

10-15-2012

Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2012-10-15

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee, "Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2012-10-15" (2012). *All Committee Minutes*. Paper 160.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/160

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.

Minutes of the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate

October 15 2012

KU 311

Present: Paul Benson, Deb Bickford, Vinod Jain, Sarah Kerns, Laura Leming, Leno Pedrotti, Paul Vanderburgh, John White

Absent: Paul Bobrowski, Jim Dunne, Kurt Mosser, Karen Swisher, Anthony Whaley

Guests: Sawyer Hunley, Juan Santamarina

Minutes: Minutes of the October 1, 2012 meeting of the Academic Policies Committee were approved.

Announcements: The next two meeting of the APC will be on Monday October 29 from 11am-12pm and Monday November 12 from 11am-12pm.

Old Business: Juan Santamarina, Chair of the Committee on the Common Academic Program and Competencies (CAPCC) brought the procedures manual developed by CAPCC to the APC for discussion and possible approval. Discussion of the provisions in the manual ensued. As a result of that discussion the APC unanimously agreed to approve all but section 4.8 (see discussion below) of the procedures manual, provided that the APC incorporate the following changes and suggestions into the manual.

1. Modify the description of timelines in Section 3 to emphasize that the timelines under consideration in that section refer to meeting schedules and timelines for the completion of CAPCC business not related to the processing of course proposals. Timelines associated with the processing of course proposals are detailed in Section 4 of the procedures manual.
2. Consider removing the overlapping language in Section 2.2.3 and Section 4.5. Section 4.5 should refer to voting on course proposals, while section 2.2.3 should govern all votes of the CAPCC.
3. Change the beginning of the first sentence of Section 4.4 from “Written comments” to “Any written comments”
4. Add the word “offered” to the sentence under Section 4.9. That is, change “...will monitor the number of CAP courses to ensure...” to “...will monitor the number of CAP courses offered to ensure...”
5. Look for instances of references to the Assistant Provost for the Academic Program and the Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to ensure that not mentioning representatives from the Schools in those references is appropriate. (Is the reference taken directly from the approved Senate CAP document?)

Leno Pedrotti suggested that, since there was limited time left in the meeting, consideration of Section 4.8 of the CAPCC of the procedures manual, entitled “Time Limitations of Approvals”, be more fully taken up at a future APC meeting. This suggestion met with approval and, consequently, Section 4.8 was not approved along with the rest of the procedures manual. A brief discussion of Section 4.8 then took place. Laura Leming voiced concern that requiring a renewal of course approval every three years might place an unnecessarily large workload on departments. She wondered whether a delay in the first re-approval date might help alleviate this problem. Juan Santamarina indicated that the renewal process for unchanged CAP course is intended to be nearly automatic and not time consuming. It was noted that the language in the procedures manual did not clearly elucidate the nature of the renewal process. Paul Benson wondered about the meaning of “other similar information” in the statement in Section 4.8 that reads “The faculty and department will be asked to submit a sample syllabus for the course or other similar information for CAPCC approval.” Vinod Jain asked whether the time period in the restriction that courses are to approved for a time period of 3 years from the date of approval by the CAPCC should be changed to a time period of three years from the date in which the course was first offered. It was agreed that Section 4.8 would be discussed at a future APC meeting. The unanimous APC approval, subject to the changes listed in these minutes,

of all parts of the CAPCC procedures manual except for Section 4.8, allows the CAPCC to begin processing course proposals.

New Business: None.

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 am.

Submitted by Leno Pedrotti