctive for incoming Honors students. The University Honors Program is looking at reducing the number of students invited into the program at the end of their first year at UD.
2. Issues raised during the review of ENG 114 are also applicable to ENG 198. There was no further discussion.

- C. Committee's Actions:
 1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
 2. Vote: 8-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

8) SEE 402: Sustainability Research II

- A. Course Proposal Information:
 1. Proposer: Rebecca Potter could not attend.
 2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Practical Ethical Action, Advanced Philosophical Studies, Major Capstone
 3. Institutional Learning Goals: Practical Wisdom (advanced), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (advanced), Vocation (advanced)
- B. Discussion:
 1. SEE 402 already has CAP designation for Practical Ethical Action and Advanced Philosophical Studies. Major Capstone is being added as a third component. The Sustainability Studies program is in the process of developing the major and needs courses approved first. The Capstone component won't be activated until the major is approved.
 2. The committee had positive feedback about the course overall.
- C. Committee's Actions:
 1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
 2. Vote: 8-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

9) VAP 497: Senior Seminar II

- A. Course Proposal Information:
 1. Proposer: Tim Wilbers could not attend.
 2. Component: Major Capstone
 3. Institutional Learning Goals: Scholarship (advanced), Vocation (advanced)
- B. Discussion:
 1. VAP 497 was developed as a one credit-hour version of VAP 499. As stated in the proposal, "Starting with Catalog Year 2018-19, VAP 499 will be increased from 1 to 3 semester hours for BFA Photography majors. Students matriculating prior to 2018-19 will be permitted to continue taking the 1-hour version of Senior Seminar II, which will then be VAP 497. After the last Photography major required to take the 1-hour version of Senior Seminar II (VAP 497) has graduated, the course will be deactivated."
 2. The committee's review of VAP 497 is only on the merits of having a one credit-hour version of VAP 499.
- C. Committee's Actions:
 1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
 2. Vote: 8-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

II. 4-Year Review Process for CAP Courses

- A. Document: Subcommittee Report Template
- B. Discussion:
 1. The following meetings have been reserved for subcommittees to share their recommendations for the 4-Year Review reports that they reviewed: March 5, March 12, and March 19. The discussion today was scheduled to address any questions or issues before subcommittees finalize their recommendations.
 2. The committee discussed suggestions to clarify and improve the 4-Year Review process and report form for next year and beyond:

- a. Section 4 of the form asks if there are plans to make changes to CAP Components, Institutional Learning Goals, and/or Course Learning Objectives, but does not request details for any proposed changes.
 - b. The form doesn't specifically ask if students are achieving the CLOs.
 - c. Question 2-C contains three questions that don't really get at what we're looking for: "What do you do to determine if *each* CLO is being achieved? How do you determine if *each* CLO is being achieved each semester? What student artifacts are used to make those determinations?"
 - d. It's a challenge to evaluate 4-Year Review reports if course proposals weren't well developed to begin with. It was acknowledged that CAP course proposals were better developed over time as both departments and the CAPC gained more experience.
 - e. Ideally, departments would have a representative to coordinate their 4-Year Reviews and reports would reflect the department's involvement rather than individual faculty preparing them. Communication has gone through department chairs and included that they have responsibilities in the process.
 - f. The committee's role is to make sure that departments have a process for evaluating their CAP courses to address the 4-Year Review questions and demonstrate that students have met the course outcomes. Departments also need to have a means for "closing the loop." The committee should not be making judgments about what constitutes good/bad assessment.
 - g. The committee discussed the need to provide departments with more resources about developing assessment plans and measures. Justin Keen will transition to a new position in July as Director of Assessment and Student-Centered Analytics. This position will support assessment across the University so he could assist in this regard.
 - h. It was noted that the committee will need to consult with the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate about making changes to the 4-Year Review process for next year.
3. The CAP Office already scheduled a 4-Year Review workshop on March 7 for departments with courses in next year's review cycle to get an early start. While the committee has discussed the need to make some adjustments to the process and form, it was agreed that it would still be beneficial to proceed with the workshop. It could include an overview of how the process has been conducted this year and that the fundamentals will be the same, although there will be some adjustments based on this year's experience.
 4. The committee will have further discussion about making modifications to the 4-Year Review process and report form after reviewing the subcommittees' recommendations for courses in this year's review cycle.

III. Plans for Upcoming Meetings

- A. March 5: The meeting will start at 1:30 p.m. Subcommittee #3 will review their recommendations. The rest of the subcommittees were asked to submit their recommendations by Friday, March 9.
- B. March 12: The meeting will start at 12:15 p.m. and the committee will get through as many subcommittee recommendations as possible.
- C. March 19: The start time will be decided following the March 12 meeting. The committee will review any remaining subcommittee recommendations.

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen