

University of Dayton

eCommons

---

All Committee Minutes

Academic Senate Committees

---

Fall 9-7-2023

## Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2023-09-07

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)

---

# ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE (APC)

ACADEMIC SENATE  
UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON  
2023-2024

## Approved Minutes

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 2023  
11am-12pm – Roesch Library, RM 215

\*members in bold were present

### Chair: Nancy Haskell

Members: **Jen Dalton**, **Greg Elvers**, Melanie Hendrick (SGA), **Allison Kinney**, **Gul Kremer**, **Harold Merriman**, **Vincent Miller**, Lou Persiani (SGA), **Rebecca Potter**, **Andrea Seielstad**, **Todd Smith**, **Kathy Webb**, Lee Dixon (ex officio), **Amy Anderson** (ex officio), **Darden Bradshaw** (Fac Board rep)

Guests: **Carolyn Phelps**

1. Welcome, Approval of Minutes
  - a. Minutes from [8.31.23](#) approved by consensus
2. ECAS Update
  - a. No formal charge yet, but will definitely relate to the CAP 4-Year Review Process
  - b. ECAS still deciding what scope APC should take on the 4-Year Review Revision
3. CAP 4-Year Review Revision: Objectives and Minimum Requirements (HLC)
  - a. HLC goal is demonstrating continuous improvement
    - i. Course-level review is not required; HLC specifies “program review” but does not define a program – could be major, could be CAP broadly, etc.
    - ii. HLC covers grad and undergrad; Does not require external review, but expected for accredited programs
    - iii. Cares about evaluation and improvement
  - b. Frequency not specified by HLC – HLC revisions occur every 10 years
    - i. College programmatic review every 7 years
    - ii. CAP programmatic review every 5 years per senate doc
  - c. Would it be helpful to do a module review of each component?
    - i. Does this imply the same criteria for all courses in the component? (Might be challenging for Humanities)
  - d. Need the review to have value added for faculty
    - i. Workshop conversation model is more productive
    - ii. Carolyn will check if workshop report is sufficient for HLC – the feeling is probably yes, and want to show continuous improvement with pilot of workshop ideas
  - e. Some sort of data collection needs to happen
    - i. Should not be data collection for the sake of data collection (tedious); needs to funnel into a collegial, productive use (developmental not bureaucratic)

- ii. Simple questions such as whether students understand the purpose of the course are informative
    - iii. Can we use the data to inform/guide workshop discussions?
    - iv. Link questions/assessment/data collection through Isidore for efficiency?
    - v. Need to think about the data from a perspective of being useful to interpret
    - vi. Data need to be able to assist/correct problems, not just developmental
  - f. The one-size-fits all plan for assessment is very painful
    - i. Many departments have good assessment and difficult to twist to fit CAP
    - ii. A good rubric executed well implies that a grade could also be an assessment
  - g. Multi-layer structure for courses and assessment is challenging
    - i. Can we have assessment of CAP component learning objectives separate from course learning and department methods?
  - h. CAP spells out goals for components
    - i. Component-level or Institutional Learning Goals (e.g., Vocation) level assessment?
    - ii. Sampling of courses in components, for example, is fine by HLC
  - i. What have other schools done well to assess "gen ed" programs?
    - i. Denise James has done some research into gen ed program assessment\
4. Next Steps
- a. Think about the objective(s) of the review
  - b. Invite Meghan Henning to next meeting

**Next Meeting: Thursday, September 14, 11am-12pm – Roesch Library, RM 215**