

University of Dayton

eCommons

Common Academic Program Committee
Minutes

Academic Senate Committees

2020

2020-08-31 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes

University of Dayton. Common Academic Program Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins



CAP Committee
Monday, August 31, 2020
2:30-3:20 p.m. via Zoom

Present: James Brill, Anne Crecelius, Jon Fulkerson, Heidi Gauder, Fred Jenkins (*ex officio*), Andrea Koziol, Sabrina Neeley (*ex officio*), Maria Newland, Michelle Pautz, Danielle Poe, Tim Reissman, Scott Segalewitz (*ex officio*), Randy Sparks (*ex officio*), Bill Trollinger, David Watkins

- I. **Committee Membership:** Committee members introduced themselves. New members this year include the following: Anne Crecelius (faculty representative for the School of Education and Health Sciences), Andrea Koziol (faculty representative for the Natural Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences; serving while Allen McGrew is on sabbatical), and Tim Reissman (faculty representative for the School of Engineering). Appreciation was expressed for all committee members' willingness to serve.
- II. **Chairperson Election:** A motion was made and seconded for Bill Trollinger to continue serving as chair for the 2020-21 academic year. It was approved by a vote of 10 in favor-0 opposed-1 abstention.
- III. **CAPC Overview and Committee's Work for the Fall**
 - A. With the Common Academic Program being at the core of UD's undergraduate curriculum, the committee's ongoing responsibilities fall into the two main categories listed below. The committee's workload is typically lighter during the fall semester. The fall schedule has been set with weekly meetings, though some may be cancelled.
 1. Approve new course proposals for CAP after evaluating the fit for the selected component(s). Proposers and chairs are invited to discuss the proposals with the committee and respond to questions. The committee approved the 500th new CAP course last spring.
 2. 4-Year Review: Review reports about assessment of student learning in the courses and make decisions about renewal for CAP (four years, two years, or remove CAP designation). This work primarily takes place in the spring semester after the report due date in late January (this year on January 22, 2021). Some updates were provided about last year's cycle and plans for this year.
 - a. This fall the committee will review some appeals from the 2019-20 review cycle where courses received two-year reapprovals. Michelle Pautz reported that she gave an update to the Provost's Council over the summer that included a summary of 4-Year Review outcomes. They appreciated that it is a meaningful process.
 - b. Michelle provided an update on REL 103's review from last year. Resulting from several conversations with the new chair and undergraduate coordinator, it was determined that some of the assessment work that had been done wasn't reflected in the materials submitted last spring. They are having conversations about revising the course learning objectives and it is likely that the department will submit an appeal for the committee to reconsider the two-year reapproval.
 - c. The starting number for the 2020-21 review cycle was 95 courses. It has been adjusted so far to 90 courses due to two-year deferral requests. It is likely there will be some additional deferral requests as well as departmental decisions to remove courses from CAP.
 - d. This year's cycle includes courses from 18 departments and programs, with the majority from the College of Arts and Sciences. The School of Engineering doesn't have any departments involved this year, and the Schools of Education and Health Sciences and Business Administration each have one.
 - e. The CAP Office and leadership of the Academic Senate and Academic Policies Committee received communications recently from a small number of faculty members from the same department with concerns about proceeding with the review process, which resulted in the

Academic Senate leadership's preliminary stance to suspend the review process this year. Michelle reported that she had conversations with the APC chair and also the full APC last week. While being sensitive to faculty workload issues, especially with the current environment and challenges as a result of the pandemic, Michelle proposed a middle-ground approach to make reasonable accommodations with the review process in order to prevent losing ground with the improvements and engagement with assessment of student learning over the last few years. The Provost's Office supports this approach, as they also have concerns from a HLC standpoint if 4-Year Review were to be suspended this year. Reasonable accommodations might include granting extensions for submitting reports or a year's delay in individual cases and allowing departments that have been doing assessment to omit data for Fall 2020 in the course reports.

- f. The committee expressed support for making reasonable accommodations this year on a case-by-case basis and noted that suspending the process this year would add to everyone's workload (departments and CAPC) next year unless adjustments would also be made to the review schedules going forward. They discussed the importance of assessment and continuing the momentum around building a culture of assessment and feel that suspending the review process this year would be detrimental to those efforts. It was noted that departments had advance notice in June about the upcoming cycle and faculty will have plenty of time to prepare course reports since the due date is in late January. The committee expressed an interest to have courses proceed with the process this year if they previously received two-year reapproval during the initial review.
 - g. Michelle will convey the committee's perspectives to the APC chair, Senate president, and the provost. If the middle-ground approach is approved, she will reach out to each department chair to discuss their situation. The CAP Office will offer workshops for departments as needed and will also meet with faculty individually to answer questions about the review process. A department workshop has already been scheduled with Religious Studies faculty who have courses up for review this year.
- B. In addition to the two primary areas of the committee's work noted above, there is also an occasional need to have proactive discussion about specific issues related to CAP implementation. It was noted that the committee will need to address the following.
- 1. Catholic Intellectual Tradition (CIT) and CAP: The committee has had previous conversations and will need to continue with respect to challenges evaluating course proposals for the Advanced Studies component. Advanced Studies proposals are supposed to include evidence that the CIT will be addressed in the course.
 - 2. Diversity and Social Justice (DSJ) Component: The committee has also had previous conversations and will need to continue in order to "unpack" this advanced component, as well as discuss the relation to efforts to be an anti-racist university. Youssef Farhat has been appointed as the inaugural DSJ component coordinator and will be invited to have a conversation with the committee.
 - 3. "Too Big to Fail" Courses: The committee raised questions during 4-Year Reviews last spring about the possible outcome of not reapproving specific courses that all undergraduates are required to take, such as foundational courses and capstones. It was agreed at that time that the committee would take up the issue this fall.

IV. Next Meeting

- A. Monday, September 14: The meeting will remain on the schedule and a decision to confirm or cancel will be made closer to the date.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen, CAP Office