

2014

2014-04-07 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes

University of Dayton. Common Academic Program Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Common Academic Program Committee, "2014-04-07 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes" (2014). *Common Academic Program Committee Minutes*. Paper 44.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins/44

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 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu.

Minutes of the Common Academic Program Committee (CAPC)

Date: April 7, 2014

Location: LTC Forum

Present:

Don Pair	Juan Santamarina
Elizabeth Gustafson (<i>ex-officio</i>)	Kathryn Kinnucan-Welsch (<i>ex-officio</i>)
Fred Jenkins (<i>ex-officio</i>)	Leno Pedrotti
Jim Dunne	Keri Brown Kirschman
Joan Plungis	Sawyer Hunley

Absent:

Scott Schneider
Stephen Brown
Riad Alakkad (*ex-officio*)
Dominic Sanfilippo
John White
Jennifer Creech

Guests:

Allen McGrew, Andrea Koziol, Daniel Goldman, Joe Mashburn, John Inglis, Laura Leming, Leslie Picca, Mehdi Zargham, Jennifer Davis-Berman, Paul Tibbetts

Note: At meeting start, there was not a quorum. Committee discussed courses and postponed voting until a quorum was achieved.

A. Review of MTH 114 Contemporary Mathematics

1. Discussion:
 - a. Course was noted as well written.
 - b. Note was made that the Critical Evaluation of our Times SLO is suggested in the CAP but not required. Proposer was asked whether this was considered as an SLO for the course.
 - i. Proposer noted that in prior CAP approved Math courses, the inclusion of this SLO was questioned so although more explicit in this course, proposer did not want it to be a required element.
 - c. It was noted that an addition to how this course relates to other CAP courses might have been that students will likely use the applied math in other courses in the capstone, however, this is not a requirement for approval.
2. Vote:
 - a. Motion and second motion were made for approval
 - b. 7-0-0 (for, against, abstained)

B. Review of SOC 328 Racial&Eth Relations

1. Discussion:
 - a. A committee member noted that diversity was very clear/obvious but found no social justice reference in the course. It was noted that this might be implied in context of the course.
 - b. Also noted was that the content of Catholic Social Teaching would seem a natural fit but was not found.
 - i. Proposer stated that there is clearly a social justice component – addressing diversity as beneficial to community as a whole
 - ii. Committee members discussed areas in the proposal which did seem to address social justice and also discussed the suggestion that it could be supplemented

Minutes of the Common Academic Program Committee (CAPC)

Date: April 7, 2014

Location: LTC Forum

- with an additional comment in the “how the course will meet the component” section
 - iii. It was noted that more explicit inclusion of Catholic Social Teaching, although perhaps appropriate, is not required
2. Vote:
- a. Motion and second motion were made for approval.
 - b. 7-0-0 (for, against, abstained)

C. Review of SWK 307 Mental Health Serv

1. Discussion:
- a. Committee members recognized this as a good course.
 - i. Mention was made that the committee should distinguish between a course which is good as opposed to one which meets the CAP requirements
 - b. A committee member noted a need for better articulation of how course meets the Critical Evaluation of our Times SLO
 - i. Committee discussed the difference between a course addressing an SLO as opposed to fulfilling the entire SLO and whether the course needs to fully fulfill or whether it may simply contribute in a meaningful way to the SLO.
 - 1. It was stated that one interpretation is that students are expected to achieve the SLOs over the course of their education as opposed to fully addressing the full scope of the SLO; that the CAPC should look to see whether the course contributes in a meaningful way to the SLO
 - c. It was noted that this course could be the place for addressing Catholic Social Teaching but that this would not be an approval consideration
 - i. The proposal chair noted that many related departmental conversations have occurred and that many faculty feel that they are being disingenuous when putting that in as they do not feel competent to teach Catholic Social Teaching;
 - 1. A lengthy discussion was held related to this topic. Committee members were not in full agreement as to whether the SLO should be addressed in its entirety, particularly with regard to Catholic Social Teaching in light of faculty perception of lack of expertise. It will be important for the campus to engage in conversation around this issue
 - 2. It was noted that the SLO does not require faculty to teach CST, but that the SLO says “informed by familiarity with...”
 - 3. It was also noted that students will take a Crossing Boundaries Faith Traditions course which will more fully address this aspect
2. Vote:
- a. Motion and second motion were made for approval.
 - b. 7-0-0 (for, against, abstained)

D. Review of GEO 109 Earth, Environ&Soc

1. Discussion:
- a. It was noted that more clarity is needed in the section “how you determine students achieve SLOs”. Description should be broken down more by the three SLOs as it is very general; would like to see criteria for each SLO

Minutes of the Common Academic Program Committee (CAPC)

Date: April 7, 2014

Location: LTC Forum

- i. Recommendation was made to include an example “for example, one way we would cover the SLO would be...” for each SLO
 - b. It was noted that in the section “how course relates to other courses in CAP” – it does not mention any other CAP courses.
 - i. Recommendation was made to add that it complements the Humanities Commons courses
 - ii. Also recommended note that students will take inquiry courses in the sciences later on which will be building upon this course
 1. Proposer could revised the course objectives“ to be incorporated into the section that asks for criteria for evaluating student performance on the targeted SLOs
 - c. The lab for this course is not yet completed.
 2. Vote:
 - a. Motion and second motion were made for approval with minor revisions
 - i. Add more specific information or examples for evaluation related to SLOs
 - ii. Insert that it complements the humanities commons courses and also what other courses might build upon this course (i.e., future inquiry courses)
 - b. 6-0-0 (for, against, abstained)

E. Review of GEO 218 Geol Site Inv Engrs Cat II Nat Science & Inquiry

1. Discussion:
 - a. It was noted that the proposal was well done in terms of how it will satisfy the components and three of the SLOs but that the proposal did not appear to have content on skills for the Community SLO and that students working in groups is not enough –
 - i. Proposer noted that the course does include peer evaluation but that he could drop this SLO if it is not adequately addressed as there is not adequate class time to build beyond this
2. There is no lab for this course
3. Vote:
 - a. Motion and second motion were made for approval with minor revision
 - i. Removal of the Community SLO
 - b. 6-0-0 (for, against, abstained)

F. Review of PHL 322 Phl Thr Dnc: Hum Id

1. Discussion:
 - a. Proposer noted she would like to cross-list with Theatre 322
 - i. It was stated that the AAC did not approve the course as cross-listed and further that cross listing is not necessary with CAP
 - b. Proposal was noted as complete and that it satisfies components and SLOs
 - c. Proposer was asked to say a few words about Catholic Intellectual Tradition
 - i. Proposer noted that the course teaches tolerance, empathy and understanding of diverse individuals particularly those who are oppressed or marginalized
 - d. Proposer was asked to clarify whether the course has specific content related to the Community SLO
 - i. Proposer noted there is specific research on identity issues in the community plus the team work component to get along with people of all identities
2. Vote:

Minutes of the Common Academic Program Committee (CAPC)

Date: April 7, 2014

Location: LTC Forum

- a. Motion and second motion were made for approval
- b. 6-0-0 (for, against, abstained)

G. Review of PHL 378 Concept of the Self

- 1. Discussion:
 - a. It was noted that the proposal is for the Inquiry component
 - i. to address the inquiry component the course needs to include a reflective component that also compares and contrasts methodologies used in the course with those used in the students' major; and
 - 1. It was noted that the Inquiry component does not require that the course be Inquiry for all majors, can be specific to certain disciplines
- 2. Vote:
 - a. Motion and second motion were made for approval as an inquiry course with revisions
 - i. Add a line or two to make it clear the manner in which students will compare/contrast methodologies of their discipline with that of the course
 - ii. Be clear that the course will not fulfill the CAP inquiry component for philosophy majors
 - b. 6-0-0 (for, against, abstained)

A. Review of CPS 450 Des&Anal of Alg

- 1. Discussion:
 - a. Committee discussed that the course objectives and course description are inconsistent with later sections regarding meeting the CAP components
 - i. Committee noted that more is needed to address contemporary issues and problems - how students would apply these methods; it is not clear whether the problems students will research are related, so examples are needed.
 - b. Course was noted as having huge potential but that proposer may need to consult with CAPC committee members and other resources on campus to pull in the social issues piece and to address how Vocation could work with modifications
- 2. Course was withdrawn by the proposer for resubmission in the future.

I. Review of HST 343 Hst-Civil Engr was postponed until 4/14

J. Next meeting: Monday, April 14, 2014