

University of Dayton

eCommons

Common Academic Program Committee
Minutes

Academic Senate Committees

2019

2019-01-25 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, "2019-01-25 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes" (2019). *Common Academic Program Committee Minutes*. 154.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins/154

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, January 25, 2019

11:15 a.m.-12:05 p.m. | Kennedy Union 310

Present: Brad Balser, Jim Dunne, Chuck Edmonson, Heidi Gauder, Linda Hartley (*ex officio*), Brad Hoefflin, Fred Jenkins (*ex officio*), Allen McGrew, Michelle Pautz, Danielle Poe, Scott Segalewitz (*ex officio*), Randy Sparks (*ex officio*), Bill Trollinger, Diandra Walker, David Watkins

Excused: John White

I. Transcribing Cross-listed Courses

A. Discussion

1. This issue was raised during the last meeting (December 14, 2018) when the committee reviewed a cross-listed course proposal for CAP designation. Since transcript revisions must go through the Academic Senate process, the committee is following up to prepare a recommendation to the Academic Policies Committee to consider a revision. The committee recognized that this cross-listing issue is broader than CAP courses.
2. Currently, only one course prefix is listed on the transcript when a student takes a cross-listed course. Ideally, both course prefixes should appear. The committee recommends doing so for accuracy in reflecting a student's experience. An additional benefit is that students would be able to demonstrate unique interdisciplinary experiences.
3. A technical solution is available to be able to transcript cross-listed courses. It was noted, however, that it would be an "all or nothing" application. Cross-listings between an undergraduate and graduate course would present a complication because there could be a distinction in assignments depending whether a student is registered for the undergraduate or graduate course. In cases where there is such a distinction, the committee recommends that the courses be decoupled. Decoupling wouldn't prevent courses from still being taught at the same time.
4. At the conclusion of the discussion, the committee endorsed recommending that the APC consider revising UD's transcripts to list both course prefixes for cross-listed courses. The recommendation will be conveyed by sharing the meeting minutes.

II. 4-Year Review Process

- A. Document: List of 4-Year Review Subcommittee Assignments. Committee members were also referred to the Resources section of the CAPC's Isidore site and the 4-Year Review section of the CAP website for more information about the 4-Year Review process.
- B. Discussion
 1. This year's 4-Year Review reports are due January 28. At this point, 36 of the 95 reports have been submitted. A few departments have requested extensions for a handful of courses and have provided sufficient reasons for their requests.
 2. The CAP Office will post the reports and supporting documents to the committee's Isidore site as they come in. The reports will be categorized by subcommittee.
 3. Since this year is the third cycle for the review process, the committee anticipates that, overall, the reports and plans for course assessment will be better developed. It was noted that the CAP Office has done a lot of consultation with departments and individual faculty over the course of the year and has also reviewed many drafts of reports and course assessment plans.
 4. It was noted that a course could be granted reapproval for four years if it has developed a robust assessment plan and there is confidence with it being implemented, even if it has not yet been implemented. The committee took this approach last year and granted four-year reapproval for several courses in this situation.

5. The 4-Year Review process encourages reflection on the CAP course to determine if how it is being taught is aligned with the initial learning aims of the course. Faculty are encouraged to make modifications as they deem appropriate, whether they are directly related to CAP or not. Proposed modifications should be outlined in the report. As a means to encourage modifications based on a robust assessment process, the revisions go through a streamlined review process at the unit level after the CAPC approves changes. In the College of Arts and Sciences, for example, the AAC Executive Committee signs off on revisions pending objections from the full AAC. The steps of CAPC's review process for this year's cycle were mentioned:
 - a. 4-Year Review report is submitted and assigned to a subcommittee.
 - b. Subcommittee presents recommendation to full CAPC regarding reapproval (four years or two years) or questions/issues for the full committee to discuss prior to a decision about reapproval.
 - c. CAPC could request more information and/or consultation with departments/faculty members before making a decision about reapproval.
 - d. Decisions about reapproval and any feedback from the committee will be communicated to departments by May 15.
 - e. Departments/faculty members should make any revisions to the course assessment plan and/or the course proposal in CIM by September 3, 2019.
 - f. The CAP Office will review the revisions on behalf of the committee and will request clarification if they are not addressed adequately.
 - g. Once the revisions are finalized, the course will be advanced to the unit-level workflow in CIM.
6. It is up to the subcommittees to decide how to organize their work (e.g., have each member take the lead on a few courses assigned to the subcommittee or have everyone review all of them). Ultimately, the subcommittees will need to complete a one-page form for each course assigned to their group as a means to present their recommendations to the full committee.
7. Subcommittees will present their recommendations to the full committee according to the proposed schedule in Appendix A.

III. Announcements: The following updates were provided about the meeting schedule.

- A. February 1: The full committee will not meet. The meeting time will be available for subcommittees' 4-Year Review work, if they choose.
- B. February 8: The full committee will meet. The agenda will include reviewing three course proposals. Subcommittees will be able to use any remaining time, if they choose, after the course reviews are finished.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen, CAP Office

Appendix A

4-Year Review Subcommittee Presentations

Draft: 01/29/2018

Subcommittee	Date(s) to present recommendations to full CAPC*
1: Danielle, Jim, Scott	February 28, March 1
2: Randy, Bill, John	March 7-8
	March 14-15: no meetings due to Spring Break
3: Fred, Brad B., David	March 21-22
4: Heidi, Chuck, Diandra	March 28-29
5: Linda, Al, Brad H., Michelle	April 4-5

*Thursday meetings are scheduled from 12:30-1:45; Friday meetings are scheduled from 11:15-12:05. If a subcommittee doesn't complete their subcommittee recommendations during the Thursday meeting, the committee will meet again on Friday.

Please note that course reviews for new CAP approval may also need to be scheduled within the above timeframe.

The timeline for this year's 4-Year Review process stated that departments would be notified by March 25 if the CAPC has requests for more information or would like to consult with the department/faculty members about the course. **Therefore, subcommittees (particularly those scheduled to present their recommendations after March 25) are asked to flag courses early that could possibly require follow-up and notify the CAPC Chair and CAP Office as early as possible.**