

2017

2017-05-02 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, "2017-05-02 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes" (2017). *Common Academic Program Committee Minutes*. 131.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins/131

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

Tuesday, May 2, 2017 | 1:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m.; Kennedy Union 312

Present: Brad Balser, Lee Dixon, Serdar Durmusoglu, Heidi Gauder, Linda Hartley (*ex officio*), Keigo Hirakawa, Sawyer Hunley, Fred Jenkins (*ex officio*), Danielle Poe, Bill Trollinger, John White, Shuang-Ye Wu

Excused: John Goebel, Terence Lau (*ex officio*), Scott Segalewitz (*ex officio*)

Guests: John McCombe, Caroline Merithew, Michelle Pautz, Juan Santamarina, Andy Slade, Daniel Thompson, Rebecca Whisnant

- I. **Four-Year Course Reviews:** This was the third 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.

Based on discussion during the first four-year review meetings the previous day, the committee developed a list of recommended elements of a course assessment plan:

- 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

Because the First Year Humanities (i.e., Humanities Commons) courses were originally approved together as a program, the Academic Senate stipulated that the four-year review should be handled in the same manner. The committee will discuss the courses separately and then take a single action that will apply to all of the Humanities Commons courses.

An introductory statement was provided that the Humanities Commons have regular interaction and coordination in support of having an integrated program. The Humanities Commons serves as a foundation for the Common Academic Program. The six Humanities Commons goals map clearly to the seven HIR Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

1) ENG 100: Writing Seminar I

2) ENG 100A: Writing Seminar I – Part I

3) ENG 100B: Writing Seminar I – Part II

4) ENG 200H: Writing Seminar II

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Representatives: Department chair Andy Slade was present, as well as Humanities Commons coordinator Caroline Merithew.
2. Component (as originally proposed): First Year Humanities (Humanities Commons)
3. Student Learning Outcomes (as originally proposed): Scholarship (introduced), Faith Traditions (introduced), Diversity (introduced), Community (introduced), Practical Wisdom (introduced), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (introduced), Vocation (introduced)

B. Discussion:

1. The department has plans to submit proposals for ENG 114 and ENG 198 to replace ENG 200H. The plans for this change are not reflected in the four-year review responses. The department has reviewed the 114 and 198 proposals and plans to submit them through the review and approval process next academic year.
2. It was noted that ENG 100 “stretch” in the First- and Second-Year Writing Program Assessment Reports refers to ENG 100 A and ENG 100B.
3. The department doesn’t plan to make any changes to the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at this time. The ENG Humanities Commons courses address all seven HIR SLOs at the introductory level.
4. In reference to the recommended elements of a course assessment plan listed on the previous page, the plan implemented for the ENG courses covers all of those elements. The committee noted that the department has been doing excellent assessment work.

5) HST 103: The West and the World

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Representatives: Department chair Juan Santamarina was present, as well as Humanities Commons coordinator Caroline Merithew.
2. Component (as originally proposed): First Year Humanities (Humanities Commons)
3. Student Learning Outcomes (as originally proposed): Scholarship (introduced), Faith Traditions (introduced), Diversity (introduced), Community (introduced), Practical Wisdom (introduced), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (introduced), Vocation (introduced)

B. Discussion:

1. The department developed a pilot assessment plan and used it to gather data in HST 103 sections offered in Fall 2016. The plan was attached with the four-year review responses.
2. The department intends that HST 103 will continue to address all seven HIR SLOs at the introductory level.
3. The department revised, reworded, and consolidated the HST 103 student learning goals and mapped them onto the Humanities Commons learning goals and the HIR SLOs. The pilot assessment plan includes four student learning goals (i.e., course learning objectives in CIM) that map onto three of the seven HIR SLOs: Scholarship, Diversity, and Critical Evaluation of Our Times. A question was raised how the remaining SLOs will be evaluated. It was clarified that the department will be evaluating SLOs on a rotating basis and will have a three-year schedule that will follow a structure similar to what was used this year (review of a random sample of student portfolios). The documentation addresses the three SLOs that were assessed this year. The department will complete the assessment plan to include all of the SLOs. It was noted that Scholarship will be evaluated every year.

4. In reference to the recommended elements of a course assessment plan listed on the first page of the minutes, it was noted that the pilot assessment plan for HST 103 covers all of those elements except for a metric for achievement (i.e., benchmark goal to determine level of student competency). It was noted that the department decided not to set a benchmark goal as part of the pilot assessment this year.
5. A general question was raised about what is to be assessed – course learning objectives or student learning outcomes? It was clarified that course learning objectives are assessed. In the case of the Humanities Commons, the CLOs are mapped to Humanities Commons learning goals, which are in turn mapped to the seven HIR SLOs. Through the mapping, assessment will determine whether or not the SLOs are being met.

6) PHL 103: Introduction to Philosophy

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Representatives: Department chair Rebecca Whisnant was present, as well as Humanities Commons coordinator Caroline Merithew.
2. Component (as originally proposed): First Year Humanities (Humanities Commons)
3. Student Learning Outcomes (as originally proposed): Scholarship (introduced), Faith Traditions (introduced), Diversity (introduced), Community (introduced), Practical Wisdom (introduced), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (introduced), Vocation (introduced)

B. Discussion:

1. The department intends that PHL 103 will continue to address all seven HIR SLOs at the introductory level. However, only three will be assessed: Scholarship, Diversity, and Practical Wisdom.
2. The assessment plan and rubric were piloted this semester with 8 faculty/9 sections. Therefore, all of the data has not been collected yet. The chair will touch base with the faculty members about their experience after the data are in.
3. The committee had positive feedback about the plan.

7) REL 103: Introduction to Religious and Theological Studies

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Representatives: Department chair Daniel Thompson was present, as well as Humanities Commons coordinator Caroline Merithew.
2. Component (as originally proposed): First Year Humanities (Humanities Commons)
3. Student Learning Outcomes (as originally proposed): Scholarship (introduced), Faith Traditions (introduced), Diversity (introduced), Community (introduced), Practical Wisdom (introduced), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (introduced), Vocation (introduced)

B. Discussion:

1. The department intends that REL 103 will continue to address all seven HIR SLOs at the introductory level.
2. A question was raised about the “fit” of mapping CLO 4 to the Community SLO: “Identify and describe accurately and critically significant religious themes in Scripture and other primary texts in relation to their historical context.” It was noted that the language of the CLOs had been edited to make them more easily assessable and the older version of CLO 4 may have fit more clearly with Community. The department chair will revisit this CLO with faculty, either to clarify how it links to Community or see if another CLO might be a better fit Community.
3. As part of the follow up, the chair was also asked to clarify whether or not the course assessment will target some or all of the HIR SLOs.
4. The department would like to change the “short title” of the course from “Intro to Religion” to “Intro Religious & Theo Studies.” The short title is what appears in CourseLeaf Section Scheduler (CLSS).
5. The department will pilot the assessment plan next year and will have an assessment coordinator (Kelly Johnson). A meeting was already held with instructors who will be teaching

REL 103 in the fall to cover how to make assignments more directly connected to CLOs and how to make them more easily assessable.

Committee's Actions for the Humanities Commons as a Whole:

1. Motion: A motion was made and seconded to conditionally re-approve the courses for two years, with the understanding that the individual proposals will be revised in CIM along the lines noted for each one. In further discussion, it was noted that the motion for conditional re-approval is a reflection of the departments being in different stages with their assessment practices. The committee expressed appreciation for the collaboration with departments over the course of the year to develop the four-year review process.
2. Vote: 9-0-1 (in favor-against-abstention).

