

University of Dayton

eCommons

---

[All Committee Minutes](#)

[Academic Senate Committees](#)

---

Fall 9-21-2023

## **Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 09-21-2023**

University of Dayton. 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 21, 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), **Meghan Henning** (standing in for Lee Dixon)

1. Welcome, Approval of [Minutes 9.14.23](#) – approved by unanimous consent
2. ECAS update: ECAS will be soliciting feedback from standing committees regarding their charges at their meeting this Friday
  - a. Kinney will provide feedback from APC: Overall we agree with the charge, but we would push back on item #2: “What are the goals of each CAP component?”
  - b. APC should rethink goals of components *only* where relevant to assessment
  - c. A [matrix](#) containing CAP component objectives already exists, created by CAP-C
3. Discussion of Todd’s [Draft Proposal](#) for a new CAP Review Process
  - a. Agreement that CAP component is probably the right level of aggregation, and component coordinators provide reports to CAP-C (rather than individual courses reporting to CAP-C)
  - b. Debate regarding the extent of reporting on assessment required by instructors. General agreement that report writing might fall on the component coordinator (would need funding for fair compensation to component coordinators)
  - c. General recognition that revising this process will involve revising CAP-C’s job
4. Discussion of [Draft Objective + Guiding Questions](#)
  - a. Adjusted objective to be about the extent to which each CAP component is achieving its objectives rather than the extent to which each course is achieving component-related objectives – some disagreement/concern over need for course-level oversight
  - b. Discussed need for survey info from students (not just faculty assessment data)
  - c. Recognition that it can be challenging for faculty to distinguish criteria for CAP-related learning objectives as it is often also tied to discipline-specific learning objectives
  - d. Recognition that there is a distinction between “course” and “instructor” – some upper level CAP courses are tied to only one instructor... but many CAP courses are not
  - e. Need to be cognizant of workload – grace period suggested for new courses or courses being offered after extended break before being asked for assessment data
  - f. Important to take a holistic approach to thinking about why students have missed learning objectives – address at the component not the instructor/course level – formative process

**Next Meeting: Thursday, September 28, 11am-12pm – Roesch Library, RM 215**