

University of Dayton

eCommons

---

Common Academic Program Committee  
Minutes

Academic Senate Committees

---

2021

## 2021-02-26 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes

University of Dayton. Common Academic Program Committee

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

---



## CAP Committee

Friday, February 26, 2021

11:15 a.m.-1:10 p.m. via Zoom

**Present:** Anne Crecelius, Jon Fulkerson, Heidi Gauder, Fred Jenkins (*ex officio*), Al McGrew, Drew Moyer, Maria Newland, Michelle Pautz, Tim Reissman, Scott Segalewitz (*ex officio*), Randy Sparks (*ex officio*), Bill Trollinger, David Watkins

**Excused:** James Brill, Danielle Poe, Sabrina Neeley (*ex officio*)

**Guests:** Jeff Burges, Youssef Farhat

### I. Course Review

#### 1) MIL 302: Leading Small Organizations II

##### A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Proposer/Chair: Jeff Burges was present.
2. Component: Diversity and Social Justice.
3. Institutional Learning Goals: Diversity (expanded), Practical Wisdom (expanded)

##### B. Discussion:

1. Appreciation was expressed for the collaboration with Youssef Farhat and Tom Morgan. Their involvement in the consultation process strengthened the proposal.
2. The committee thought that the proposal was well developed.

##### 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: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

### II. Advanced Studies Course Review Guidelines

A. Overview: The chairs from the Departments of History, Philosophy, and Religious Studies raised some concerns last semester about the rubrics that CAPC uses to evaluate Advanced Studies course proposals. They were requesting clarification to ensure that courses being considered for these components are drawing upon the disciplinary perspectives of History, Philosophy, or Religious Studies. Since the rubrics use verbatim language from the CAP Senate document, revisions to the content would require Academic Senate discussion. To address the chairs' concerns, existing language in the rubrics was reformatted for emphasis, as follows (bold/underline added): **Courses offered outside the Departments of Philosophy, Religious Studies, and History may count towards the advanced religious, philosophical, and historical studies requirements if the courses draw extensively from those disciplinary perspectives and address in significant ways aspects of the Catholic intellectual tradition.** (The individual guidelines for each Advanced Studies area reference the respective department.) In addition to the proposed reformatting, the discussion with the chairs included the need for robust consultation and collaboration in the course development process for courses being considered for the Advanced Studies components.

#### B. Discussion

1. The committee was supportive of the formatting changes to the Advanced Studies rubrics.
2. While the goal is to stick to the language from the CAP Senate Document from when CAP was created, a broader discussion may be needed, particularly in light of transfer credit conversations related to CAP. For example, there are limits with the departments that can

propose courses for the Natural Sciences component (Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geology, and Physics). With those limitations, would a student from a larger institution with an Astronomy department be restricted from transferring credit to count for CAP-Natural Sciences? If and when the CAP Senate Document is reviewed, it should be done in alignment with other institutional priorities as well maintaining the integrity of CAP.

**III. 4-Year Review Process:** All 72 4-Year Review reports have been submitted at this point. A number of courses had been granted extensions.

- A. Procedural Discussion: The committee revisited the approach it has taken that courses going through the review process can be reapproved for four years with an assessment plan that has not yet been implemented. For the sake of consistency and with the current review cycle being underway, the committee agreed to have further conversation in April in order to communicate higher expectations to departments going forward that reports must include empirical evidence, though not necessarily raw data, to support whether or not students are achieving course learning goals. The following are highlights from the discussion and suggestions that were offered.
1. It has only been in the past couple of years that approval letters for new CAP courses included explicit expectations for assessment. The committee can review that messaging, as well as the 4-Year Review report form and the communication sent to departments in early June when they are notified about the next year's review cycle.
  2. With a course being reapproved for four years without having any data yet, could the committee request an interim report? It could be brief rather than a comprehensive report.
  3. The committee needs to consider the implications of situations where courses aren't being taught within a two-year window.
  4. Workshops could be offered on developing course assessment plans, as well as good assessment methods. Prior to the pandemic, the CAP Office offered a 4-Year Review workshop each semester that was structured along those lines. The CAP Office has been in conversation with the Provost's Office and the College of Arts and Sciences about offering assessment workshops that would be broader than CAP. Courses receiving two-year reapprovals could be a target audience for future workshops.
  5. "Assessment with Friends" sessions could be offered in addition to informational workshops. These could be work sessions to assist faculty with things like analyzing data they have already collected.
  6. The committee recognized that there has been a great deal of improvement with each 4-Year Review cycle and that faculty are generally taking the reflective aspect seriously to improve courses.
  7. Rather than focusing on assessment in general, it was suggested that the committee needs to emphasize the context of CAP components more in the review process. In response, it was noted that the committee reviews the degree to which CLOs align with components during the initial CAP approval process. The committee could look at strengthening the review of assessment plans as new courses are approved for CAP.
- B. Subcommittees 1 and 2 presented recommendations for a total of 17 courses. The CAP Office will compile the subcommittee's feedback, as well as additional feedback from the entire committee, which will be shared with the respective departments when the committee's decisions (reapproval for four years, conditional reapproval for two years, or non-renewal) are communicated by May 14. The notification letters will include standardized language as much as possible to capture the different types of issues the committee has noted.
- C. The following information includes only the committee's decision and corresponding vote for each course, as well as any changes to CAP components or Institutional Learning Goals. All reapprovals

will be contingent upon the requisite updates being made in CIM by September 3, 2021 in response to the committee's feedback. The committee voted using a Google Form and submitted their votes at the end of the meeting.

- a. *REL 256: Faith Traditions: Prayer*: 4-year reapproval; vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). The committee approved the addition of Advanced Religious Studies as a third component. The department is making component changes for several of the courses so that they will count for both Crossing Boundaries-Faith Traditions and Advanced Religious Studies.
- b. *REL 270: Popular Culture, American Religions*: 4-year reapproval; vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). The committee approved the addition of Advanced Religious Studies as a third component.
- c. *REL 315: The Gospels*: 4-year reapproval; vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). The committee approved the addition of Crossing Boundaries-Faith Traditions as a second component, replacing Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry.
- d. *REL 328: United States Catholic Experience*: 2-year reapproval; vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). The committee approved the addition of Crossing Boundaries-Faith Traditions as a third component.
- e. *REL 329: African-American Religion*: 2-year reapproval; vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). The committee approved the addition of Crossing Boundaries-Faith Traditions as a third component.
- f. *REL 363: Faith & Justice*: 4-year reapproval; vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). While this course wasn't identified as having a model report, it was strong enough that it might be highlighted as an example to follow within the department.
- g. *REL 369: Christian Ethics and Engineering*: 4-year reapproval; vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).
- h. *REL 374: Visual and Material Cultures of Religion*: 2-year reapproval; vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). The committee approved the addition of Crossing Boundaries-Faith Traditions as a second component, replacing Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry.
- i. *REL 379/VAR 379: Sustaining Art and Faith*: 4-year reapproval; vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). The committee approved the addition of Crossing Boundaries-Faith Traditions as a second component, replacing Crossing Boundaries-Integrative.
- j. *REL 408: Islam in the Muslim World*: 4-year reapproval; vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). The committee approved the addition of Crossing Boundaries-Faith Traditions as a third component.
- k. *REL 443: The Sacraments*: 4-year reapproval; vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).
- l. *ENG 499: Capstone*: 4-year reapproval; vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). The course is completing a second review after receiving two-year reapproval in 2017-18.
- m. *PHL 312: Ethics*: 4-year reapproval; vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).
- n. *PHL 321: Environmental Ethics*: 4-year reapproval; vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).
- o. *PHL 341: Hip Hop and Philosophy*: 4-year reapproval; vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). The course was identified as having a model report.
- p. *PHL 347: Japanese Philosophy*: 4-year reapproval; vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention). The committee approved changing the developmental level for the Scholarship ILG from advanced to expanded.
- q. *PHL 371: Philosophy & Human Rights*: 4-year reapproval; vote: 9-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

#### **IV. Announcements**

##### **A. Plans for March meetings**

1. March 5: recommendations from Subcommittees 3 and 4.
2. March 12: 7 new course reviews and recommendations from Subcommittee 5.
3. March 19: It is likely that the meeting will be cancelled.
4. March 26: Subcommittees 1 and 2 will complete their recommendations.

##### **B. The CAP Office's goal is to send the committee's decision letters in mid-April. The committee was reminded that subcommittees communicate any significant issues with 4-Year Review reports as soon as possible so that the CAP Office can reach out to departments to request clarification. The committee was also reminded to be as detailed as possible with comments in the subcommittee reports so that feedback can be incorporated into the decision letters.**

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen, CAP Office