Next Steps for Humanities Commons Courses:

1. The proposals will be rolled back to the department chair level in CIM for revisions to be made. The committee's action and the revisions discussed will be outlined in CIM under the reviewer comments section. Following the meeting, it was communicated to the chairs that revisions should be completed 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. In further discussion, it was noted that the original Humanities Commons program proposal included mapping of the course learning objectives to the Humanities Commons goals to the HIR Student Learning Outcomes. Since some departments are making changes to their course learning objectives, it was suggested that it might be helpful to update the mapping after the departmental revisions are completed. This might be done by the Humanities Commons coordinator and/or the Dean's Office.

8) ENG 321: Reading Popular Music

A. Course Proposal Information:

1. Representatives: John McCombe was present, as well as department chair Andy Slade.
2. Component (as originally approved): Crossing Boundaries-Integrative
3. Student Learning Outcomes (as originally approved): Scholarship (expanded), Critical Evaluation of Our Times (expanded)

B. Discussion:

1. The course was originally approved with two SLOs: Scholarship and Critical Evaluation of Our Times. It was noted that the attachment for the four-year review includes two additional SLOs: Diversity and Community. It was clarified that ENG 321 is a theme-based course and that the original proposal mentioned that other SLOs could be addressed based on the theme. However, there are no plans to change the approved SLOs for the course. With this information, the committee advised caution about what is being set up to be assessed. It was then noted that the two approved SLOs are being assessed as described in the attachment for the four-year review.

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: 6-0-1 (in favor-against-abstention). (Three committee members left the meeting prior to the vote on this proposal.)

D. Next Steps:

1. The proposal will be rolled back to the chair level in CIM for revisions to be made. Since the committee did not discuss any specific revisions, in this case the proposal should be updated as appropriate to reflect how the course will be taught going forward (e.g., revising course

- learning objectives, methods of evaluation/attainment, instructional methods). Following the meeting, it was communicated that revisions should be made in CIM by August 1, 2017.
2. After that, the AAC Executive Committee will review the proposal based on the outcome of the four-year review conversation with the CAPC.

II. Four-Year Review Process: Feedback

- A. In between the conversations about the Humanities Commons courses and ENG 321, the committee requested feedback about the four-year review process. The following are highlights from the discussion.
 1. For future courses up for four-year review, is the committee's intent to invite proposers for the review conversations rather than department chairs. The Humanities Commons chairs indicated that they wouldn't be aware of how courses outside of the Humanities Commons are delivered. In response, it was noted that the Department of Art and Design has 11 courses up for four-year review this year. The initial contact was with the chair. After that, the chair of the department's curriculum committee became the primary contact and he reached out to others involved at the course level. The CAPC is not assuming that every department will use the same process. A department might involve an assessment committee rather than curriculum committee. In general, the committee's thinking is that chairs have ongoing conversations with faculty about their courses.
 2. Is the expectation that departments will have a mini assessment plan for each course? What are the expectations for departments to begin gathering information for courses that might not be up for review for several years? In general, it was noted that it would be helpful for the committee to provide more detailed guidance for what will meet expectations for the reviews.
 3. A question was raised about how the committee will manage the process once the number of courses up for review in a particular year expands significantly.
 4. Some faculty are perceiving the process as needing to defend their teaching. The language of "re-approval" is having a negative effect and causing tension. It would be helpful to have greater clarity about the purpose of the four-year review process.
 5. Determining whether a course is effective or not is up to the department. The committee's role is to ensure that a process is occurring for reflection about courses and advancing student learning.
 6. In light of the previous point, it was recommended to revise the wording of question #4 from the four-year review questions: "What were the results of your student assessment for each course learning objective?" The committee won't be reviewing assessment data for courses; rather, it will want to make sure that the department has a process to review if the course is being delivered as initially conceived. For the review question noted above, the committee is looking for information about how the results were used (i.e., actions taken as a result).
 7. The questions' wording in terms of "each" course learning objective is challenging and more burdensome. Would it be possible to allow selection of one or two to reflect upon? In response, it was noted that the course learning objectives demonstrate how the SLOs are being delivered; because of that, it would be difficult to select just one or two. A follow up question was raised whether the purpose is to account for all outcomes or to ensure that faculty are being reflective with their teaching.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Judy Owen