

2017

2017-05-01 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, "2017-05-01 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes" (2017). *Common Academic Program Committee Minutes*. 130.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins/130

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, May 1, 2017 | 11:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.; Kennedy Union 312

Present: Brad Balsler, Lee Dixon, Heidi Gauder, Linda Hartley (*ex officio*), Keigo Hirakawa, Sawyer Hunley, Fred Jenkins (*ex officio*), Danielle Poe, Bill Trollinger

Excused: Serdar Durmusoglu, John Goebel, Terence Lau (*ex officio*), Scott Segalewitz (*ex officio*), John White, Shuang-Ye Wu

Guest: Wiebke Diestelkamp

- I. **Four-Year Course Reviews:** This was the first of four meetings the committee had this week to hold departmental conversations concerning a total of 24 CAP courses that have gone through the four-year review process over the course of the academic year. As part of the review process, departments were asked to provide responses for each course to the following questions (the responses were added in the Course Inventory Management, or CIM, system):
- A. What specific course learning objectives or experiences are linked to this UD student learning outcome (*Habits of Inquiry and Reflection*)?
 - B. What criteria are/will be used to judge the student evidence for each specific course learning objective? (You may attach an assessment rubric or list of criteria.)
 - C. What evidence (e.g., student artifact or performance) is/will be used to demonstrate level of achievement for each course learning objective?
 - D. What were the results of your student assessment for each course learning objective?
 - E. If you have decided this course should address different CAP components from when it was originally approved, what changes are you proposing and why?
 - F. If you have decided this course should address different UD student learning outcomes (HIR) from when it was originally approved, what changes are you proposing and why?

As background information, it was noted that this is the first year to implement the four-year review process. A workshop was held in the fall for departments with courses up for review. Different methods were used to submit responses to the six questions above as a result of the CIM course proposal form being under revision as the four-year review cycle began.

The committee can take the following actions with respect to four-year review courses: a) re-approve fully for four years; b) conditionally re-approve for two years (in cases where an assessment plan has been developed but not implemented); c) not re-approve.

1) MTH 137: Calculus I with Review

- A. Course Proposal Information:
 1. Representative: Department chair Wiebke Diestelkamp was present.
 2. Component (as originally approved): Mathematics
 3. Student Learning Outcomes (as originally approved): Scholarship (introduced); Practical Wisdom (introduced)
- B. Discussion:
 1. The department has proposed removing Practical Wisdom as one of the SLOs for the course. The committee agreed with the rationale. The Course Learning Objectives will be updated appropriately in light of this revision and to reflect the CLOs that are central to the course.
 2. The Scholarship SLO will be assessed by using specific exam questions to determine if the course learning objectives are being met. Sample problems were submitted as part of the four-year review responses. The chair, in consultation with the full-time faculty member who teaches MTH 137, will likely be the ones to select the exam questions, rather than the

- department as a whole. One or two sections will be randomly selected each semester to implement the exam questions.
3. The committee requested that the department provide additional detail in the assessment plan (as part of a rubric) concerning the following:
 - a. Who will conduct the assessment?
 - b. Who will be assessed (i.e., sample of students or entire section)?
 - c. Frequency of assessment (if appropriate)
 - d. Metric for achievement method for interpreting and using assessment results (It is up to the department to determine the appropriate goal. The first time collecting assessment data will set a baseline for determining performance level goals, and then the department can make any needed adjustments.)
 4. The Method of Evaluation/Attainment of Course Learning Objectives can be updated in the proposal [under the Course Learning Objectives (CLO) and Criteria for Evaluation/Attainment of CLOs section in CIM] since the department has determined that exams will be the method.
- C. Committee's Actions:
1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to conditionally re-approve the course for two years, with the understanding that the department will revise the proposal in CIM along the lines noted above. There was no further discussion.
 2. Vote: 7-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).
- D. Next Steps:
1. The proposal will be rolled back to the department chair level in CIM for revisions to be made. Following the meeting, it was communicated to the department chair that revisions should be made in CIM by August 1, 2017.
 2. After that, the Executive Committee of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) in the College will review the proposal based on the outcome of the four-year review conversation with the CAPC. The AAC developed a "Changes Based on Assessment Policy" to determine how it will handle four-year review proposals.
 3. The department will implement the assessment plan for the course over the next two years.

2) ASI 495: Integrative Capstone Project, India Program

- A. Course Proposal Information:
1. Representative: College of Arts and Sciences Associate Dean Danielle Poe was present.
 2. Component: Crossing Boundaries-Integrative
 3. Student Learning Outcomes: Scholarship (advanced); Faith Traditions (advanced); Diversity (expanded); Community (expanded), Practical Wisdom (expanded); Vocation (advanced)
- B. Discussion:
1. The course is offered as part of a small Philosophy degree program for Marianists in India. Dr. Rani Thanickachalam and Bro. Tom Oldenski deliver the curriculum. Assistant Dean Cindy Shafer serves as a liaison with the program and travels to India once a year. In addition, Dr. Rani also periodically comes to UD.
 2. It is proposed to add Major Capstone as a component in addition to maintaining Crossing Boundaries-Integrative. It was uncertain that the two components could be combined when the course was originally proposed.
 3. It is also proposed to remove SLOs so that the following three remain: Scholarship, Faith Traditions, and Vocation.
 4. The Course Learning Objectives will be updated as appropriate to reflect the changes to the SLOs.
 5. Since this course represents a special case, the committee agreed that it's not necessary to require a specific rubric.

- C. Committee's Actions:
 - 1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to re-approve the course fully for four years, with the understanding that the proposal will be revised along the lines noted above. There was no further discussion.
 - 2. Vote: 7-0-0 (in favor-against-abstention).
 - D. Next Steps:
 - 1. The proposal will be rolled back to the ASI chair level in CIM. Danielle Poe will oversee the revisions prior to the AAC Executive Committee reviewing the proposal based on the outcome of the four-year review conversation with the CAPC. Following the meeting, it was communicated that revisions should be made in CIM by August 1, 2017.
- II. CAPC's Follow-up Discussion:** After completing the four-year review conversations for two courses, the committee thought that it would be helpful to identify a few recommended elements of a course assessment plan to provide during future four-year review conversations. The committee discussed the following:
- A. System for administering assessment (e.g., rubric)
 - B. Identify who will conduct the assessment
 - C. Identify who will be assessed (i.e., sample or entire population)
 - D. Frequency of assessment (if appropriate – depends on how often the course is offered)
 - E. Metric for achievement
 - F. Method for interpreting and using results from assessment

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen