

University of Dayton

eCommons

[All Committee Minutes](#)

[Academic Senate Committees](#)

Fall 9-14-2023

Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate 2023-09-14

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Academic Policies Committee

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

ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE (APC)

ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
2023-2024

Approved Minutes

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 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: **Meghan Henning**, **Judy Owen**

1. Welcome, Approval of [Minutes 9.7.23](#) – approved by unanimous consent
2. ECAS Update – they wrote committee charges
3. [ECAS Charge](#):
 - a. List of expected consultation in APC's charge is a minimum
 - i. Also consider unit Deans, component coordinators, and faculty
 - ii. Best to consult with broader faculty once we have a new framework
 - b. Defining goals for each CAP component is a deep rabbit hole – a [matrix](#) already exists, as created by initial CAP-C
4. Discussion of 4-Year Review Purpose:
 - a. CAP-C shouldn't do individual course reviews (workload & qualification issues). CAP-C should review content from a lower level collection... debate on who:
 - i. Departments? Concerns over time, willingness, and workload
 - ii. Units (e.g. Curriculum Review Committees or Associate Deans)?
 - iii. CAP Component Coordinators? Fund coordinators in all components?
 - b. Meghan shares goals from perspective of CAP Office:
 1. Clear meaning and productive for revision/improvement/adaption (hesitancy re connotations of "continuous improvement" phrase)
 2. Clear objective around what we're assessing with a process that matches
 3. Collect relevant data (qualitative/quantitative) by knowledgeable stakeholders
 4. Retain strengths of the current process (e.g., built in opportunities to change/reflect/adjust CLOs/decapify in a less cumbersome way)

- c. Use Isidore to embed rubric and export data as needed – could be pushed to faculty and students
 - i. One-size fits all on Isidore might be tough for some areas (e.g. arts)
 - ii. Qualitative data collect in room with other faculty might be more enjoyable/energizing
 - d. Goals: no checkboxes, not onerous, more active/meaningful
 - i. Informal/grassroots/workshops might resonate more with some faculty
 - ii. Checkbox/forms maybe keeps some faculty at least minimally attached
 - e. Need to also collect some feedback from students on the components – offers a different lens that doesn't always match faculty perspective
5. Next steps: continue to discuss an objective and a define a process consistent with charge from ECAS

Next Meeting: Thursday, September 21, 11am-12pm – Roesch Library, RM 215