

2015

2015-03-23 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, "2015-03-23 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes" (2015). *Common Academic Program Committee Minutes*. 121.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins/121

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, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

CAP COMMITTEE

Monday, March 23, 2015 | 1:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m.; Kennedy Union 310

Present: Riad Alakkad (*ex officio*), Jennifer Creech, Lee Dixon, Jim Dunne, Austin Hillman, Sawyer Hunley, Fred Jenkins (*ex officio*), Elizabeth Kelsch, Terence Lau (*ex officio*), Joe Mashburn, Don Pair, Joan Plungis, Juan Santamarina, John White

Excused: Katie Kinnucan-Welsch (*ex officio*), Elias Toubia

Guests: Marybeth Carlson, Carl Friese, Jack Kanet, Daniel Klco, Grant Neeley, Jay Prasad, Anthony Talbott

I. Course Reviews

1) MIS 475: MIS Project II-Design & Implementation in Teams

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Proposer: David Salisbury was not able to attend. Department chair Jay Prasad was present for the committee's discussion.
2. Component: Major Capstone
3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (advanced), Practical Wisdom (advanced), Vocation (advanced)

B. Discussion:

1. The committee had positive feedback about the proposal overall. In particular, it was noted that the rubric for the reflective paper is impressive to provide an understanding about what is being looked for in the assignment.
2. The chair noted that majors need to take MIS 465 as a pre-requisite and MIS 475, taken in the second semester of senior year, will be treated as the capstone.

C. Committee's Actions:

1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
2. Vote: 11-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

2) OPS 495: Capstone Operations & Supply Management Project II

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Proposer: Jack Kanet was present for the committee's discussion, as well as department chair Jay Prasad. Co-proposer Michael Gorman could not attend.
2. Component: Major Capstone
3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (advanced), Community (advanced), Practical Wisdom (advanced), Vocation (advanced)

B. Discussion:

1. A question was raised about selecting four SLOs for the course. The committee has had experience with other courses selecting more than three SLOs determining that it was too much to evaluate and ultimately reduced the number of SLOs. The proposer noted that the four SLOs have already been part of the course. The Community SLO, which is rare for a capstone, is natural for this type of course. The committee recognized that it's good for a capstone course to be ambitious.

C. Committee's Actions:

1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
2. Vote: 11-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

3) POL 336/INS 336: United Nations System: Theory and Practice (cross-listed)

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Proposer: Anthony Talbott was present for the committee's discussion, as well as Marybeth Carlson (International Studies program director) and Grant Neeley (Political Science department chair).
2. Component: Crossing Boundaries-Integrative
3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (expanded), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (expanded)

B. Discussion:

1. Like MIS 475, the committee appreciated the inclusion of a rubric.
2. It was noted that the course has been offered previously only under INS, with 1 credit hour and a pass/fail grading option. A 1-credit, pass/fail option will continue to be offered with INS 390 for members of the Model UN Club. The cross-listed course (3 credit hours, standard letter grade) is for students preparing to participate in the national Model UN conference in New York City. Those who do the preparation work but do not travel to the conference will participate in a simulation panel during the Stander Symposium instead. UD has had a long history with the Model UN conference and the expansion of the course represents strengthening and formalizing the experience through a class. It also fits well with internationalization and experiential learning initiatives.
3. As an Integrative course, it was noted that it will draw from the perspectives of Human Rights Studies and International Studies, which are interdisciplinary programs, and also Political Science, Economics, Finance, History, etc. Students will study a sampling of issues that the United Nations addresses.

C. Committee's Actions:

1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
2. Vote: 11-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

4) BIO 395: Global Environmental Biology

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Proposers: Carl Friese and Daniel Klco were present for the committee's discussion.
2. Component: Natural Sciences
3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (expanded), Practical Wisdom (expanded), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (expanded)

B. Discussion:

1. It was noted that this course does not have an accompanying lab. The pre-requisites include BIO 101, BIO 151, or SCI 230. The pre-requisites were included so that students would already have introductory background.
2. It was noted that this course is an example in which the content reflects the goals of CAP, though it's not designed in a way to take advantage of CAP "course counting" to fulfill requirements since the Natural Science component must be fulfilled through two lecture courses in different disciplines and an accompanying lab. Since the prerequisite courses are in the same discipline (Biology), students would be unlikely to take BIO 395 for the Natural Science component. Could another component be considered, such as Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry (though it wouldn't count as Inquiry for science majors)? The committee didn't see any reason to exclude the course from being CAP approved, but recognized that there might not be many students taking it for CAP credit because of the reasons noted above.

