

Fall 10-25-2021

## Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate 2021-10-25

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Academic Policies Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_cmte\\_mins](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Academic Policies Committee, "Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate 2021-10-25" (2021). *All Committee Minutes*. 448.  
[https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_cmte\\_mins/448](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/448)

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

## **APC Minutes**

**October 25, 2021**

Met by Zoom

<https://udayton.zoom.us/j/83021521161?pwd=dXNSMjFHRnZTZHVhUjlyRkovdkJwdz09>

**Committee Members: Phil Anloague (ex officio); Philip Appiah-Kubi; Deb Bickford (ex officio); Laurel Bird; Jenna Borrelli; Art Busch; Ali Carr-Chellman; Trevor Collier; Jennifer Dalton; Neomi DeAnda (chair); Greg Elvers; Harold Merriman; Jason Pierce; Dan Reyes; Sarah Webber**

Guests: Michelle Pautz (Assistant Provost for CAP), Judy Owen, CAP Coordinator, Elizabeth Mackay (Humanities Commons Coordinator, in her second year as coordinator), Youssef Farhat (DSJ Coordinator)

1:30 pm Approval of minutes from October 18, 2021. 1 abstention, 12 approved.

1:33 pm Follow up on “Working”

1. **Possible language: to provide more clarity to the wording in the five year review**
  - a. **working:** are there aspects of the program that you think should remain as is or with only minor changes because they seem to be achieving desired student outcomes, based on what you can see? Any recommended minor changes?
  - b. **not working:** are there aspects of the program (or the part you are reviewing/assessing) that you would like to see improved, along with ideas you have on what those desired improvements might be?
2. Instead of asking “is it working,” we would substitute the questions in place of where it used to say “is it working”?
3. A unanimous vote was taken on substituting the language.
4. **Should it be moved into the 5 year plan?** Yes

1:45 pm Conversation with CAP Coordinators of Components being Assessed this Year

1. Interim report is due on December 3, final report due on March 4.
2. Elizabeth has been doing a lot of reading and collecting data for the 8 different courses that comprise the Humanities Commons. She has a rough draft of her review that focuses on the 3 important questions from the review document. She hopes to have the draft ready for the humanities chairs so that they can

review the report before it is handed in. She posed a question to the body:

- a. Her plan is to cite evidence from individual courses, but doesn't want it to be too long. What are we looking for in this? Overall, individual course evidence is not what we are looking for, but much broader pieces.
- b. These are 8 distinct courses, and so there is a challenge to figure out what level of detail to include. The data is created by 8 distinct courses.
- c. In Youssef's case, there are a couple of hundred courses that constitute the diversity and social justice component.
- d. Liz talked about some big claims. One thing that has changed since the 2017 interim report-- then there were 5 humanities commons courses; now there are 8 (in part, changes in English department courses). They can make the claim that the humanities commons is the foundational common experience of students. They collectively provide access to all seven ILG's.
- e. She and the humanities chairs are still working on her recommendations-- there is nothing they feel confident in sharing at this point.

- f. Recommendations can come from the content of courses, process, staging, and much more
- 3. Since this is the first of the five year process, we can expect we will be learning from this process and improving the process over time.
- 4. Youssef:
  - a. Youssef will not be convening a group to assess the component. First, he is sensitive to DEI and DSJ work of colleagues across campus, and he is trying not to tax them any more. Second, Youssef is building on the work of the diversity ILG working group. He is willing to work with someone from APC to go over all the documentation he already has.
  - b. The diversity ILG working group engaged in a survey and collected data from 23 sections of 18 courses, giving a significant number of responses from different schools. They created a report that was presented to the Provost Office within the past two weeks.
  - c. In the future, he is hoping to engage faculty who teach a DSJ CAP course to participate in a workshop in the future. He hopes to launch the report as a town hall open space. The data would not be ready for the

March 1 deadline.

5. Art and capstone group
  - a. Will be meeting this Thursday
  - b. They will attempt to get feedback from faculty teaching the capstone courses; it might be more challenging to get feedback from the students
  - c. They will try to collect data over the end of this semester and the beginning of the next semester
  - d. Because there are so many different courses, and assessed differently, might be hard to synthesize the data they can collect

2:10 pm **General overview of CAP in each of 5 years**

1. What information will we be wanting from the CAP office? Is there data we need for our synthesis and analysis?
2. Should APC be weighing in on how we think we should assess CAP?
3. How would the shift change to big picture issues moving forward, not just

checking a box. How do we design goals that are forward-looking and can move us forward faster?

4. How do we design an assessment that reflects where we want CAP to be in the future? Where should CAP go in the next five years and how do we position it to be able to address where we want it to be in five years?
5. What do we want for general education in the future at UD?
  - a. Can there be an iterative process whereby the APC develops a deeper understanding of the component specific dilemmas, issues, and opportunities, and then we can weigh in from an organizational perspective while drawing on the expertise of the coordinators?
  - b. As an institution and through the Senate, we have decided that the ILGs are the foundation of our academic mission-- those will be crucial to understanding and providing the structure for an overview. The ILGs provide coherence for these different pieces (for institutional website, see <https://udayton.edu/provost/ilg/index.php>)
  - c. We don't have CAP ILG's-- they are university ILG's, linked to CAP and also courses in the major. We have not yet operationalized what these should mean. How do we provide the meta-level assessments."

There are two providing information to faculty: vocation and DSJ.

- d. In light of the complexity of trying to map these to the ILGs, should part of the more meta-level evaluation.
  - e. Who is responsible for assessing the ILGs? Is it this group or another one that needs to be formed?
6. There was some conversation about the extent to which the coordinators should focus upon the ILGs. The humanities commons has a special relationship with the ILGs and will need to address what is “knowable” given our current level of sophistication around assessment of the ILGs, and address what might be put in place in the future so that in the next five year round of assessments, we can build on what we know and address issues with more intentionality. Neomi reiterated that we do not expect the coordinators to resolve these ambiguities when they are not resolvable at this point in our learning curve around assessment/program evaluation.

**Commented [1]:** Neomi, I got the first question

**Commented [2]:** but not the second....