

University of Dayton

eCommons

---

Common Academic Program Committee  
Minutes

Academic Senate Committees

---

2019

## 2019-02-28 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes

University of Dayton. Common Academic Program Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc\\_mins](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Common Academic Program Committee, "2019-02-28 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes" (2019). *Common Academic Program Committee Minutes*. 168.  
[https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc\\_mins/168](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins/168)

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](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu), [mschlangen1@udayton.edu](mailto:mschlangen1@udayton.edu).



## **CAP Committee**

**Friday, February 8, 2019**

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

**Present:** Brad Balser, Jim Dunne, Chuck Edmonson, Heidi Gauder, Fred Jenkins (*ex officio*), Allen McGrew, Michelle Pautz, Danielle Poe, Scott Segalewitz (*ex officio*), Randy Sparks (*ex officio*), Bill Trollinger, John White

**Excused:** Linda Hartley (*ex officio*), Brad Hoefflin, Diandra Walker, David Watkins

**Guests:** Joy Kadowaki, Molly Sayre

- 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) SOC 324: Communities and Crime**

- A. Course Proposal Information:
  - 1. Proposer: Joy Kadowaki was present.
  - 2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Practical Ethical Action, Diversity and Social Justice
  - 3. Institutional Learning Goals: Diversity (expanded), Community (expanded), Practical Wisdom (expanded)
- B. Discussion:
  - 1. The committee had positive feedback about the proposal overall – that it was well done and the information is clearly mapped.
- 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: 7-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

### **2) SOC 380/SWK 380: Health and Inequality (cross-listed)**

- A. Course Proposal Information:
  - 1. Proposer: Molly Sayre was present.
  - 2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Practical Ethical Action, Diversity and Social Justice
  - 3. Institutional Learning Goals: Diversity (expanded), Practical Wisdom (expanded)
- B. Discussion:
  - 1. The committee had positive feedback about the proposal overall – that it was well done and the information is clearly mapped.
- C. Committee's Actions:
  - 3. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
  - 4. Vote: 8-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). (Another committee member arrived following the vote on the previous proposal.)

### **3) ENG 335: African American Literature**

- A. Course Proposal Information:
  - 1. Proposer: Tom Morgan was not available to attend and the department was not able to send a representative due to a conflicting meeting with a faculty candidate. The proposer and department chair did not have any objections to the committee proceeding with the review.
  - 2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Practical Ethical Action, Diversity and Social Justice
  - 3. Institutional Learning Goals: Diversity (advanced), Community (expanded), Practical Wisdom (expanded), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (expanded)

- B. Discussion:
  1. The committee thought that the course content fits well with the two proposed components.
  2. Trying to address four different Institutional Learning Goals in the course could be a challenge; however, the committee thought the selection seemed very intentional.
  3. The committee requested a minor revision for the CLOs to include explicit language about ethics in order to strengthen the proposal and the connection to the Crossing Boundaries-Practical Ethical Action component and the Practical Wisdom ILG. The committee suggested that CLO 3 might be an appropriate place to incorporate ethics.
- C. Committee's Actions:
  1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal pending the minor revision noted above. There was no further discussion.
  2. Vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). (Another committee member arrived following the vote on the previous proposal.)
  3. The CAP Office will follow up with the proposer and department chair and work with them to update the proposal in CIM.

## II. 4-Year Review Process

- A. Subcommittee presentation schedule (01/29/2019 draft)
- B. Discussion
  1. The committee discussed the issue of how explicitly the ILGs should be addressed in 4-Year Review reports. Some context was provided that the terminology changed from Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) to Institutional Learning Goals (ILGs) in Fall 2017 in recognition that the statements aren't assessable the way they're currently written. HIR Working Groups have been formed to help operationalize the ILGs. Three have been formed so far: Vocation, Practical Wisdom, and Vocation.
  2. In further discussion it was noted that the 4-Year Review process focuses on assessing Course Learning Objectives (CLOs). The connection to the ILGs is implicit as a result of mapping the CLOs to the ILGs. In recent years the CAPC has done more to encourage stronger CLOs so that they are set up to be assessable. In providing feedback on 4-Year Review reports, the committee can provide suggestions for strengthening CLOs, if needed, and can ask for clarification about the CLO mapping if it doesn't seem to make sense.
  3. The section of the 4-Year Review report that asks for CLO mapping only requires listing the CLO numbers associated with each ILG. The committee will discuss changes to the report form before the end of the semester and can revisit whether or not to ask for a rationale for the mapping going forward.
  4. Logistics for subcommittees to present their recommendations to the full committee were reviewed. Subcommittees are expected to complete the one-page form for each course they review. Those reports should be submitted to the CAP Office at least one day prior to the meeting when they are scheduled to present. The CAP Office will share them with the full committee via Isidore.
  5. Committee members were reminded of this year's timeline for the 4-Year Review process – that departments are to be notified by March 25 if any additional information is needed for a course being reviewed or if the committee would like to consult with the department and faculty members before the end of the semester. As such, subcommittees (particularly subcommittees 4 and 5 that are scheduled to present after March 25) should notify the CAP Office as soon as possible if they have any courses that might fall under this category.
  6. The committee discussed the possibility of providing 4-Year Review reports as models. The committee was reluctant to do so last year, but could consider providing a range of examples, with faculty members' permission, going forward

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen, CAP Office