

University of Dayton

eCommons

Common Academic Program Committee
Minutes

Academic Senate Committees

2019

2019-09-26 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, "2019-09-26 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes" (2019). *Common Academic Program Committee Minutes*. 163.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins/163

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

Thursday, September 26, 2019

12:30-1:45 p.m. | Kennedy Union 310

Present: Jim Brill, Heidi Gauder, Fred Jenkins (*ex officio*), Sabrina Neeley (*ex officio*), Maria Newland, Michelle Pautz, Scott Segalewitz (*ex officio*), Randy Sparks (*ex officio*), Bill Trollinger, David Watkins

Excused: Chuck Edmonson, Jon Fulkerson, Allen McGrew, Danielle Poe, John White

I. Announcements

- A. Quorum: Committee members were requested to provide notification to the CAP Office as soon as possible if they are unable to attend a meeting, especially when course reviews are scheduled.
- B. Plans for Upcoming Meetings
 1. October 7: One course review (HST 366: History of Religion in Latin America) and discussion about inconsistencies in CAP credit for transient students studying abroad
 2. October 24: Discuss report from the Diversity and Social Justice Curriculum Fellows and follow up about consultation guidelines.
 3. November 4 or 21: Discuss revisions to the subcommittee form that will be used for the 4-Year Review process to summarize subcommittees' feedback and recommendations to the full committee for courses they will review.
 4. To be scheduled: Discussion about the Catholic Intellectual Tradition and CAP.

II. Consultation Guidelines

- A. Document: Consultation guidelines from CAPC Procedures and consultation clarification from the College of Arts and Sciences' Academic Affairs Committee
- B. Discussion
 1. The committee discussed additional guidance for course proposers regarding consultation with other departments/programs/units during the course development and review process. The consultation clarification developed by the College's Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) was shared as a starting point for the committee's conversation.
 2. It was noted that the Academic Senate is working on guidance for consultation at the program level.
 3. The CAPC Procedures state that the committee can return a proposal for additional consultation if they feel that it has not been sufficient or broad enough (see CAPC Procedures, Section 4.3).
 4. The committee's discussion focused on addressing two overarching questions:
 - a. Under what circumstances should consultation be part of the CAP course development process?
 - i. A proposer should pursue consultation if the course content integrates other disciplines beyond a superficial level. Identifying areas for consultation should be based on the course content and the disciplines that will be integrated. In terms of CAP components, consultation would be particularly relevant for the Crossing Boundaries and Advanced Studies areas, as well as Diversity and Social Justice. The intent of consultation is to initiate conversations across disciplines that would serve to strengthen delivery of the course.
 - ii. Consultation would also be beneficial in terms of notifying others about the course being developed that may be of interest to students in their areas.
 - b. What is the substantive intent of consultation?
 - i. A response to a consultation request should be more than a sentence. Requests should not overburden chairs and directors; however, consultation is intended to foster conversation

5. Consultation should not be an obstacle to the course development process; it does not constitute veto power. For the CAPC to consider a CAP course proposal, it needs approval from the proposer's department and a recommendation for approval from the proposer's academic unit. If a consultation request elicits an unsupportive response, the proposer might consider following up to ask what could make the course work better to garner support.
6. The committee was supportive of the statement in the AAC's clarification about providing adequate time for consultation (recommended: one month). If no response is received after allowing adequate time, the proposer should indicate the consultation attempts in the course proposal and proceed with submitting it.
7. The CAP Office can assist proposers by identifying potential departments/programs/units to consult with and by facilitating outreach to those areas.
8. An additional aspect of consultation is whether the University Libraries have appropriate resources to support the course. This piece sometimes does not get sufficient attention during the course development process.
9. The CAP Office will prepare a draft based on the committee's discussion. Follow up conversation is tentatively scheduled for the meeting on October 24.

The meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen, CAP Office