2017

2017-02-20 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

http://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins/122

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, February 20, 2017 | 2:30 p.m.-3:45 p.m.; Learning Teaching Center Forum, room 044

Present: Brad Balser, Serdar Durmusoglu, Keigo Hirakawa, Linda Hartley (ex officio), Sawyer Hunley, Fred Jenkins (ex officio), Danielle Poe, Scott Segalowitz (ex officio), Bill Trollinger, Shuang-Ye Wu
Excused: Lee Dixon, Heidi Gauder, John Goebel, Terence Lau (ex officio), John White
Guests: Phyllis Bergiel, Rebecca Potter, Michael Sandy, Andy Slade

Sawyer Hunley, Assistant Provost for CAP, chaired the meeting in Lee Dixon’s absence.

I. Review of Minutes: The minutes of the January 23, 2017 meeting were accepted as written.

II. Course Reviews

1) ENG 342: Literature and the Environment
   A. Course Proposal Information:
      1. Proposer: Rebecca Potter was present for the committee’s discussion, as well as department chair Andy Slade.
      2. Components: Crossing Boundaries-Practical Ethical Action, Diversity and Social Justice
      3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (expanded), Diversity (advanced), Practical Wisdom (expanded)
   B. Discussion:
      1. The committee noted that ENG 342 looks like a terrific course and did not have any specific comments or questions about the proposal. There was a clarification that the proposal was originally drafted using the previous course proposal form in CIM and was revised after the new form was launched. Therefore, the course learning objectives in the new format and the original course objectives from the previous form do not match. The information in the new format is correct and the “original” text will be removed after the proposal completes workflow in CIM.
   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: 6-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).

2) GEO 116L: Geological History of the Earth Laboratory
   A. Course Proposal Information:
      1. Proposer: Michael Sandy was present for the committee’s discussion.
      2. Component: Natural Sciences
      3. Student Learning Outcome: Scholarship (introduced)
   B. Discussion:
      1. A question was raised about one of the methods of evaluation/attainment of course learning objectives being exam grades. The proposer clarified that students have exams for information covered in the lab. The lab and lecture course (GEO 116) are assessed independently. Ideally students would take the lecture course and lab at the same time. GEO 116 is coded as a co-requisite for GEO 116L.
   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: 6-0-1 (in favor-against-abstention). (Note: Another committee member arrived prior to the vote on this proposal.)
3) **HST 334: History of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict**

A. **Course Proposal Information:**
   1. Proposer: Ellen Fleischmann could not be present for the committee’s discussion, and neither could department chair Juan Santamarina.
   2. Components: Advanced Historical Studies, Diversity and Social Justice
   3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (expanded), Diversity (expanded), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (expanded)

B. **Discussion:**
   1. The committee did not have any comments or questions specific to the proposal. A general comment was made about developing more specific ways to assess learning outcomes.

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: 6-0-1 (for-against-abstention).

### III. Announcements

A. **2nd Annual Assessment Speaker, Dr. Karen Tarnoff, Associate Dean for Assurance of Learning, Assessment, and International Programs for the College of Business Technology at East Tennessee State University:** Committee members were reminded about the upcoming visit on February 23-24 and were encouraged to attend sessions whenever possible. The CAPC was specifically invited to one session: “How Mature is Your Assurance of Learning System?” (Friday, Feb. 24 from 8:15-9:45 a.m. in KU 310).

B. **4-Year Review of CAP Courses:** The committee agreed to schedule the departmental discussions in early May for the 24 courses going through the review process this year. This is due to a need to prioritize reviewing new CAP proposals for the rest of the semester. In addition, scheduling at the end of the semester will help make a distinction that the 4-year reviews will need a different “lens” than reviewing new proposals.

C. **Revised CAPC Procedures:** On February 16, the committee approved an addition (see below in bold) under the Periodic Review of Courses section (4.8). The revised procedures were submitted to the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate; however, they have not yet scheduled their discussion and vote.

   1. **Addition to the CAPC Procedures: 4.9.3 Actions on Courses Submitted for Re-Approval / Course is re-approved pending major changes.** (See p. 11 of the revised document for details.)

D. **Upcoming Meetings:**
   1. February 27, March 6, and March 13: There won’t be any course reviews. The committee will be notified prior to each date whether or not the committee will meet.
   2. March 20: The committee will begin reviewing CAP course proposals that are approved by the College’s Academic Affairs Committee on February 24.

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