C. Committee's Actions:

1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
2. Vote: 11-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

5) VAP 499: Senior Seminar II

- A. Course Proposal Information:
 - 1. Proposer: Joel Whitaker was not able to attend, and neither was department chair Judith Huacuja.
 - 2. Component: Major Capstone
 - 3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (advanced), Vocation (advanced)
- B. Discussion:
 - 1. With respect to Vocation, it was noted that the proposal seems more heavily focused on the career aspect than broader aspects of vocation. However, it was also noted that the broader aspects will likely be part of the course. Majors go through a portfolio review in their sophomore year and again in their senior year and the reflective aspect is more substantial than expressed in the proposal.
- C. Committee's Actions:
 - 1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to approve the course proposal as written. There was no further discussion.
 - 2. Vote: 11-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

II. CAP Two-Year Evaluation Proposal (03/05/2015 draft): The committee reviewed a revised proposal for conducting the two-year evaluation next year. The CAP Senate Document (DOC-10-04) calls for a thorough and systematic evaluation after two years of implementation. The proposal was previously developed in consultation with the Academic Policies Committee (APC) of the Academic Senate. The following are highlights from the committee's discussion.

- A. The proposal has been revised to include surveys (students, faculty and administration) because the APC recommended adding a mechanism for independent review. The Business Research Group will be contacted about overseeing the survey, possibly in Fall 2015.
- B. In terms of elements of the evaluation, items 1-4 in the proposal (listed below) will be initiated over the summer so that the committee can begin reviewing a draft in the fall. The report must be submitted to the Academic Senate by the end of the fall semester.
 - 1. Development and deployment of CAP courses and experiences
 - 2. Mapping of the CAP with the majors
 - 3. Assessment of the student learning outcomes
 - 4. Conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations for the continuing implementation and delivery of the CAP
- C. The committee continued discussion about the surveys. In terms of generating questions, it was decided that the committee would develop an initial list of questions and request assistance from the Business Research Group to refine them. There would be different questions for different audiences (i.e., faculty vs. students). The committee began brainstorming to develop questions or topics for questions:
 - 1. Do you like CAP?
 - 2. I am aware of CAP. (agree/disagree)
 - 3. CAP is distinctive to UD.
 - 4. CAP is one of the reasons I came to UD.
 - 5. Participating in CAP helped to decide what major/unit I wanted to be in. (e.g., through Crossing Boundaries-Inquiry)
 - 6. Have I seen in my CAP classes a development of ideas from one class to another? (agree/disagree)
 - 7. I have taken a course outside of my major that exposed me to xxxx. (agree/disagree)
 - 8. I have/have not been able to find enough CAP courses.
 - 9. I have not selected a double major because of CAP. (agree/disagree) It was noted that students likely wouldn't have enough information to make this kind of judgment.

- D. After the initial brainstorming, the committee determined that it is probably too early in the implementation process to survey students. For instance, with the use of daylighting students may be taking courses for CAP credit that haven't been revised to meet the goals of CAP. It would make more sense to survey students during the five-year evaluation that will follow this initial evaluation. Since the APC recommended conducting the surveys, the committee will need to provide a recommendation and rationale for not surveying students at this time.
- E. Sawyer Hunley will report back to the committee after consulting with the Business Research Group about the survey. The committee can continue its discussions and planning after that.

III. Committee Membership

- A. As stipulated in the CAPC Procedures, which draw upon the CAP Senate Document, faculty members on the CAPC shall have "staggered three-year terms" and "all seven CAPC faculty members appointed for the initiation of the CAPC in the Spring of 2011 shall serve full three year terms until the Spring of 2014."
- B. Three faculty members rotated off the committee at the end of the 2013-14 academic year – those representing Engineering, Science, and Social Science. Four original committee members would be eligible to rotate off at the end of this year, and two or three will need to do so. Those eligible are Jim Dunne, Joan Plungis, Juan Santamarina, and John White.
- C. It was decided that Joan Plungis would rotate off and also John White, since he will conclude his appointment on the Academic Senate at the end of the year and will be on sabbatical in Spring 2016. Jim Dunne will continue at least one more year because he will continue on the Academic Senate and has also served on the Academic Policies Committee. At least three of the faculty and student CAPC members must come from the Academic Senate, and at least one member must come from the Academic Policies Committee. Juan Santamarina indicated that he was willing to continue to serve on the CAPC if needed.

The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen