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Common Academic Program

What is special about CAP?

The Common Academic Program is a curricular innovation that will impact undergraduate students at the University of Dayton beginning in Fall 2013. The CAP’s distinctive structure is built on the notion that all students will have unique experiences at U.D. and that all academic programs and services are informed by the learning goals articulated in *The Habits of Inquiry and Reflection (HIR)*: scholarship, faith traditions, diversity, community, practical wisdom, critical evaluation of our times, and vocation. The CAP is an evolving flexible curriculum that is responsive to the changing times while remaining grounded in the HIR principles and Catholic and Marianist intellectual traditions. Both curricular and co-curricular aspects of student life at the University of Dayton resonate with the seven learning goals.

What is unique and valued about CAP?

Five primary characteristics guide the Common Academic Program. First, the CAP intentionally sequences courses so that over time students build knowledge of and expertise in understanding, analyzing, and demonstrating the seven central learning goals and outcomes. Second, it calls on students to integrate what they learn by requiring them to take courses which intentionally cross disciplinary boundaries and incorporate relevant non-classroom experiences. Third, the CAP emphasizes assessment of student learning to guide continual course improvement. Fourth, students are engaged through application of knowledge in learning centered tasks. Finally, professional and vocational learning opportunities are expansive and include skills valued by employers: communication, decision-making, and critical thinking.

Why should students care about this kind of education?

The University of Dayton created the Common Academic Program (CAP) to address the learning needs of students who will be leaders in the 21st Century. As leaders, graduates must respond well to rapid and sometimes dramatic changes in society and the workplace, a need the CAP addresses through engaging and informative introductions to a range of academic disciplines which students critique and synthesize. University of Dayton students will prepare for the future by applying knowledge, skills and values to real life experiences, through broad exploration, by linking theory and creative thought with practice, and through integrative involvement. Experiences at the University of Dayton will enable graduates to be recognized for their outstanding abilities and their meaningful contributions to the workplace and society.
UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. **Scholarship:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity through the production of a body of artistic, scholarly or community-based work intended for public presentation and defense.

2. **Faith traditions:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to engage in intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical inquiry regarding major faith traditions. Students will be familiar with the basic theological understandings and central texts that shape Catholic beliefs and teachings, practices, and spiritualities. Students’ abilities should be developed sufficiently to allow them to examine deeply their own faith commitments and also to participate intelligently and respectfully in dialogue with other traditions.

3. **Diversity:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical understanding of the cultures, histories, times, and places of multiple others, as marked by class, race, gender, ethnicity, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, and other manifestations of difference. Students’ understanding will reflect scholarly inquiry, experiential immersion, and disciplined reflection.

4. **Community:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate understanding of and practice in the values and skills necessary for learning, living, and working in communities of support and challenge. These values and skills include accepting difference, resolving conflicts peacefully, and promoting reconciliation; they encompass productive, discerning, creative, and respectful collaboration with persons from diverse backgrounds and perspectives for the common purpose of learning, service, and leadership that aim at just social transformation. Students will demonstrate these values and skills on campus and in the Dayton region as part of their preparation for global citizenship.

5. **Practical wisdom:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate practical wisdom in addressing real human problems and deep human needs, drawing upon advanced knowledge, values, and skills in their chosen profession or major course of study. Starting with a conception of human flourishing, students will be able to define and diagnose symptoms, relationships, and problems clearly and intelligently, construct and evaluate possible solutions, thoughtfully select and implement solutions, and critically reflect on the process in light of actual consequences.

6. **Critical evaluation of our times:** Through multidisciplinary study, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate habits of inquiry and reflection, informed by familiarity with Catholic Social Teaching, that equip them to evaluate critically and imaginatively the ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, and ecological challenges of their times in light of the past.

7. **Vocation:** Using appropriate scholarly and communal resources, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to articulate reflectively the purposes of their life and proposed work through the language of vocation. In collaboration with the university community, students’ developing vocational plans will exhibit appreciation of the fullness of human life, including its intellectual, ethical, spiritual, aesthetic, social, emotional, and bodily dimensions, and will examine both the interdependence of self and community and the responsibility to live in service of others.
Components of the Common Academic Program

1. First-Year Humanities Courses – 12 total credit hours

Introductory courses in Religious Studies, Philosophy and History and a First-Year Writing Seminar - The first-year Humanities component will introduce the seven student learning outcomes and develop appropriate disciplinary objectives as part of the first-year courses in Religious Studies, Philosophy, History and English that create a foundation for student learning in the rest of the Common Academic Program and their majors. See also the Humanities Commons Learning Goals.

2. Second-Year Writing Seminar– 3 credit hours

The second-year writing seminar, taken by students who completed the first-year writing seminar, is a variable theme composition course focused on academic discourse, research, and argumentation. Students will further develop their reading, writing, research, and critical thinking abilities as they come into contact with the ways that various disciplines (at least three) engage a particular theme. In addition, by studying scholarship across disciplines students will develop rhetorical awareness about the arguments, approaches, and conventions of these disciplines. A focus throughout the course will be on enabling students to take a process approach to making effective arguments in a complex academic context.

3. Oral Communication – 3 credit hours

To enhance students’ ability to communicate effectively, all students will complete three hours [one course] in oral communication, normally in their first or second year of study. The Oral Communication foundational course will focus on the concepts of dialogue and debate, with the goals of engaging in constructive mutual dialogue in conversations and meetings; developing the ability to articulate, analyze, and defend a position in a public forum; understanding the differences between dialogue and debate; and understanding relative advantages and disadvantages of each mode of communication. With its focus on dialogue and debate, the course will assist students in the development of the skills necessary for learning, living, and working in communities. By developing the ability to engage in conversation that advances understanding, students will be better able to interact and collaborate with persons from diverse backgrounds and perspectives.

4. Mathematics – 3 credit hours

To enhance quantitative reasoning skills, all students will complete three hours in mathematics. The particular course will vary based on the students’ major and background in mathematics. The mathematics courses are most closely related to the HIR outcomes related to scholarship, practical wisdom and critical evaluation of our times.

5. Social Science – 3 credit hours

Essential to life in the 21st century is an understanding of the relationship between individuals, groups and institutions. All students will complete three hours in the social sciences. The social science course will be a theme-based course that varies across sections but shares common learning outcomes. The course will use social science methods and social theory to critically examine a human issue or problem from at least three social science disciplinary perspectives (anthropology, economics, political science, psychology and sociology). The course will emphasize outcomes related to scholarship, critical evaluation of our times, and the diversity of the human world.

6. Arts – 3 credit hours

To ensure that all students acquire a basic understanding of the arts as significant manifestations of diverse cultural, intellectual, aesthetic, and personal experiences, all students will complete a three hour component in the Arts. The Arts component may include courses from the Departments of Music, Visual Arts, English and the Theatre Program. Courses will assist students to develop skills and acquire experiences that enable them to understand, reflect upon, and value the creative process within the context of the arts. The requirement may be satisfied by taking studio and performance courses as well as historical studies courses. Students may satisfy the three hour requirement with one three hour course or a combination of one- and two-hour courses. Given the diversity of the Arts, the specific learning outcomes addressed will vary across courses.
7. Natural Sciences – 7 total credit hours

An understanding of many significant issues confronting our world today requires a basic understanding of science. Students must take two three-hour lecture courses in the physical or life sciences or computer science, at least one of which should be accompanied by a corresponding one-hour laboratory section. Lecture sections are either a pre-requisite or co-requisite to their correlative laboratory sections. Students will be exposed to at least two of the five disciplines: biology, chemistry, computer science, geology, and physics. The science component will actively challenge students to explore the scientific dimensions of complex, controversial or unresolved problems facing human society. It will further the development of the outcomes related to scholarship, practical wisdom and critical evaluation of our times by challenging students to achieve an enriched understanding of the scientific method by applying it to issues of broad public interest. The community outcome will also be enhanced through the team-based learning that occurs in the laboratory setting.

8. Faith Traditions (Crossing Boundaries) – 3 credit hours

The course on faith traditions is designed to encourage students to better understand, reflect on, and place their own religious beliefs and experiences in a broader historical or cultural context. Courses satisfying the faith traditions component may be offered by any department provided that the courses incorporate some of the ideas from the introductory religious studies course and that the courses develop students’ ability to examine their own faith commitments and to participate in dialogue with other faith traditions. The courses will: 1) place religious traditions within their historical context; 2) examine their philosophical foundations or the internal logic of religious thought, language, and practice; 3) compare religious traditions by examining their philosophical foundations, historical origins, artistic expressions, canonical texts, and/or storied practices; or 4) examine a religious tradition with which students are unfamiliar (e.g., a non-Christian tradition).

9. Practical Ethical Action (Crossing Boundaries) – 3 credit hours

The practical ethical action course is designed to cross the boundaries between the theoretical and the practical and between the liberal arts and the applied fields. It offers the opportunity for faculty to cross the boundaries of their own disciplines to dialogue with faculty from other disciplines in ways that enrich their own understanding of important ethical issues and that enrich the courses they offer to students. Courses satisfying the practical ethical action component may be offered by any department provided that the courses engage students in thick description and analysis of ethical issues using concepts central to the study of ethics such as justice, rights, natural law, conscience or forgiveness and that the courses provide sufficient normative content that allow students to reflect on value judgments and ethical reasoning and practical application. These courses will draw from relevant interdisciplinary knowledge as well as an understanding of the professions and social institutions.

10. Inquiry Course (Crossing Boundaries) – 3 credit hours

The Inquiry component of CAP requires that students select a course outside their own division to better understand the ways of knowing found in other academic disciplines. The Inquiry course provides an opportunity for all academic units, particularly the professional schools, to develop courses for the CAP. The Inquiry course will serve as an introduction to key methods of investigation, interpretation, exploration, and ways of knowing. Taking a course outside one’s major can broaden awareness of differing philosophies or analytic approaches, and it can offer new ways of conceiving of and resolving problems. The Inquiry course will provide students an opportunity to contrast inquiry in their own field with a different discipline’s methods of inquiry. Some modes of inquiry engage experimentation and creative practice; other modes employ cognitive systems or analytical frameworks. Still other modes of inquiry investigate the complexity of systems, languages, or cultures. Exposure to modes of inquiry not typically used in the students’ major prepares them to think critically about ways of acquiring, evaluating, and applying knowledge claims within their own discipline. For this reason, the Inquiry course will include a reflective and comparative component in which a student examines methods in his or her major field with those in the field of the Inquiry course.

11. Integrative Course (Crossing Boundaries) – 3 credit hours

The integration of knowledge has a long-standing position within the Catholic intellectual tradition and an increasingly important role in understanding contemporary social issues and problems. The Integrative course in the CAP requires that faculty develop, and students select, a course that transcends disciplinary boundaries and explicitly examines significant social issues or problems in a multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary framework. Collaborative, interdisciplinary efforts by faculty are encouraged but not required for this course. Courses offered by one faculty member that bring together different disciplinary perspectives to enhance students’ understanding of significant issues may also be developed.
12. Major Capstone Course or Experience – hours determined by department (can be zero hours)

The ability of students to integrate the knowledge acquired in the undergraduate career, both within the major and in the Common Academic Program, is greatly enhanced by a capstone experience. All students will have a capstone course or experience in their major. The capstone will provide students the opportunity to engage, integrate, practice, and demonstrate the knowledge and skills they have developed in their major courses and which reflect learning outcomes associated with the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection. The capstone will provide students the opportunity to engage in the scholarship, activity and/or practice of their major field and further the students’ understanding of their chosen vocation, career or profession. Students will present their work in a forum appropriate to their major. This course or experience will be designed by faculty in each major. It may, or may not be assigned credit hours.

Advanced Study in Religious Studies and Philosophy – 6 credit hours (can double count with XB)

Courses satisfying the religious studies component might examine the central beliefs, texts or practices of one or more religious traditions or movements; examine ethics as a central feature of a religious tradition including the use of Catholic social teaching as a resource, or; examine cultural expressions of religious identity or tradition as the central focus of theological or religious studies. Courses satisfying the advanced philosophical studies component might evaluate competing solutions to theoretical or ethical options in the present day, or draw on the philosophical resources of the Catholic intellectual tradition to address the challenges of their times. Students will have flexibility in fulfilling these requirements. First, these courses will frequently focus on issues related to, and satisfy the criteria for the Faith Traditions, Practical Ethical Action, Inquiry and Integrative components of the CAP. Second, the criteria for these requirements are disciplinary-based in the fields of religious, philosophical and historical studies and therefore not limited to specific departments. Courses offered outside the Departments of Philosophy, Religious Studies and History may count towards the advanced religious studies, philosophy and history requirements if the courses draw extensively from those disciplinary perspectives and address in significant ways aspects of the Catholic intellectual tradition.

Advanced Study in Historical Studies - 3 credit hours (can double count with XB)

Courses satisfying the advanced historical studies component might engage students in the study and analysis of primary materials to further develop students’ historical sensibilities in a way that illuminates the historical dimensions of HIR learning outcomes. The course could examine a historical topic drawing on the work of historians to show how interpretations of the past may change over time. Students will have flexibility in fulfilling these requirements. First, these courses will frequently focus on issues related to, and satisfy the criteria for the Faith Traditions, Practical Ethical Action, Inquiry and Integrative components of the CAP. Second, the criteria for these requirements are disciplinary-based in the fields of religious, philosophical and historical studies and therefore not limited to specific departments. Courses offered outside the Departments of Philosophy, Religious Studies and History may count towards the advanced historical studies, philosophy and history requirements if the courses draw extensively from those disciplinary perspectives and address in significant ways aspects of the Catholic intellectual tradition.

Diversity and Social Justice Requirement - 3 credit hours (can double count with XB or Capstone)

As a Marianist university, the University has a special concern for the poor and marginalized and a responsibility to promote the dignity, rights and responsibilities of all persons and peoples. The University curriculum is responsible for contributing to this effort and does so throughout the Common Academic Program, but in a more focused way through a Diversity and Social Justice component. Every student will investigate human diversity issues within a sustained academic context by taking at least three credit hours of course work that have a central focus on one or more dimensions of diversity that are relevant to social justice. The course must have a central focus on one or more dimensions of human diversity on the basis of which systems, institutions, or practices that obstruct social justice have functioned. The dimensions may include, but are not limited to, race, gender, socioeconomic class, and sexual orientation. Courses may address diversity within the United States, in a global context, or both. Since the course uses a social justice framework, it will consider constructive responses to such injustice.

Courses approved to satisfy the Diversity and Social Justice component will build on earlier CAP courses addressing diversity including the First-Year Humanities courses, the Second-Year Writing Seminar, and the Social Science, Arts, Natural Science, and Oral Communication courses. The Diversity and Social Justice component may not double count with these courses, but may double count with courses taken to satisfy other CAP components or courses taken in the student’s major.

Note: Students with transfer credits or credits earned through Advanced Placement or College Level Examination Program may apply those toward appropriate CAP components.

Note: The new CAP structure [is not intended] to result in students taking more credit hours outside their major than they are currently required to take.
Dear Colleagues,

Attached below is the April 13, 2010 document titled “The Common Academic Program” submitted by the Coordinating and Writing Task Force and evaluated through the Academic Policies Committee. The 2010 CAP proposal culminates a five-year, university-wide collaboration by faculty to transform education at the University of Dayton. Importantly, this document is borne out of truly extensive dialogue from faculty, staff, and students across every sector of the university.

Curricular revision began in 2005 when the Marianist Education Working Group (a committee of ten faculty representing all units across UD) researched best practices in general education and facilitated campus-wide conversations about Marianist educational practices at UD. Their research and highly consultative process produced the document *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection (HIR)* that sets forth the Marianist-based educational aims for a “common academic program.” While *HIR* focused educational revision through the articulation of seven student learning outcomes, the Marianist Education Working Group acknowledged that the more significant work of large-scale curricular revision rested with the faculty. Since 2006, over two hundred faculty have stepped forward to serve on key committees, working groups, and departmental focus groups, bringing significant revision to this 2010 CAP.

During the 2006-2007 academic year, over fifty faculty discussed and Senate representatives adopted the seven overarching learning outcomes in *HIR* as guidelines for units
to follow when drafting their student learning goals (Senate DOC 07-02). Throughout the 2007-2008 academic year, a sub-committee of the Academic Policies Committee (made up of nine faculty representing all units across the university) drafted the early outlines of CAP. Using *HIR* as the foundation, this CAP sub-committee affirmed the distinguishing characteristics for a common academic program at UD to include: a developmental approach over four years; a commitment to reciprocity between the College and the professional schools; a clear integration of the major and CAP; and interdisciplinary learning opportunities. Notably, this first CAP drafted by the 2008 Academic Policies Committee (APC) sub-committee strengthens the University’s commitment to educating in the Catholic and Marianist traditions through the values expressed in the *HIR* student learning outcomes.

With the understanding that the 2008 CAP offered a framework for university-wide curricular revision, the 2008-2009 APC collected, summarized and publicly posted wide-ranging feedback from the university community. These conversations are documented in over two hundred pages from twenty-two departments and professional schools, five programs, and seven additional groups of staff, students, and faculty. Working towards refinement of CAP, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate appointed the 2009-2010 CAP Coordinating and Writing Task Force to move the process forward. The Task Force reviewed the past research on CAP, suggested adjustments to the program, then established and tasked nine working groups including seventy faculty with developing components of CAP. The working groups consulted widely to develop criteria for CAP as the Task Force presented drafts of CAP to the university community. Each draft was vetted through APC Forums and APC Open Meetings. Over 200 faculty, students and staff attended the four forums and ten meetings in 2010. The discussions and feedback were documented and publicly posted in another two hundred pages of Forum and APC Meeting Minutes (see CAP and Senate sites at quickplace.udayton.edu).

At the February and March Open Meetings, the APC considered the Diversity & Social Justice Requirement proposal, the Natural Sciences proposal to add 1 credit hour, the Crossing Boundaries Working Group proposal to merge (or not merge) Inquiry & Integration, and the Upper Level Humanities course. Our deliberations considered each proposal, its thematic contributions towards CAP, the *HIR* learning outcomes, and the possible resultant increase in
CAP credit hours. As a brief introduction to the most recent APC recommendations: During April the APC deliberated on Senate concerns, resolving criteria for the Inquiry course and instituting a limit on CAP hours whereby students can complete CAP requirements without taking more credit hours outside the major than are currently required. The APC recognizes that over the next 24 months faculty initiative and creativity, with University support, could address the credit hour concerns while maintaining all of the CAP components. The APC also considered a proposal to amend the single social science course. After hearing from faculty in Economics, Psychology, and the Social Science Working Group, the APC determined that the proposal from the Working Group was the best proposal for the single experience that all UD students would be required to have in the social sciences. Social Science faculty understand the theme-based course asks them to teach from their area of specialty and to deliver introductory knowledge from two other disciplines at a modest level of proficiency appropriate for 1st and 2nd year students. The Social Sciences Working Group devoted five months to examining the issue and supported their criteria with a 6/2 vote. Many social sciences faculty believe they have the ability to draw upon at least three disciplines, they can integrate this knowledge around a common theme, and are motivated to do so. With the CAP criteria as it stands, social sciences faculty will be able to develop curricula to satisfy the specific needs of particular departments or schools.

Lastly, the APC considered a proposal to modify content of the CAP Oral Communication course. The Oral Communication Working Group confirmed the interviewing modules will be offered more appropriately as one-credit hour electives students take in their third or fourth year. Importantly, this supplements the interviewing services already provided to all students by Career Services. The introductory course, as it stands, is structured to supply students with foundational skills such as dialogue, oral presentations, critical thinking and oral argument. The Working Group surveyed over thirty departments, identifying skills needed earlier such as persuasive argument, explanation of complex concepts to non-experts, and effective public speaking, all of which serve as the foundation for interviewing skills. Given this, the APC voted to maintain the Oral Communication Course Proposal as is.
In summary, CAP 2010 represents in-depth study of best practices in curricular innovation and it reflects the values of the university’s faculty, staff and students. Over the past five years, key faculty representatives on university committees studied current literature on curricular reform; studied literature on the character and history of Catholic and Marianist higher education in the United States; participated in the Association of American Colleges and Universities’ Institutes on General Education; convened numerous campus-wide forums and meetings for conversation about a common academic program (MEWG 2005, MEWG 2006, APC 2008, APC 2009, APC 2010); solicited departmental reports about Marianist education and a common academic program (MEWG 2006, APC 2008, APC 2009, APC 2010); issued interim reports summarizing these conversations and key points for further dialogue (MEWG 2007, APC 2008, APC 2009, CAP Task Force 2009 and 2010, APC 2010); and incorporated community insight throughout a rigorous and extensive evaluation process.

Throughout the past five years, faculty have offered insight on building a more intentionally developmental approach to undergraduate education. They have explored methods that facilitate interdisciplinary study and dynamic integration with the major. The University of Dayton faculty, staff and students have engaged its educational mission with a commitment to scholarship and serious exploration of diverse perspectives within the Catholic and Christian traditions and alternative perspectives. The APC is deeply appreciative to the many faculty, students and staff who devoted the time, energy and focus involved in shaping this collaborative effort. Given their contributions, the APC supports this formal CAP proposal and welcomes its presentation to the Academic Senate to be discussed and acted upon at the Senate’s April 23, 2010 meeting.

On behalf of the Academic Policies Committee,
Judith Huacuja, Chair of the APC.
Revised Proposal for the Common Academic Program

CAP Coordinating and Writing Task Force

Patrick Donnelly (Chair), Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work, Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate

Margaret Pinnell, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering

Danielle Poe, Department of Philosophy

April 13, 2010
I. Introduction

Throughout its long history, the University of Dayton has sought to advance the intellectual, cultural, social, moral, and spiritual development of undergraduates and to intentionally incorporate into its educational program key elements of the Catholic intellectual tradition and its Marianist charism. The University’s efforts to revise its common curriculum for all undergraduate students seek to build on the strengths of our current program while incorporating many innovative concepts and ideas generated by faculty at the University of Dayton and professionals nationally to provide a more integrative, more reflective, and more engaging educational program for University of Dayton students in the 21st century. These efforts embody the spirit of the Marianist tradition which invites an openness to change and acceptance of the challenge presented by Blessed William Joseph Chaminade, the founder of the Society of Mary, when he wrote “New times call for new methods.”

II. Background and Context

The University of Dayton first adopted its General Education Program for all undergraduate students in the Fall of 1983 when Senate Doc #81-2 was approved. Its stated purpose was to make “students aware of the diversity of intellectual thought and theory represented by the sciences, the humanities and the social sciences. In addition, the general education component offers the students an opportunity to synthesize and evaluate information from various disciplines and thus enhance the study of a specific profession.” In 1991 significant curricular revisions were made to the General Education Program including the introduction of the Humanities Base and Thematic Cluster requirements.

The current effort to develop a new common academic program dates back to February 2005 when the Marianist Education Working Group, was established to facilitate a campus-wide discussion about the purposes and substance of a Marianist education at UD. Based on an examination of numerous documents relating to Catholic and Marianist education and on extensive consultation, it presented recommendations about how a common academic program should express the ideals of university education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions. The
Group’s 2006 report, *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection: A Report on Education in the Catholic and Marianist Traditions at the University of Dayton (HIR)* identified key goals, a mission statement, and seven student learning outcomes of an education in the Catholic and Marianist tradition. The report is available at:


The key aspects of HIR that provide important guiding principles and goals of the development of the academic plan include the following.

*Education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions at the University of Dayton: 1) seeks knowledge in a sacramental spirit; 2) pursues learning in, through, and for community; 3) cultivates practical wisdom; 4) forges critical ability to read the signs of these times; and 5) supports discernment of personal and communal vocation...*

Accordingly, the common academic program for undergraduates should be guided by the following mission statement:

*Students educated in the Catholic and Marianist traditions at the University of Dayton pursue rigorous academic inquiry, in a sacramental spirit, and engage in vigorous dialogue, learning in, through, and for community. Guided by the purpose of transforming society for the ends of justice, peace, and the common good, the University’s academic program challenges students to excellence in their majors, cultivates practical wisdom in light of the particular needs of the twenty-first century, and fosters reflection upon their individual vocations.*

The HIR report identified seven core student learning outcomes for the common academic program.

The learning outcomes presented below are intended to function at the level of the common academic program. They could be promoted in different ways, through different structures and activities, in the student’s major, in General Education and the Competencies programs, in co-curricular programming, and in learning experiences that transpire outside the formal curriculum. They are not to be regarded as the exclusive responsibility of a limited segment of the university community. Rather, they should shape all intentional planning for students’ educational experience in every division of the university.

The proposed outcomes do not necessarily map onto unique elements of the common academic program, and they do not exhaust the goals of the academic program for students.

1. **Scholarship:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity through the production of a body of artistic, scholarly or community-based work intended for public presentation and defense.
2. **Faith traditions:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to engage in intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical inquiry regarding major faith traditions. Students will be familiar with the basic theological understandings and central texts that shape Catholic beliefs and teachings, practices, and spiritualities. Students’ abilities should be developed sufficiently to allow them to examine deeply their own faith commitments and also to participate intelligently and respectfully in dialogue with other traditions.

3. **Diversity:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical understanding of the cultures, histories, times, and places of multiple others, as marked by class, race, gender, ethnicity, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, and other manifestations of difference. Students’ understanding will reflect scholarly inquiry, experiential immersion, and disciplined reflection.

4. **Community:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate understanding of and practice in the values and skills necessary for learning, living, and working in communities of support and challenge. These values and skills include accepting difference, resolving conflicts peacefully, and promoting reconciliation; they encompass productive, discerning, creative, and respectful collaboration with persons from diverse backgrounds and perspectives for the common purpose of learning, service, and leadership that aim at just social transformation. Students will demonstrate these values and skills on campus and in the Dayton region as part of their preparation for global citizenship.

5. **Practical wisdom:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate practical wisdom in addressing real human problems and deep human needs, drawing upon advanced knowledge, values, and skills in their chosen profession or major course of study. Starting with a conception of human flourishing, students will be able to define and diagnose symptoms, relationships, and problems clearly and intelligently, construct and evaluate possible solutions, thoughtfully select and implement solutions, and critically reflect on the process in light of actual consequences.

6. **Critical evaluation of our times:** Through multidisciplinary study, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate habits of inquiry and reflection, informed by familiarity with Catholic Social Teaching, that equip them to evaluate critically and imaginatively the ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, and ecological challenges of their times in light of the past.

7. **Vocation:** Using appropriate scholarly and communal resources, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to articulate reflectively the purposes of their life and proposed work through the language of vocation. In collaboration with the university community, students’ developing vocational plans will exhibit appreciation of the fullness of human life, including its intellectual, ethical, spiritual, aesthetic, social, emotional, and bodily dimensions, and will examine both the interdependence of self and community and the responsibility to live in service of others.
The Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate charged the Subcommittee on
the Common Academic Program with creating a draft proposal for a common academic program
based on the seven learning outcomes in HIR. The Subcommittee presented its Draft Report,
The Common Academic Program in August 2008. The CAP sought to: provide a more
developed understanding of the Catholic and Marianist traditions explicated in HIR; structure a
developmental program that built the learning outcomes over the students’ years at UD; provide
integration of general education with the major; provide significant interdisciplinary experiences
throughout the undergraduate experience; and promote reciprocity of learning between the
College and the undergraduate schools. Following extensive feedback, the ECAS established the
Coordinating and Writing Task Force in April, 2009 to present a plan to move the process
forward. The Work Plan presented by the Task Force in August 2009 proposed maintaining
those features that are central to the University mission and that were supported by the
University community. The Work Plan sought to maintain a number of distinguishing guiding
principles of the CAP, including the following:

The central feature of CAP is the developmental nature of the program which begins
in the first year and builds towards a more sophisticated appreciation of the learning
outcomes over four years, both in the CAP courses and the major…

An education in the Catholic and Marianist tradition emphasizes the unity of
knowledge and seeks to develop integrative thought across disciplines. The Catholic
intellectual tradition calls for collaborative efforts across disciplinary bounds. The
Marianist approach to education promotes linking theory and practice, and liberal and
professional education through integrative learning and living in community. The
CAP seeks to build on this tradition and approach.

This creation of a strong and distinctive common academic program also reflects changes
in higher education at a national level. These changes involve both pedagogy and content.
Robert Barr and John Tagg (1995) describe the transformation from a more traditional teaching
paradigm to a learning paradigm. In the teaching paradigm, the mission of the college is to teach
while in the learning paradigm, the mission is to produce learning. In recent decades higher
education has placed greater focus and emphasis on student learning rather than on instruction
per se. This transition fits well with the Marianist mission of the University which seeks to
implement the philosophy of Blessed William Joseph Chaminade: “We teach in order to
educate.” This program seeks to emphasize student learning outcomes that are tied both to the mission of the institution as well as to the particular fields of study. The focus on common outcomes, addressed in various ways across elements of the program, will serve as an integrative feature within the program as well as facilitating integration between the program and the major fields of study.

The common academic program also incorporates educational programs that have been shown to enhance student engagement in their educational journey. These include a common intellectual experience with some basic common courses that are connected to more advanced integrative courses, communities such as Learning-Living Communities that integrate learning across courses, writing intensive courses, undergraduate research, collaborative projects and assignments, courses and programs that encourage understanding and appreciation of cultures and life experiences other than our own, service learning, community-based programs, internships, and capstone experiences.

III. Overview and Components

The CAP curriculum is designed to be developmentally integrative. Skills, content and outcomes that are introduced in foundational courses will be reinforced and broadened in subsequent courses. The curriculum will develop distinctive graduates who possess the critical reading, writing, oral communication, quantitative reasoning, and information literacy skills that students need to function in their academic, community, and professional lives. The program will introduce students to the various ways of knowing found in different disciplines and to courses and experiences that help to integrate knowledge across the disciplines. CAP is designed to provide all University of Dayton students with an excellent and distinctive education yet ensure sufficient flexibility for students to complete their degree requirements in an appropriate time frame. To achieve that end, the College and the Schools will make a collective commitment to cooperate in the design, development, and delivery of the curricular components to ensure that the new CAP structure does not result in students taking more credit hours outside their major than they are currently required to take.
The outcomes or goals of *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection* will serve as a unifying theme for the CAP. The CAP will address the seven HIR outcomes, not necessarily in any single course, but as a composite whole. The seven HIR outcomes will be introduced in the first-year Humanities courses and regularly addressed in later CAP courses and experiences. These outcomes will not be the only learning outcomes for CAP courses or experiences. Each disciplinary or interdisciplinary course or experience will also develop outcomes specific to that course or experience.

**Components of the Common Academic Program**

1. First-Year Humanities Courses – 12 total credit hours
   - Introductory courses in Religious Studies, Philosophy and History and a First-Year Writing Seminar.
2. Second-Year Writing Seminar – 3 credit hours
3. Oral Communication – 3 credit hours
4. Mathematics – 3 credit hours
5. Social Science – 3 credit hours
6. Arts – 3 credit hours
7. Natural Sciences – 7 total credit hours
8. Faith Traditions (Crossing Boundaries) – 3 credit hours
9. Practical Ethical Action (Crossing Boundaries) – 3 credit hours
10. Inquiry Course (Crossing Boundaries) – 3 credit hours
11. Integrative Course (Crossing Boundaries) – 3 credit hours
12. Major Capstone Course or Experience – hours determined by department

In addition to the introductory Religious Studies and Philosophy courses, all students are required to take a total of six hours of approved courses in religious studies or philosophical studies. All students are required to take three additional hours of approved courses in historical studies beyond the introductory History course. These nine hours in religious studies, philosophical studies and historical studies may also satisfy the Faith Traditions, Practical Ethical Action, Inquiry, and Integrative components.
All students must take a three-hour course that has been approved for the Diversity and Social Justice requirement. Courses used to satisfy the Diversity and Social Justice requirement may also satisfy the Faith Traditions, Practical Ethical Action, Inquiry, Integrative, the Major Capstone components, or a course in the students’ major.

Students with transfer credits or credits earned through Advanced Placement or College Level Examination Program may apply those toward appropriate CAP components.

First-Year Humanities

The first-year Humanities component will introduce the seven student learning outcomes and develop appropriate disciplinary objectives as part of the first-year courses in Religious Studies, Philosophy, History and English that create a foundation for student learning in the rest of the Common Academic Program and their majors. These courses will exhibit, at an introductory level, the value of humanistic inquiry and reflection as a means of advancing the seven learning outcomes. Particular emphasis will be placed on the diversity outcome. Collectively, these courses will introduce students to the concept that learning is a process of integrating knowledge within and across disciplines. To help students understand the relationship between disciplines and to begin to understand the importance of integrating knowledge across disciplines, the faculties of the departments offering these courses will develop other common elements, questions or themes to be considered in these courses. These courses challenge students to ask the question: “What does it mean to be human?” These courses will, when considered collectively, familiarize students with central concepts and texts of the Catholic intellectual tradition.

The CAP program will contain two writing courses, a first-year writing seminar and a second-year writing seminar. As part of the First-Year Humanities component of the CAP, students will enroll in either a first-year writing seminar or a first-year honors writing seminar. Many students will begin by taking the first-year writing seminar. This course focuses on personal and academic literacies, with an emphasis on expository writing and the development of college-level reading, writing, research, and critical thinking skills as well as a process approach to writing. With its focus on personal and academic literacies, the first-year writing seminar
addresses directly the question, “What does it mean to be human?” as it explores the relationship between reading/writing (or literacy) and being human. Based on placement criteria, some students will qualify to enroll in the first-year honors writing seminar. This course will also engage the question of what it means to be human in a manner fitting the context of a themed writing seminar (see description of second-year writing seminar below). Together, then, the first-year writing seminar and the first-year honors writing seminar will provide all incoming first-year students with a course in writing that supports multiple HIR outcomes and explores the question, “What does it mean to be human?” Students who complete the first-year honors writing seminar will not take the second-year writing seminar.

The second-year writing seminar, taken by students who completed the first-year writing seminar, is a variable theme composition course focused on academic discourse, research, and argumentation. Students will further develop their reading, writing, research, and critical thinking abilities as they come into contact with the ways that various disciplines (at least three) engage a particular theme. In addition, by studying scholarship across disciplines students will develop rhetorical awareness about the arguments, approaches, and conventions of these disciplines. A focus throughout the course will be on enabling students to take a process approach to making effective arguments in a complex academic context.

Oral Communication

To enhance students’ ability to communicate effectively, all students will complete three hours in oral communication, normally in their first or second year of study. The Oral Communication foundational course will focus on the concepts of dialogue and debate, with the goals of engaging in constructive mutual dialogue in conversations and meetings; developing the ability to articulate, analyze, and defend a position in a public forum; understanding the differences between dialogue and debate; and understanding relative advantages and disadvantages of each mode of communication. With its focus on dialogue and debate, the course will assist students in the development of the skills necessary for learning, living, and working in communities. By developing the ability to engage in conversation that advances
understanding, students will be better able to interact and collaborate with persons from diverse
backgrounds and perspectives.

**Mathematics**

To enhance quantitative reasoning skills, all students will complete three hours in
mathematics. The particular course will vary based on the students’ major and background in
mathematics. The mathematics courses are most closely related to the HIR outcomes related to
scholarship, practical wisdom and critical evaluation of our times.

**Arts**

To ensure that all students acquire a basic understanding of the arts as significant
manifestations of diverse cultural, intellectual, aesthetic, and personal experiences, all students
will complete a three hour component in the Arts. The Arts component may include courses
from the Departments of Music, Visual Arts, English and the Theatre Program. Courses will
assist students to develop skills and acquire experiences that enable them to understand, reflect
upon, and value the creative process within the context of the arts. The requirement may be
satisfied by taking studio and performance courses as well as historical studies courses. Students
may satisfy the three hour requirement with one three hour course or a combination of one- and
two-hour courses. Given the diversity of the Arts, the specific learning outcomes addressed will
vary across courses.

**Social Science**

Essential to life in the 21st century is an understanding of the relationship between
individuals, groups and institutions. All students will complete three hours in the social sciences.
The social science course will be a theme-based course that varies across sections but shares
common learning outcomes. The course will use social science methods and social theory to
critically examine a human issue or problem from at least three social science disciplinary
perspectives (anthropology, economics, political science, psychology and sociology). The
course will emphasize outcomes related to scholarship, critical evaluation of our times, and the
diversity of the human world.

**Natural Science**

An understanding of many significant issues confronting our world today requires a basic
understanding of science. Students must take two three-hour lecture courses in the physical or
life sciences or computer science, at least one of which should be accompanied by a
corresponding one-hour laboratory section. Lecture sections are either a pre-requisite or co-
requisite to their correlative laboratory sections. Students will be exposed to at least two of the
five disciplines: biology, chemistry, computer science, geology, and physics. The science
component will actively challenge students to explore the scientific dimensions of complex,
controversial or unresolved problems facing human society. It will further the development of
the outcomes related to scholarship, practical wisdom and critical evaluation of our times by
challenging students to achieve an enriched understanding of the scientific method by applying it
to issues of broad public interest. The community outcome will also be enhanced through the
team-based learning that occurs in the laboratory setting.

**Crossing Boundaries**

The Crossing Boundaries component includes four courses (Faith Traditions, Practical
Ethical Action, Inquiry and Integrative courses) that challenge students and faculty to link
aspects of their own lives, majors, and careers to a broader world within and outside academia.
As a Catholic, Marianist, comprehensive university, the University of Dayton is particularly
well-suited to develop curricular programs that forge these links and to offer extracurricular
experiences to help students reflect on and understand these links. These courses focus on faith
traditions, practical ethical action, Inquiry and Integration. Collectively, these courses will
strengthen the Catholic intellectual tradition in significant ways. This tradition in Catholic and
Marianist higher education emphasizes the centrality of theology and philosophy, the importance
of linking faith and reason, the integration of knowledge, and the application of that knowledge
to personal and social situations in the world today. Collectively, these courses will build on our
strengths as a comprehensive Marianist university by engaging students and faculty across
disciplinary lines and across academic units in order to see the relationship between the practical
and the theoretical and to understand issues in a more integrative and holistic perspective. The
student learning outcomes related to faith traditions, diversity, practical wisdom, critical
evaluation of our times, and vocation are particularly important for this set of courses.

The course on faith traditions is designed to encourage students to better understand,
reflect on, and place their own religious beliefs and experiences in a broader historical or cultural
context. Courses satisfying the faith traditions component may be offered by any department
provided that the courses incorporate some of the ideas from the introductory religious studies
course and that they develop students’ ability to examine their own faith commitments and to
participate in dialogue with other faith traditions. The courses will: 1) place religious traditions
within their historical context; 2) examine their philosophical foundations or the internal logic of
religious thought, language, and practice; 3) compare religious traditions by examining their
philosophical foundations, historical origins, artistic expressions, canonical texts, and/or storied
practices; or 4) examine a religious tradition with which students are unfamiliar (e.g., a non-
Christian tradition).

The practical ethical action course is designed to cross the boundaries between the
theoretical and the practical and between the liberal arts and the applied fields. It offers the
opportunity for faculty to cross the boundaries of their own disciplines to dialogue with faculty
from other disciplines in ways that enrich their own understanding of important ethical issues
and that enrich the courses they offer to students. Courses satisfying the practical ethical action
component may be offered by any department provided that the courses engage students in thick
description and analysis of ethical issues using concepts central to the study of ethics such as
justice, rights, natural law, conscience or forgiveness and that the courses provide sufficient
normative content that allow students to reflect on value judgments and ethical reasoning and
practical application. These courses will draw from relevant interdisciplinary knowledge as well
as an understanding of the professions and social institutions.
The Inquiry component of CAP requires that students select a course outside their own division to better understand the ways of knowing found in other academic disciplines. The Inquiry course provides an opportunity for all academic units, particularly the professional schools, to develop courses for the CAP. The Inquiry course will serve as an introduction to key methods of investigation, interpretation, exploration, and ways of knowing. Taking a course outside one’s major can broaden awareness of differing philosophies or analytic approaches, and it can offer new ways of conceiving of and resolving problems. The Inquiry course will provide students an opportunity to contrast inquiry in their own field with a different discipline’s methods of inquiry. Some modes of inquiry engage experimentation and creative practice; other modes employ cognitive systems or analytical frameworks. Still other modes of inquiry investigate the complexity of systems, languages, or cultures. Exposure to modes of inquiry not typically used in the students’ major prepares them to think critically about ways of acquiring, evaluating, and applying knowledge claims within their own discipline. For this reason, the Inquiry course will include a reflective and comparative component in which a student examines methods in his or her major field with those in the field of the Inquiry course.

The integration of knowledge has a long-standing position within the Catholic intellectual tradition and an increasingly important role in understanding contemporary social issues and problems. The Integrative course in the CAP requires that faculty develop, and students select, a course that transcends disciplinary boundaries and explicitly examines significant social issues or problems in a multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary framework. Collaborative, interdisciplinary efforts by faculty are encouraged but not required for this course. Courses offered by one faculty member that bring together different disciplinary perspectives to enhance students’ understanding of significant issues may also be developed.

**Major Capstone**

The ability of students to integrate the knowledge acquired in the undergraduate career, both within the major and in the Common Academic Program, is greatly enhanced by a capstone experience. All students will have a capstone course or experience in their major. The capstone
will provide students the opportunity to engage, integrate, practice, and demonstrate the
knowledge and skills they have developed in their major courses and which reflect learning
outcomes associated with the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection. The capstone will provide
students the opportunity to engage in the scholarship, activity and/or practice of their major field
and further the students’ understanding of their chosen vocation, career or profession. Students
will present their work in a forum appropriate to their major. This course or experience will be
designed by faculty in each major. It may, or may not be assigned credit hours.

**Advanced study in religious studies, philosophy, and history**

As a Catholic and Marianist institution of higher education, the University regards
religious studies and philosophy as having special roles in the undergraduate curriculum and in
the attainment of University-wide learning outcomes. Students are expected to deepen their
knowledge of the religious and philosophical traditions that inform the Catholic and Marianist
education. Advanced study in these areas, especially when conducted through interdisciplinary
courses, also assists students in constructing integrated knowledge of the central human
questions examined in a liberal education. The fields of philosophy and religious studies,
together with historical study are indispensable for students’ education in the Catholic
intellectual tradition. Students will take courses beyond the 100 level in these fields to further
their understanding of the resources that the Catholic intellectual tradition offers for their own
personal, professional and civic lives and also for the just transformation of the social world. By
requiring every student to take six hours of courses in the areas of religious studies or philosophy
and three hours in history beyond the 100 level, the University expects students to engage in
liberal learning that connects theory and practice and to draw upon the resources of the Catholic
intellectual tradition as they consider how to lead wise and ethical lives of leadership and service.

Students will have flexibility in fulfilling these requirements. First, these courses will
frequently focus on issues related to, and satisfy the criteria for the Faith Traditions, Practical
Ethical Action, Inquiry and Integrative components of the CAP. Second, the criteria for these
requirements are disciplinary-based in the fields of religious, philosophical and historical studies
Courses offered outside the Departments of Philosophy, Religious Studies and History may count towards the advanced religious studies, philosophy and history requirements if the courses draw extensively from those disciplinary perspectives and address in significant ways aspects of the Catholic intellectual tradition. Courses satisfying the religious studies component might examine the central beliefs, texts or practices of one or more religious traditions or movements; examine ethics as a central feature of a religious tradition including the use of Catholic social teaching as a resource, or; examine cultural expressions of religious identity or tradition as the central focus of theological or religious studies. Courses satisfying the advanced philosophical studies component might evaluate competing solutions to theoretical or ethical options in the present day, or draw on the philosophical resources of the Catholic intellectual tradition to address the challenges of their times. Courses satisfying the advanced historical studies component might engage students in the study and analysis of primary materials to further develop students’ historical sensibilities in a way that illuminates the historical dimensions of HIR learning outcomes. The course could examine a historical topic drawing on the work of historians to show how interpretations of the past may change over time.

**Diversity and Social Justice Course**

As a Marianist university, the University has a special concern for the poor and marginalized and a responsibility to promote the dignity, rights and responsibilities of all persons and peoples. The University curriculum is responsible for contributing to this effort and does so throughout the Common Academic Program, but in a more focused way through a Diversity and Social Justice component. Every student will investigate human diversity issues within a sustained academic context by taking at least three credit hours of course work that have a central focus on one or more dimensions of diversity that are relevant to social justice. The course must have a central focus on one or more dimensions of human diversity on the basis of which systems, institutions, or practices that obstruct social justice have functioned. The dimensions may include, but are not limited to, race, gender, socioeconomic class, and sexual orientation. Courses may address diversity within the United States, in a global context, or both.
Since the course uses a social justice framework, it will consider constructive responses to such injustice.

Courses approved to satisfy the Diversity and Social Justice component will build on earlier CAP courses addressing diversity including the First-Year Humanities courses, the Second-Year Writing Seminar, and the Social Science, Arts, Natural Science, and Oral Communication courses. The Diversity and Social Justice component may not double count with these courses, but may double count with courses taken to satisfy other CAP components or courses taken in the student’s major.

**IV. Administrative Structure**

The position of an Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program will be created to facilitate, implement, and assess the Common Academic Program. Each school and College will establish its own Common Academic Program Committee. A University Committee on the Common Academic Program and Competencies will be established. The Assistant Provost will work closely with the designated Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in these efforts to assure the integrity and quality of the Common Academic Program.

**School/College Common Academic Program Committees**

The College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Business Administration, the School of Education and Allied Professions, and the School of Engineering will each establish committees or specify an extant committee to carry out the unit’s responsibilities for the Common Academic Program. The size, composition, and selection procedure of each of these committees will be determined by, and based on, the needs of each of these academic divisions. The responsibilities of these Committees shall be the following:

1. Propose and/or review proposals for courses or experiences in the CAP originating from that College or School. Courses or experiences that involve faculty or staff from more than one unit would be proposed and reviewed by the authorized committees in all applicable units. If the Committee judges that a proposal meets the purposes of the CAP and that it would be an appropriate for students in that division, the Committee will forward the proposal to the
University Committee on Common Academic Program and Competencies. If it does not reach this judgment, the Committee will return the proposal to the proposer with an explanation of its decision.

2. Periodically review approved courses and experiences relative to their appropriateness for students in that academic division.

3. Provide recommendations to the University CAP Committee relating to CAP policies and procedures.

4. Through communication with faculty and students in that academic division, facilitate an understanding of, and appreciation for, the Common Academic Program.

5. Work with the University Committee and with the Assistant Provost to conduct assessments of the Common Academic Program.

University Structure for the Common Academic Program and Competencies

The Committee on the Common Academic Program and Competencies will be a standing subcommittee of the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate. In consultation with the provost and deans, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will appoint the members of the Committee on the Common Academic Program and Competencies. Membership on the Committee must be a representative cross-section of the various components of the University.

The Committee will be composed of a minimum of nine members plus three ex officio members. The ex officio members are the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program, an Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; and the Registrar or designate. Membership shall be designated as follows:

1. Four faculty members: one each from the three professional schools of Business Administration, Education and Allied Professions, Engineering, and University Libraries.

2. Three faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences with one each from the humanities, the social sciences, and the sciences.

3. Two student members from the Academic Policies Committee, or from the Common Academic Program Committees of the Schools or College, or from the Academic Senate.
4. At least three of the nine members must come from the Academic Senate, preferably from the Academic Policies Committee. At least one member must come from the Academic Policies Committee.

5. Each undergraduate dean has the option to serve or to appoint a designate as an *ex officio* member in addition to the *ex officio* members identified above.

Members with the exception of the students shall have staggered three-year terms of office. Student members shall have a one-year term of office, but may be reappointed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

The responsibilities of the University Committee on the Common Academic Program and Competencies shall be as follows:

1. Review courses and experiences that form the components of the Common Academic Program

2. If the Committee judges that a proposal meets the purposes of the Common Academic Program and that the proposal appears feasible in terms of staffing and other resources, it shall approve the proposal. If the Committee does not judge that the proposal meets the purposes of the Common Academic Program, the Committee shall notify the proposer and the appropriate unit committee of its judgment with an explanation of its decision.

3. Facilitate communication and collaboration among faculty proposing courses and experiences.

4. Instruct the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program to identify and promulgate, at least once a year, a list of courses or experiences that have been approved for the Common Academic Program.

5. Keep a file of documents for approved courses in the CAP under the auspices of the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program.

6. With the assistance of the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program, monitor and evaluate courses and experiences in the CAP to insure that the CAP requirements can be satisfied by students in a timely and systematic fashion.
7. Review proposals that would satisfy more than one component of the Common Academic Program to determine whether the goals of the Common Academic Program would be met.

8. With the assistance of the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program and the Associate Dean, conduct evaluations of the Common Academic Program and make recommendations to the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate for strengthening the Common Academic Program. A thorough and systematic evaluation of the Program will be conducted two years after it has been implemented and every five years thereafter. The Committee may conduct a review of the Common Academic Program or any of its components at any time to assess the extent to which students are achieving the specified goals.

The Committee shall select its chairperson at the first organizational meeting each year. The chairperson will be selected from among the faculty serving on the Committee. The Committee shall develop its own procedures for performing its duties and such procedures shall be submitted to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for its approval.

The CAP Leadership Team

The CAP Leadership Team will serve as advocates for the Program during its implementation on campus and as an advisory body to the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program. Team members will be selected by the Academic Policies Committee in consultation with the academic deans to serve terms of two academic years. The Team will be chaired by the Assistant Provost and will include one faculty representative each from humanities, arts, mathematics and the natural sciences, social sciences, the undergraduate professional schools, the designated Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and one representative from Student Development.

The Team members will work as a group to:

1. Promote faculty understanding and participation in the Common Academic Program across the university;

2. Serve as CAP liaisons within their individual units;
3. Develop criteria for CAP Innovation Awards to support faculty and curricular development;
4. Distribute a Request for Proposals for CAP Innovation Awards twice a year;
5. Review and award grants to proposals that will significantly advance the development, implementation and continued vitality of the CAP.
6. Receive and review reports from awardees on the implementation and effectiveness of their projects.

Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program

An Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program will be appointed by the Provost after consultation with the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate. The Assistant Provost will be responsible for the administration of all aspects of the Common Academic Program. The Assistant Provost will work closely with the designated Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences Associate Dean in assuring that the Common Academic Program is implemented in a manner consistent with the mission and policies of Common Academic Program.

Among other responsibilities, the Assistant Provost will:
1. Lead planning efforts for the initial implementation of the CAP including facilitation of professional development activities related to CAP;
2. Develop and implement a plan to communicate details about the CAP and its implementation to the entire University community, including faculty, advisors and students and facilitate an ongoing discussion among administrators, faculty, and students concerning the role of general education in the mission and vision of the University;
3. Promote faculty interest in and development of CAP course proposals and serve as a resource for faculty with questions about proposal development;
4. Work with the College and professional schools to coordinate CAP logistical and staffing issues;
5. Work with the College Associate Dean and professional schools to implement common procedures for effective assessment, review, and evaluation of the Common Academic Program;

6. Report the results of the assessment and evaluation to the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate and other appropriate University bodies.

7. Work with the College Associate Dean and other university staff to identify and pursue possible outside funding sources for the Common Academic Program.

**Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences**

Because of the significant role of the College of Arts and Sciences in the Common Academic Program, the designated Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences will play an important role in the implementation and administration of the Program. Among other roles, the Associate Dean will:

1. Promote faculty interest in and development of CAP course proposals and serve as a resource for faculty with questions about proposal development;

2. Coordinate faculty development and curriculum development activities in those areas of CAP that are generally limited to faculty in the College;

3. Work with the Assistant Provost to address logistical issues related to CAP and to implement procedures for effective assessment, review, and evaluation of the Common Academic Program. The Associate Dean will assist in reporting the results of that assessment to the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate and other appropriate University bodies;

4. Work with the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program and other university staff to identify and pursue possible outside funding sources for the Common Academic Program.
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Attached is a copy of the Marianist Education Working Group (MEWG) Report entitled, “Habits of Inquiry and Reflection: A Report on Education in the Catholic and Marianist Traditions at the University of Dayton.” At its retreat on 7 August 2006, the Provost’s Council unanimously agreed to sponsor this document and bring it to the Academic Senate for thorough consideration. On behalf of the Provost’s Council, I ask that the Senate review the document and suggest that it render two key decisions. First, does the Senate believe that the MEWG captured the ideals of a university education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions? If so, I respectfully request that the Senate take appropriate action on the document through its committee structure in order to generate broad campus discussion and endorsement of the document’s mission statement, educational aims, and core learning outcomes. Second, if the Senate finds that the campus is supportive of the proposed purposes and outcomes of the education proposed in the document, I respectfully request that the Senate take appropriate action on the document through its committee structure in order to generate a set of recommendations regarding specific programs, infrastructure, faculty development, and resources necessary to realize the educational aims and learning outcomes.

In addition to the support offered by the Provost’s Council as a whole, I would like to offer my strong personal support for moving this thoughtful and provocative report to the Academic Senate. I encourage the Senate to make this a priority item and look forward to its leadership in hosting meaningful, university-wide consideration of the larger conceptual framework this report provides for our collective work in undergraduate education.
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I. Executive Summary

The Marianist Education Working Group was charged to facilitate a campus-wide conversation about the purposes and substance of a Marianist education at the University of Dayton and to present recommendations about how the common academic program for undergraduates should express the ideals of university education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions. In this report, the Working Group proposes a mission statement and educational aims for the common academic program, a set of core student learning outcomes, and accompanying recommendations for academic programs, infrastructure, and faculty development. The report also considers implications for faculty work life and investment of university resources.

The Working Group proposes that five educational aims should orient the common academic program for undergraduates [section III]. Education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions at the University of Dayton: 1) seeks knowledge in a sacramental spirit; 2) pursues learning in, through, and for community; 3) cultivates practical wisdom; 4) forges critical ability to read the signs of these times; and 5) supports discernment of personal and communal vocation. Key concepts in the proposed aims are explained in Section III.

Accordingly, the common academic program for undergraduates should be guided by the following mission statement [section IV]:

Students educated in the Catholic and Marianist traditions at the University of Dayton pursue rigorous academic inquiry, in a sacramental spirit, and engage in vigorous dialogue, learning in, through, and for community. Guided by the purpose of transforming society for the ends of justice, peace, and the common good, the University’s academic program challenges students to excellence in their majors, cultivates practical wisdom in light of the particular needs of the twenty-first century, and fosters reflection upon their individual vocations.

Explication of the orienting educational aims suggests that all undergraduates, through the common academic program, should attain seven core learning outcomes, among others appropriate to their degree programs and to General Education. These core learning outcomes [section V] would require that all undergraduates develop and demonstrate:

1) advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity through production of scholarly work;
2) ability to engage in inquiry regarding major faith traditions, and familiarity with the basic theological understandings and texts that shape Roman Catholicism;
3) understanding of the cultures, histories, times, and places of multiple others;
4) understanding of and practice in values and skills necessary for learning, living, and working in community;
5) practical wisdom in addressing human problems and needs, drawing upon advanced knowledge, values, and skills in students’ chosen professions or majors;
6) habits of inquiry and reflection, informed by Catholic Social Teaching and multidisciplinary study, that equip students to evaluate critically and imaginatively the challenges of our times; and
7) ability to articulate reflectively through the language of vocation the purposes of students’ lives and their proposed work.

Complete statements of these learning outcomes are presented in Section V.

The Working Group recommends certain developmentally sequenced, programmatic changes that would promote student achievement of the learning outcomes [section VI.A-D]. For the first year of study, revisions in first-year seminars and the Humanities Base Program are recommended. For the first and second years of study, the report recommends expanding Arts Study offerings and inquiry-based courses in the sciences and social sciences. Habits of mind cultivated in these fields lend themselves to multidisciplinary integration and experiential learning. For the second and third years of study, the report recommends expanding service learning, expanding and facilitating multidisciplinary minors and self-declared or occasional clusters, and creating problem-based interdisciplinary courses in General Education. Expanding opportunities for international and intercultural study, promoting global learning, and increasing foreign-language study are also recommended. For the fourth (or final) year of study, capstone seminars or projects should be developed in majors, multidisciplinary capstone course(s) in General Education should be created, and structures for supporting student scholarship should be developed. All of these recommendations require faculty development in curricular design and pedagogy and should inform criteria for faculty hiring. The recommendations also require expanded collaboration between faculty and staff in Student Development and Campus Ministry, as well as significantly increased staff support.

The Working Group recommends changes in educational infrastructure that must be undertaken if the proposed educational aims are to be realized in vital and sustainable ways [section VI.E]. These recommendations concern augmenting opportunities for learning and living in community, strengthening academic advising, creating faculty seminars to generate curricular revision, and reconfiguring classroom space and course schedules. The report also underscores implications of its recommendations for faculty work life and investment of university resources [sections VI.F-G]. These implications concern faculty reviews, workload, new faculty lines and support staff, budget models, and effective program coordination. Acknowledgement of such implications is critically important if education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions is to flourish at the University of Dayton.

II. Charge and context

In February 2005, Mary E. Morton, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, in cooperation with the Deans from the professional schools and the Provost, charged the Marianist Education Working Group to facilitate a campus-wide conversation about the purposes and substance of a Marianist education at the University of Dayton and to present recommendations by May 2006 about how the common academic program for undergraduates should express the ideals of university education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions.

The Marianist Education Working Group has completed the following tasks in carrying out its charge:

1. Studied current literature on curricular reform and participated in the Association of American Colleges and Universities’s Institute on General Education in May 2005;
2. Studied literature on the character and history of Catholic and Marianist higher education in the United States;
3. Assembled an oral history of General Education at the University of Dayton from the late 1970s through the mid-1990s;
4. Convened in August-October 2005 a series of campus-wide forums and meetings for conversation about Catholic, Marianist education and the state of the University of Dayton’s common academic program for undergraduates;
5. Solicited departmental reports about the ideals of higher education in a Marianist context and elements of the common academic program that should be retained, revised, or created;
6. Issued an interim report in November 2005 that summarized the results of these conversations and departmental reports and identified a set of focal points for further dialogue;
7. Hosted targeted meetings in November 2005-February 2006 about the focal points and other issues that emerged from campus discussions;
8. Distributed in March 2006 a draft of the final report and hosted forums for comment on the draft; and
9. Updated regularly the College Chairs and Program Directors, Provost’s Council, and Academic Senate about the progress of the project.

The recommendations presented in this report are offered to Dean Morton, who defined and commissioned the project and who will have responsibility to initiate appropriate review of the report. The Working Group has sought to cast recommendations in a form that would set clear directions for potential revisions in curricular and co-curricular programs without addressing details for the process and substance of such changes that are properly the responsibility of the Academic Senate, the curriculum committees of the academic units, and the Provost’s Council. Therefore, as the Working Group’s charge indicates, the recommendations are often broad and philosophical in content and tone. As the recommendations are also ambitious, it will be critically important that specific, feasible priorities be established and that clear and consultative processes be used to implement these recommendations.

In the preparation of this report, as in all its work, the Working Group has relied on a number of recent important formulations of the University’s founding commitments and its Catholic and Marianist heritage and identity. Chief among these are the *Statement on the Catholic and Marianist Identity of the University of Dayton* (1990), *Characteristics of Marianist Universities* (1999) and *Conversing: Reflections on the University of Dayton’s Catholic and Marianist Character in its 150th Year – A Report from the Task Force on the Sesquicentennial Conversation* (2002). In its more focused task of discerning the implications of Marianist education for the common undergraduate academic program, the Working Group acknowledges and draws upon the foundations and breadth of the Catholic and Marianist character of the University articulated more fully in these other resources. The Working Group has been guided, as well, by the strategic directions presented in *Vision 2005: The Foundation* (1999) and developed most recently in *A Vision of Excellence* (2005). This report should be read within the context of the University’s commitment to excellence in transformative education.

The Working Group acknowledges that the ultimate fate of proposals for large-scale curricular revision such as this rests with the faculty and with those staff who develop and coordinate co-curricular elements of the common academic program. Unless the following recommendations capture the scholarly and pedagogical imaginations of the faculty and stimulate sufficient creative energy in faculty and staff to undertake the difficult, but exciting, work of refashioning many of the components that shape undergraduates’ common academic experience at the University of Dayton, formally instituted decisions about these recommendations will not come to life and bear fruit for the University’s students. Because of the central and critical place of the faculty for the future of this project, the present...
III. Orienting educational aims of the University of Dayton

The ideals of higher education inherent in Catholic and Marianist traditions, and expressed in the University of Dayton’s guiding documents, suggest that the educational aims stated below should orient the common academic program for undergraduates at the University of Dayton, articulating its horizons and providing direction for curricular and co-curricular offerings. The entire university community should embrace and advance these aims as central to its academic purposes. At the same time, the Working Group understands that the proposed aims do not exhaust the purposes that guide any particular curricular or co-curricular academic program. Other important educational aims are compatible with the aims that manifest most clearly the ideals of university education in the University of Dayton’s Catholic and Marianist context.

Education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions at the University of Dayton . . .

1. Seeks knowledge in a sacramental spirit;
2. Pursues learning in, through, and for community;
3. Cultivates practical wisdom;
4. Forges critical ability to read the signs of these times; and
5. Supports discernment of personal and communal vocation.

The five proposed educational aims should not be regarded as discrete or independent of one another. Rather, the Working Group understands them to be inseparable elements of university education in a Catholic and Marianist context; the full realization of any one of these aims would depend upon the realization of others. While the concepts used to express these aims are familiar from the University’s guiding documents, Catholic intellectual tradition, and discussions of Catholic higher education, they can be subject to multiple interpretations. The following explications are offered to clarify the senses in which the Working Group uses these concepts.

Sacramentality: Catholic universities represent a distinctive expression of the belief in the sacramental nature of the world. Belief in God as creator and as incarnate in Jesus Christ leads Catholics and many other Christians to a special awareness of the presence of God in creation and the possibility of seeing God in the ordinary things of life. Study of the world or inquiry into any subject that yields some truth about the world has the potential to reveal in meaningful ways knowledge of the God who created the world. To seek knowledge in light of the world’s sacramental character is to do so in a sacramental spirit.

The sacramental spirit of inquiry does not necessarily entail that all members of a Catholic university community must assent to the theological principle that signs of God’s presence may be seen in all things. It means, rather, that every form and mode of genuine inquiry can be celebrated and affirmed as inherently valuable. It implies also that the wonder and joy of beholding the world – the animating spirit of liberal education – should be cultivated in all learning in the university and that scholarship should be pursued rigorously and openly.

A sacramental approach to knowledge means, too, that the whole person – mind, spirit, and body – should be engaged in learning and should be the subject of study, as every
dimension of human life bears value. In turn, inquiry in a sacramental spirit naturally supports the university’s commitment to care for the development of the whole person.

The sacramental spirit of knowledge-seeking affirmed in a Catholic university also means that deep value is to be found in the plurality of the world’s people and cultures. A Catholic university commits itself to respect and embrace the inviolable dignity of all persons, and to welcome the exploration of a multiplicity of perspectives, beliefs, and traditions regarding what is true, beautiful, and good. A Catholic university thrives on dialogue and collaboration among persons with diverse backgrounds, values, cultures, and abilities. A sacramental approach to inquiry anchors the distinctive Marianist affirmation of the values of inclusivity and equal dignity for genuine community.

**Community:** A Catholic and Marianist university is specially committed to the ideals and responsibilities of community in the design and delivery of its common academic program. These ideals and responsibilities are powerfully conveyed through the concept of “family spirit.” The common academic program should reveal a community of learning dedicated to challenging itself to realize the highest academic and ethical standards and to supporting its members fully in this challenge.

The academic program should reflect clearly the primary ways in which the communal values and relationships that shape student learning also infuse students’ residential life on campus. Because contemporary American society does not normally inculcate or nurture the habits, attitudes, skills, and practices that are necessary for building inclusive community of the sort that Marianists envision, the university’s academic program should approach the fundamental aim of communal learning explicitly and deliberately. This means that students, faculty, and staff alike must grow in their capacities to welcome collaboration in the face of differences, to sustain dialogue even when disagreements seem insurmountable, and to turn beyond the university community in the recognition that all learning should ultimately seek to serve the common good and, in serving, to lead. All members of the university should come to realize that learning in, through, and for community generates high expectations for responsibility from each person in the community.

The pursuit of learning in community also means that the undergraduate academic program should prepare students for intelligent and fruitful participation in various forms of community that mediate human life and activity in the local, regional, national, and global spheres.

**Practical wisdom:** The innovative and transformative purposes of higher education in a Catholic and Marianist context mean that the search for wisdom and truth that defines any university must ultimately be rendered practical. A Catholic, Marianist university strives to cultivate wisdom in the adoption of practical ends, in practical judgment, and in reflective decision-making. These purposes are to be distinguished from mere skill in the fruitful practical application of knowledge. A Catholic, Marianist university aims to educate persons for good and whole lives, developing rigorous theoretical understanding yet also influencing sensibilities, motives, and conduct in academically appropriate and relevant ways.

Cultivation of practical wisdom requires that deep immersion in the world through experience, activity, and imaginative exploration be central to a university education. In particular, university education must address real human problems and needs. This is why descriptions of Catholic, Marianist education properly emphasize integration of liberal and professional education and the uniting of creative imagination with analytical forms of inquiry.
**Reading the signs of these times:** The Society of Mary was formed in response to crises in modernity that the Marianist founding generation experienced in the wake of the French Revolution. Central to Marianist education is the forging of abilities for the critical interpretation and examination of one’s times in light of the past. While higher education with a Marianist character draws upon profound and longstanding intellectual traditions, and especially Catholic intellectual tradition, it also interrogates the particular challenges of its own time and place in an open, critical, and hopeful spirit that seeks justice, peace, and the common good.

The common academic program of a Catholic, Marianist university addresses the university’s specific historical, geographical, and social circumstances and prepares students to acquire habits of inquiry and reflection that enable them to identify, evaluate critically, and respond creatively to the vital issues of their own day. The university’s academic program in the early decades of the twenty-first century must investigate the pressing ethical, social, political, technological, economic, and ecological issues of its time.

**Vocation:** Education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions strives to support academically students’ efforts to find and explore the deep purposes that lend meaning, wonder, and fulfillment to their lives. These purposes consist not merely in what students may find themselves especially fit for pursuing but in what each student is specially called to do. The university’s commitment to support students’ discernment of their vocations in academically appropriate ways follows from the fundamental objective to educate whole persons, in mind, spirit, and body, for whole lives.

Students’ reflections upon their unique vocations belong in the common academic program because the habits of mind and character which that program inculcates support thoughtful investigation and articulation of life purposes. The academic program also prepares students for excellence in the majors or professional studies that will influence much of their working lives, as well as their communal roles and responsibilities. Through the common academic program students come to grips with the multiple dimensions of human flourishing with which they must engage as they pursue the meaning-giving purposes of their lives.

Academic support for reflection upon vocation naturally accompanies the other orienting educational aims of a Catholic, Marianist university. Pursuit of rigorous inquiry in a sacramental spirit, through a community of learning dedicated to cultivating practical wisdom in the face of the critical issues of the times, naturally encompasses extended reflection upon the unique contours and directions of our individual and collective lives. Excellence in university education also fosters dedication to the particular vocation of learning throughout our lives.

**IV. Mission statement for the undergraduate academic program**

The orienting educational aims proposed here may be conjoined in a mission statement for the common academic program which expresses the academic significance of the University of Dayton’s Catholic and Marianist heritage and ideals for all undergraduates.

*Students educated in the Catholic and Marianist traditions at the University of Dayton pursue rigorous academic inquiry, in a sacramental spirit, and engage in vigorous dialogue, learning in, through, and for community. Guided by the purpose of transforming society for the ends of justice, peace, and the common good, the*
University’s academic program challenges students to excellence in their majors, cultivates practical wisdom in light of the particular needs of the twenty-first century, and fosters reflection upon their individual vocations.

The Working Group intends the proposed mission statement to articulate the academic life of the University’s Catholic and Marianist traditions and so to guide future development of the common academic program for undergraduates.

V. Core student learning outcomes for the common academic program

For the past year, the Marianist Education Working Group has facilitated campus-wide conversations about the purposes and substance of education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions at the University of Dayton. These conversations have also considered where the University best displays its central academic ideals and where the common academic program stands in greatest need of further development or significant reform. Considered in light of these conversations and the substantial study conducted by the Working Group, the five educational aims and mission statement presented above point toward certain student learning outcomes as being particularly important for guiding future developments in the common academic program for undergraduates.

The learning outcomes presented below are intended to function at the level of the common academic program. They could be promoted in different ways, through different structures and activities, in the student’s major, in General Education and the Competencies programs, in co-curricular programming, and in learning experiences that transpire outside the formal curriculum. They are not to be regarded as the exclusive responsibility of a limited segment of the university community. Rather, they should shape all intentional planning for students’ educational experience in every division of the university.

The proposed outcomes do not necessarily map onto unique elements of the common academic program, and they do not exhaust the goals of the academic program for students.

1. **Scholarship:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity through the production of a body of artistic, scholarly or community-based work intended for public presentation and defense.

2. **Faith traditions:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to engage in intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical inquiry regarding major faith traditions. Students will be familiar with the basic theological understandings and central texts that shape Catholic beliefs and teachings, practices, and spiritualities. Students’ abilities should be developed sufficiently to allow them to examine deeply their own faith commitments and also to participate intelligently and respectfully in dialogue with other traditions.

3. **Diversity:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical understanding of the cultures, histories, times, and places of multiple others, as marked by class, race, gender, ethnicity, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, and other manifestations of difference. Students’ understanding will reflect scholarly inquiry, experiential immersion, and disciplined reflection.

4. **Community:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate understanding of and practice in the values and skills necessary for learning, living, and working in
5. **Practical wisdom:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate practical wisdom in addressing real human problems and deep human needs, drawing upon advanced knowledge, values, and skills in their chosen profession or major course of study. Starting with a conception of human flourishing, students will be able to define and diagnose symptoms, relationships, and problems clearly and intelligently, construct and evaluate possible solutions, thoughtfully select and implement solutions, and critically reflect on the process in light of actual consequences.

6. **Critical evaluation of our times:** Through multidisciplinary study, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate habits of inquiry and reflection, informed by familiarity with Catholic Social Teaching, that equip them to evaluate critically and imaginatively the ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, and ecological challenges of their times in light of the past.

7. **Vocation:** Using appropriate scholarly and communal resources, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to articulate reflectively the purposes of their life and proposed work through the language of vocation. In collaboration with the university community, students’ developing vocational plans will exhibit appreciation of the fullness of human life, including its intellectual, ethical, spiritual, aesthetic, social, emotional, and bodily dimensions, and will examine both the interdependence of self and community and the responsibility to live in service of others.

**VI. Recommendations for programs, educational infrastructure, and faculty development; implications for faculty work life and university resources**

The Working Group offers the following recommendations concerning academic programs, educational infrastructure, and faculty development as preferred ways to advance the educational aims and student learning outcomes proposed for the common academic program. These learning outcomes reflect an educational approach that must attend carefully to undergraduate students’ academic and personal development over the course of a four-year degree program. Recommendations in the first four sub-sections [VI.A-D] are organized in relation to the developmental progression of students’ academic experience. The Working Group recognizes that “year of study” does not constitute a discrete developmental stage. Rather, the concept is used to provide a practically manageable way of highlighting certain appropriate points of emphasis along students’ four-year educational experience at the university. The final three sub-sections [VI.E-G] identify features of educational infrastructure, faculty work life, and investment of university resources that must be addressed if the recommended programmatic and pedagogical changes are to flourish and the proposed educational aims are to be vital and sustainable.

As well as reflecting the discussions initiated by the Working Group, these recommendations draw upon other work on the curriculum being done by the First Year Team, the Humanities Base Committee, the Cluster Coordinating Committee, the Committee on General Education and Competencies, and faculty involved in various academic excellence initiatives funded by
the Provost. These recommendations are also designed to advance the seven strategic goals set out in *A Vision of Excellence*.

VI.A. Recommendations for the first year of study

1. Revise **first-year seminars** substantially to become academically challenging courses that foster engaging academic inquiry and reflection and orient students to the nature and purposes of a University of Dayton education. First-year seminars should be designed to promote the core learning outcomes, especially in scholarship, diversity, community, and vocation. They should also be coordinated with the Humanities Base Program. Some seminars may be offered in conjunction with first-year learning-living communities. First-year seminars should require that students begin construction of academic portfolios and also offer opportunities for service-based learning, focused partly on the campus community. First-year seminars would also be powerful vehicles through which to promote student learning about health and personal discipline in the context of students’ educational development. In order to achieve these aims, first-year seminars should be expanded in curricular significance, either by counting for 3-4 semester hours of General Education credit or through linking with General Education courses. Ideally, these should be small, interdisciplinary, writing-intensive courses. The University should explore the possibility that writing-intensive seminars might replace one of the English composition courses in the first year. Collaboration with the Libraries, Student Development, and Campus Ministry will be essential to future development of first-year seminars. [Learning outcomes 1, 3-4, 7]

2. Revise the **Humanities Base Program** to lay the foundation for all core learning outcomes for the common academic program and to facilitate coordination with the objectives of first-year seminars and first-year learning-living communities. In particular, all Humanities Base courses should contribute to students’ examination of faith traditions and to their academic encounters with diversity. As expressed in the current Humanities Base goals, all Humanities Base courses should actively support consideration of global perspectives. [All learning outcomes]

VI.B. Recommendations for the first and second years of study

1. Expand **Arts Study** offerings for first- and second-year students. Some of these courses should be coordinated with first-year seminars, Humanities Base courses, and first-year learning communities. Some Arts courses might be coordinated with proposals below for the second or third years of study. Study of, and active participation in, the arts provide uniquely powerful occasions to explore modes of inquiry, reflection, and experiential immersion in the world that advance the proposed student learning outcomes. [All learning outcomes]

2. Incorporate **scientific inquiry**, as pursued in the natural sciences, mathematics, engineering, and technology, more deliberately in the first and second years of study. Inquiry using the methods of these fields should be pursued in some first-year seminars. Some introductory science courses in General Education should be coordinated with courses in the Humanities Base or with first-year courses in the social sciences or arts. Courses that explore the distinctive methodologies and habits of mind in scientific fields advance learning outcomes for scholarship, community, practical wisdom, and critical evaluation of our times. Scientific inquiry is also inherently a form of global, transnational learning that relies on collaborative, communal work. [Outcomes 1, 4-6]

3. Incorporate **social scientific inquiry** more deliberately in the first and second years of study. Inquiry that employs methods of the social sciences should be pursued in
some first-year seminars and should be coordinated with other first- or second-year courses in General Education. Courses that develop the habits of mind necessary for critical study of human societies are potentially germane to all of the proposed learning outcomes. [All learning outcomes]

The preceding recommendations do not mean that the General Education Program’s present emphasis on humanistic inquiry should be diminished. Rather, these other forms of inquiry should be explored more deliberately in the first and second years of study as complementary with, and in relation to, forms of humanistic inquiry and reflection.

VI.C. Recommendations for the second and third years of study

1. Expand curricular and co-curricular offerings in, and support for, service learning. In the second year of study, service-learning opportunities should be focused substantially on the City of Dayton and the Greater Miami Valley; in the third year, service learning should be coordinated especially with study abroad or cultural immersion programs. Programmatic structures and pedagogical methods for integrating service experience with academic inquiry, scholarship, and reflection should be promoted. Support for faculty and staff who deliver and coordinate service-learning programs must be increased significantly. The expansion of service-learning programs must proceed with particular attention to respect for the dignity of community partners and the integrity of the University’s relationships with them. [Learning outcomes 3-7]

2. Expand and facilitate multidisciplinary minors and self-declared clusters as successors to the current thematic cluster requirement. The goals of the thematic clusters are worthy, but their realization could be achieved more meaningfully through either multidisciplinary minors or student designed, self-declared clusters. Such multidisciplinary, integrative structures should focus on addressing real human problems and needs in light of critical evaluation of these times. They should also assist students in their on-going vocational reflections. There may also be a role for occasional course clusters that examine issues of special relevance to our times. Integration could be supported through an expanded student portfolio. Support for development and coordination of multidisciplinary minors would need to be increased significantly. [Learning outcomes 5-7]

3. Create problem-based, interdisciplinary courses in General Education designed especially for second- or third-year students. Such courses would aim at developing practical wisdom and critical evaluation of these times. They should develop familiarity with forms of technological and economic analysis, as well as with critical modes of ethical, social, and ecological inquiry, including Catholic Social Teaching. Such courses could belong to multidisciplinary minors or to self-declared or occasional clusters, and should be linked both to the Humanities Base and to majors, where feasible. [Learning outcomes 5-6]

4. Expand opportunities for international and intercultural study, including curricular revisions to promote global learning. Objectives for global learning should be incorporated in all multidisciplinary minors and in many capstone courses, in addition to the Humanities Base. Cultural immersions should incorporate explicit links to the curriculum in order to promote academically-informed reflection and analysis. Opportunities for and incentives to promote study of foreign language should be developed wherever possible for each academic unit. [Learning outcomes 3-4, 6]

VI.D. Recommendations for the fourth (or final) year of study
1. Develop a culminating **capstone seminar or project in each major**. Such a seminar or project would aim at promoting scholarship and culminating reflection on vocational discernment and life plans. Such a course or project should also aim to integrate study at various levels in General Education with study in the major. An expanded student portfolio could document such integration and vocational reflection. [Learning outcomes 1 and 7]

2. Create **multidisciplinary capstone course(s) in General Education**. Where feasible within a course of study, such a capstone course could support the previous recommendation, helping to develop and integrate culminating study in General Education in relation to the major. An expanded portfolio system could again be valuable for such a course. The course would also be linked clearly to the Humanities Base and could provide students opportunities to build upon a multidisciplinary minor or self-declared or occasional cluster. The course should emphasize all core learning outcomes. Where feasible, it could be coordinated with capstone seminars in the majors. General Education requirements may need to be modified in order to accommodate such a multidisciplinary capstone in General Education. [All learning outcomes.]

3. Develop and expand structures for requiring, coordinating, funding, and reviewing **student scholarship**. Undergraduate research programs would need to be developed that are appropriate to serve each unit’s majors. A portfolio structure could be helpful for coordination and review of student scholarship. [Learning outcome 1]

Recommendations for the common academic program, and especially the third and fourth years of study, should be pursued in ways that support valuable relationships between undergraduate and graduate education, so that undergraduates will be well prepared for graduate work and so that the University’s emerging strategies for graduate education are well coordinated with its approach to undergraduate education.

The foregoing recommendations [section VI.A-D] all require substantial investment in faculty development for curricular design and pedagogical innovation, and should inform criteria for faculty hiring.

**VI.E. Recommendations concerning educational infrastructure**

The proposed student learning outcomes also support recommendations concerning the educational infrastructure that makes possible the development and delivery of the common academic program. The following recommendations are fundamentally important for the realization of the educational aims proposed in this report.

1. Expand structures and coordination of opportunities for **learning and living in community**. These should include, but by no means be limited to, learning-living communities for first-year students. Opportunities for multi-year learning communities should also be explored as vehicles through which third- and fourth-year students can exercise academic leadership in the campus community and contribute to younger students’ academic development. Values and skills for learning and living in community should be developed, in part, in the context of engaging the culture and structure of the student neighborhood in both academically guided and religiously grounded ways. This recommendation requires faculty-development support for planning of the curricular elements of learning communities and for expanded collaboration with Student Development and Campus Ministry staff on co-curricular programming. [Learning outcomes 2 and 4]
2. Strengthen structures, support, and faculty preparation for academic advising. More effective and better supported academic advising is essential for developmentally sensitive delivery of the common academic program, for meaningful integration of learning across disciplines, for integration of curricular and co-curricular learning, and for sustained reflection on vocation. An expanded portfolio system could facilitate student interaction with advisors. Tools for evaluating academic advising by faculty should be developed and incorporated into reviews for performance, promotion, and tenure. Academic advisors should also work in tandem with the mentoring activities carried out through Student Development and Campus Ministry. [All learning outcomes]

3. Create and fund faculty seminars to develop proposals for key elements of a revised curriculum. Possible areas for faculty study might include undergraduate scholarship, the Catholic and Marianist context for the components of the first-year curriculum, service learning and community-based learning, global learning, or pedagogies for experiential learning in multiple fields. Where possible, faculty seminars should build upon recent faculty development efforts in scholarship, curriculum, and pedagogy. Such seminars would be well suited to the University of Dayton’s faculty culture and would be likely to yield thoughtfully developed, innovative pilot programs. [All learning outcomes]

4. Reconfigure design and assignments of classroom space and course schedules to facilitate student inquiry, collaboration, and reflection. Successful coordination among courses or between courses and co-curricular experiences also requires creative scheduling and use of space. Protected opportunities for reflection, community building, service activity, or prayer should be created. The busy, distraction-filled environment of the campus otherwise will preclude the deep forms of engagement recommended in this report. The new master plan for the campus should place high priority upon the architectural implications of this report. [All learning outcomes]

Just as the recommendations presented here will require investment in faculty development, they also entail substantially expanded collaboration between faculty and staff, especially in Student Development and Campus Ministry, as well as significantly increased staff support in general.

The Working Group recognizes that the recommendations presented in this section are ambitious and will require thoughtfully prioritized and sensitively planned implementation. Planning for implementation falls outside the scope of the Working Group’s charge. However, the ambitious character of the recommendations reflects the high aspirations for the University and its students that were expressed consistently and repeatedly by the many faculty and staff who contributed to this project.

VI.F. Implications for faculty work life

Curricular and co-curricular revisions motivated by the educational ideals expressed in this report will require special investments of faculty members’ time, talent, and energy. Unless faculty members have the time, funding, and support needed to take meaningful ownership of the programmatic revisions recommended here, the resulting curricular changes will lack academic depth and vitality and will become unsustainable. The following implications for faculty work life are, therefore, particularly important for the flourishing of Catholic, Marianist education at the University of Dayton.

1. Significant contributions to major curricular-revision efforts must be recognized and rewarded appropriately in annual performance reviews if faculty commitment to
these efforts is to be sustained for the long term. Significant faculty involvement in experiential, inquiry-based learning outside the classroom and the integration of co-curricular activities with the curriculum should also be recognized and rewarded in annual merit reviews.

2. **Reviews for tenure and promotion** likewise must give appropriate recognition to significant faculty contributions to major curricular revisions. This does not mean that standing responsibilities of tenure-line faculty members to be active and productive scholars and contributing members of their departmental, university, and professional communities should diminish. Rather, significant contributions to curriculum revision and co-curricular planning must be supported generously (e.g., through course releases or summer salary) so that faculty working toward tenure or promotion have sufficient time and receive due recognition for such activities.

3. **Faculty workload expectations** may need to be revised in light of the demands imposed by the initiation of major pilot projects in the curriculum and co-curriculum.

**VI.G. Implications for resources and coordination**

The recommendations presented in this report carry substantial implications for university resources. If these recommendations are to be implemented effectively, the University will need to consider reallocation of current resources and major investment of new resources. The Working Group’s study of the history of the current General Education Program revealed that, according to key faculty and administrative advocates for the program, the resources needed for the program to reach and sustain over time its full potential were never realized. Future work on the common academic program should benefit from the lessons of this history.

1. Effective multi- or interdisciplinary curriculum development and teaching, integration of curricular and co-curricular learning, creation of new seminars, and the development of innovative pedagogies suited to these projects will require increased **budgetary support** for new full-time faculty lines and for faculty development, as well as for expanded support staff in such critical areas as service learning, international and intercultural learning, and Residence Education.

2. **Budget models**, including means of accounting for delivery of student credit hours, will need to be revised in order not merely to permit but also facilitate faculty collaboration across departments, programs, and academic units. Many promising collaborative initiatives in the past have died in their early stages because of the inflexibility of current budget models.

3. Funding for effective **coordination** of pilot programs and their eventual full-scale implementation will also be required. The work of coordinating programs of the proposed nature and scale will need to be performed collaboratively by faculty members, staff, and administrators alike. Coordination of these programs with other University initiatives will be important and may also require additional resources.

**VII. Membership of the Marianist Education Working Group**

With the exception of Dr. Jim Biddle and Fr. Paul Marshall, the following members have worked on the project from its inception in February, 2005. Dr. Biddle and Fr. Marshall joined in the project in July, 2005 to represent, respectively, the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate and the vowed Marianists at the University of Dayton.

Paul Benson (Chair): Associate Dean for Integrated Learning and Curriculum, College of Arts and Sciences; Professor, Department of Philosophy
Jim Biddle:  Chairperson, Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate; Associate Professor, Department of Teacher Education
Una Cadegan:  Director, American Studies Program; Associate Professor, Department of History
Chris Duncan:  Chairperson and Professor, Department of Political Science
Jim Dunne:  Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs and Information Technology, School of Business Administration; Professor, Department of Management Information Systems, Operations Management, and Decision Sciences
Kevin Hallinan:  Chairperson and Professor, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Judith Huacuja:  Assistant Professor, Department of Visual Arts
Katie Kinnucan-Welsch:  Chairperson and Associate Professor, Department of Teacher Education
Paul Marshall, S.M.:  Rector
Don Pair:  Chairperson and Professor, Department of Geology
Appendices

Appendix A: Consultations, presentations, and forums

The Working Group made presentations to the College Chairs and Program Directors and to the Educational Leadership Council in May, 2005.

During June and July, 2005, the Working Group interviewed faculty members and administrators who were deeply involved in the development or oversight of the present General Education Program in order to construct an oral history of General Education at UD since the late 1970s. These interviews included Mike Barnes, Jim Farrelly, Ray Fitz, Jim Heft, Pat Johnson, Tom Lasley, Paul Morman, and Pat Palermo.

At the beginning of the 2005-06 academic year, the Working Group invited reports from each academic department on campus, especially those that teach undergraduate students, about their understanding of the key elements of education in a Marianist context and the implications of that understanding for future development of the University’s common academic program for undergraduates. The Working Group received reports from the following academic units: Accounting, Biology, Chemistry, Communication, Computer Science, Counselor Education and Human Services, Economics and Finance, Geology, Health and Sports Science, History, Languages, Libraries, Management and Marketing, Mathematics, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, MIS/OM/Decision Sciences, Philosophy, Physics, Political Science, Psychology, Religious Studies, the SBA Administrative Committee, Sociology/Anthropology/Social Work, Teacher Education, and Visual Arts.

The Working Group met at the beginning of the Fall Term, 2005 with the Provost’s Council, the SBA Administrative Committee, and the Chairs Collaborative. Presentations were given in September for the Faculty Exchange Series and the Academic Senate; a Faculty Exchange Series Roundtable was also convened. The Working Group hosted forums for untenured tenure-track faculty and for non-tenure-line faculty members. Meetings were held with the Humanities Base Committee, the Department of Religious Studies, the 2005-06 Leadership UD cohort, and representatives of the SBA’s Catholic and Marianist Heritage Advisory Committee. The Fall Humanities Base faculty workshop discussed the Marianist education project. After the Working Group released an interim report on November 22, 2005, discussions of the report were held with the College Chairpersons and Program Directors, the vowed Marianist community on campus, the Deans Council, the Integrated Natural Science Sequence faculty workshop, and the black faculty. The Working Group also received written comments on the interim report, including a report on the common educational experience from the School of Engineering’s Integrated Engineering Core Committee.

During Winter Term, 2006, discussions of focal points identified in the November interim report continued. A presentation was given for the Faculty Exchange Series, and an open forum was convened. Meetings were held with Campus Ministry staff, Student Development heads, the Department of Philosophy, and the Cluster Coordinating Committee. A forum on ethics education was hosted by the Working Group in conjunction with the Jacob Program in Professional Ethics. An early version of the first sections of the final report was presented to the Academic Senate in March. A full draft of the final report was released March 28, 2006 and discussed in two open forums, as well as with the College Chairs and Program Directors, in April. Many written comments on the draft were received from faculty and staff members prior to the final revisions of the report in late April.
Appendix B: Selected bibliography

Important sources studied by the Working Group in the course of the project included the following.


Cadegan, Una M. 2001. Life, the universe and everything: Universities, Catholic universities and general education. Paper presented at Chaminade University, Honolulu, HI.


Committee on General Education. 1981. Final report: Committee on general education. Dayton, OH: University of Dayton. [Also known as The Darr report.]


Heft, James L., S.M. 2003. The “open circle”: The culture of Marianist universities. Marianist University Meetings, Chaminade University, Honolulu, HI. Available at <http://www.udayton.edu/~amu-usa/pdfs/open_circle.pdf>


The Arts within the Proposed Common Academic Program (CAP)

A Proposal from the CAP Arts Working Group
to the CAP Coordinating and Writing Task Force

15 December 2009
(revised 20 January 2010)
Charge to CAP Arts Working Group

Chair: Sean Wilkinson
Members: James Farrelly (English), Sharon Gratto (Chair, Music); Judith Huacuja (Visual Arts); Eric Street (Music); Joel Whitaker (Chair, Visual Arts); Sean Wilkinson (Graul Chair in Arts & Languages and Visual Arts)

1. Devise a procedural plan for the Working Group. The Working Group Chair will meet every three weeks with the Coordinating and Writing Task Force.

2. Familiarize itself with the opening sections of the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection document, particularly the seven student learning outcomes that are now at the heart of the University’s assessment plan; the CAP Draft Proposal; and the Coordinating and Writing Task Force’s summary of the comments on the CAP Draft Proposal, and CAP Work Plan.

3. Develop the Arts component of the CAP by:
   a) establishing criteria for an Arts component that incorporate the appropriate student learning outcomes and disciplinary objectives;
   b) proposing a small number of arts courses within each area that satisfy the criteria.

In completing its assignment, the Working Group should:
- consult regularly and substantively with their colleagues in the departments they represent;
- develop courses that are geared toward first- and second-year students;
- develop courses that address as many of the seven assessment plan outcomes as possible, given the content and focus of the arts;
- develop courses for this area that contain a significant common element. This might involve common topics, common readings, common lectures, panels, exhibitions, concerts, pedagogy, or assignments.

This proposal should be submitted to the Coordinating and Writing Task Force by December 15, 2009.

4. Identify the resources and faculty development needed to deliver these courses, as well as a suggested assessment plan for this component of the CAP, and submit it to the Coordinating and Writing Task Force by February 1, 2010.
Foundational Issues for the Inclusion of the Arts within the CAP

- The inclusion of studio and performance arts courses in the proposed CAP, in addition to maintaining historical studies in the arts, represents a long overdue recognition that creating something can be a vital form of learning. This step finally seeks to correct the shortsighted exclusion from the general curriculum courses that provide opportunities for students to take an active role in making art. This inclusion is therefore warmly welcomed by all those whose professional careers as artists and educators have been devoted to exactly this form of learning, and who embrace the opportunity to share their interests, abilities, and expertise more widely, thereby substantially enriching the vitality of the University and the lives of our students.

- Neither a single arts course, as originally called for in the proposed CAP, nor a very small number of arts courses, as currently called for in the charge to the Arts Working Group, are feasible or desirable for the CAP. The arts are too diverse and the opportunities for learning the arts at UD are too varied and rich for the choices to be radically limited. Students should have the option of selecting from among several different kinds of arts courses to satisfy the arts component of the proposed CAP.

- Because the arts are so diverse in both form and content, it is unrealistic to identify common themes that are narrowly focused or specific to a given medium or discipline within the arts. The themes listed below in the section “Common Elements Across All Proposed CAP Arts Courses” reflect concepts that can be suitably addressed in all of the courses that would be included in the CAP.

- Faculty engagement in teaching CAP arts courses and individual faculty approaches to these courses are essential. Different courses and even different sections of the same course will reflect the interests and abilities of the faculty teaching them. Faculty will be strongly encouraged to make explicit as many of the Common Elements identified below, and to include them in their syllabi, but how they incorporate these various elements into their teaching is entirely up to them.

- Faculty should be encouraged to develop interdisciplinary courses and/or to collaborate in interdisciplinary teaching and learning in the arts. Yet given the many obstacles to and challenges of such teaching and collaboration, any work in this area must arise from faculty interest in designing and delivering such courses, and administrative support for such efforts must be clearly available.

- As noted above, studio and performance courses in the arts have historically been excluded from General Education at the University of Dayton. Only courses in the history of the arts have been deemed suitable. The arts departments and program have therefore developed their studio and performance courses primarily to serve majors and minors in their respective programs. The enlightened inclusion of studio and performance courses within the proposed CAP does not, however, require extensive alteration of the courses listed below as prospective CAP Arts Courses. Most of these courses serve as introductions to particular media, concepts, and experiences, and as such they provide excellent opportunities for all students to learn something meaningful about the arts within the context of a quality education.

Learning the Arts

Learning the arts is accomplished through the informed and thoughtful creation of images, objects, performances, texts, and other manifestations of human inquiry and expression. This learning is also accomplished through the making, discovering, and understanding of meaning inherent in the act of creation, and through the study and interpretation of that which is created.

Common Elements Across All Proposed CAP Arts Courses

Students in all CAP arts courses will recognize the arts as significant manifestations of diverse cultural, intellectual, aesthetic, and personal experiences and as evidence of engagement and interaction in community. In the context of articulating both conceptual and contextual understanding of the arts, students will apply critical thinking skills to the examination of the work of past and present artists, of their own work, and of the interpretations that scholars have brought to bear upon the arts. Finally, for both those students who satisfy the arts component of the
proposed CAP with the production of art, and those who study the history and creation of art by others, will demonstrate dedication and self-discipline through the practice of creative production and/or scholarly research and writing.

**Common Outcomes for All Proposed CAP Arts Courses**

Students will develop skills and acquire experiences that enable them to understand, reflect upon, and value the creative process within the context of the arts.

Students will engage in critical analysis and articulate informed aesthetic and conceptual judgments related to the arts.

Students will develop the ability to identify basic concepts, theories, and developments in the arts.

Students will be able to ask questions and seek answers appropriate to modes of inquiry that are relevant to the arts.

**Arts Courses in the Proposed CAP and the Seven Student Learning Outcomes from “Habits of Inquiry and Reflection”**

See the section at the end of this document under this title.

**Existing Arts Courses Suitable for the CAP**

**ENGLISH**

ENG 282 Introduction to Writing Poetry
A beginning course in analyzing and writing poetry.
Prerequisite(s): ENG 102 or equivalent.

ENG 284 Introduction to Writing Fiction
A beginning course in analyzing and writing short fiction.
Prerequisite(s): ENG 102 or equivalent.

ENG 286 Introduction to Writing Drama
A beginning course in analyzing and writing short plays.
Prerequisite(s): ENG 102 or equivalent.

**MUSIC**

MUS 110 Fundamentals of Music
For the student with no previous experience with theory of music. Notation of music, key and time signatures, fundamental harmonic progression, and introduction to the piano keyboard. Elementary ear training and dictation. Open to all University students.

MUS 115 Music in Theory and Practice
Music theory studies in an historical context, appropriate for non-music majors. Fundamentals of music vocabulary and music prior to 1600: origins of melody and counterpoint. Aural skills incorporated into daily classes. Open to all University students.
Prerequisite(s): At least one year of instrument/voice studies which required note-reading ability.
Corequisite(s): Current performance studies or active participation in a music ensemble which requires note-reading skills.

MUS 191 Voice Class
Basic principles of good singing; development of the voice; vocal literature. Open to all students, especially non-music majors.

MUS 195 Beginning Guitar Class I
Introduction to playing the guitar with emphasis on chord playing and accompaniment, improvisation, and application of the guitar to music teaching.
MUS 196 Group Piano I
For the student with no previous piano study. Rudiments of music reading, performance of simple folk and popular music, basic knowledge of scales, key signatures, and chords. Open to all University students. Fee.

MUS 201 Music in Concert
A survey of music literature, styles, and important composers, through preparation for and attendance at selected concerts on the campus and in the community. Concert ticket fees will be required. Open to all University students.

MUS 203 Sights and Sounds of Music
An introduction to music and its literature, with emphasis on the way music has been shaped by its cultural, geographic, and historical contexts. Open to all University students.

MUS 205 Music, Instruments, and Technology
A survey of music literature, styles, and important composers, and the way the development of instruments has influenced changes in musical style. The course will also consider the ways technology has altered our approach and access to music making, listening, and dissemination in the twentieth century. Open to all University students.

MUS 223 Introduction to Music Technology
Provides students with an introduction to the notation and recording of music with a computer. Students will learn to compile and print music, record digital instruments with MIDI, and record and mix music with portable digital audio workstations.
Prerequisite(s): (MUS 111, 112) or (MUS 115, 116) or permission of instructor.

MUS 303 Introduction to Music of the World
A survey of music from representative cultures around the world, and its role and function in society.

MUS 304 History of American Music
Survey of the American musical heritage emphasizing Anglo- and Afro-American folk traditions, early religious music, country music, pioneers in piano, band and concert music, and contemporary popular music. Open to all University students.

MUS 305 African-American Sacred Music
A historical survey of African-American sacred music from its African roots to the present with an emphasis on developments in recent decades. Examines spirituals, the ring-shout, civil rights songs, the various forms of Gospel music, traditional hymnody of the African-American church, and the musical aspects of black preaching. Open to all University students.

MUS 306 History of American Jazz
Survey of the literature and performance practices from 1890 to the present. Includes blues, Dixieland, ragtime, boogie-woogie, swing, bop, cool, funky, and current techniques. Open to all University students.

MUS 307 Development of American Popular Song
Survey of American popular music from the days of the colonies, the war years, the ballad opera, minstrel, vaudeville, operetta, early film music, through Tin Pan Alley to Broadway, including European influences. Open to all University students.

MUS 309 Opera History and Literature
Survey of the development of the opera and its literature from its seventeenth-century beginnings to the present. Focus upon major works and composers. Open to all University students.

MUS 327 Music in Film
A survey of the styles, aesthetics, and techniques of film music, emphasizing the interaction of music and visual image in film. Consideration of the changes in the evolution of both film and film music, and their relationship to culture and society.

MUS 328 History of the American Musical
A survey of the history and literature of the American musical from its nineteenth century predecessors to the present day. The course will focus on major representative works, major composers, and other artistic innovators. Open to all University students.

THEATRE
THR 105 Introduction to the Theatre
Analysis of the nature of theatre, its origin and development from the standpoint of the play, the physical theatre, and its place in our culture. Required of all majors. Open to all University students.

THR 201 Basic Dance for the Performing Artist
Beginning course in movement introducing the basic principles of dance and performance technique. Open to all University students.

THR 203 Technical Production
Introductory survey of scene design, construction, painting, and lighting. Current theory will be examined along with practical applications and techniques.

THR 251 Beginning Tap Dance
Beginning course in the theory and practice of tap dance.

THR 261 Beginning Jazz Dance
Beginning course in the theory and practice of jazz dance.

THR 271 Beginning Ballet
Beginning course in the theory and practice of classical ballet technique.

THR 307 Theatre Lighting
Study and application of lighting for the stage: instruments, controls, sources, elements of electricity, and lighting design for all types of theatres, as well as graphic representation.

THR 310 Acting I
The study and practice of basic techniques in rehearsal and performance. Emphasis on self-analysis and self-awareness. Development of basic skills in vocal, emotional, and mental interpretation of character. Required of all theatre majors.

THR 330 Concepts of Scene Design
Studies in the principles of composition and aesthetic theory as applicable to scene design. Development of personal design approach to plays of various styles.

VISUAL ARTS
VAD 211 Fundamentals of Visual Communication Design
A course for non-majors in the basics of design for communication. Attention to page layout, typography, image, graphic style, and information delivery. Studio fee.

VAF 104 Foundation Drawing
Introduction to basic visual concepts, various drawing media, and approaches to experimental technique. Emphasis on perspective, perceptual awareness, volume in space, and expressive freedom. Studio fee.

VAF 112 Foundation 2-D Design
Study of the underlying elements and principles of design as they are used in two-dimensional composition and the creation of illusionistic three-dimensional space. Studio fee.

VAF 117 Foundation 3-D Design
Introduction to basic principles and practices of design in three dimensions. Emphasis on current theory and construction techniques using a variety of media and methods. Studio fee.
VAR 210 Visual Journal
Students document and interpret their experience of a given site through the creation of unique journals. They create, collect, edit, and juxtapose visual materials in combination with written commentary and reflections. Studio fee.

VAR 220 Visual Resources
Students study a wide variety of visual elements, including many forms of visual communication as well as architecture, public spaces, and museums, in order to understand ways in which art and design play key roles in defining the unique cultural environment of a given site. Studio fee.

VAF 240 Ceramics I
Introduction to basic methods of working in clay using coil and slab techniques. Studio fee.

VAF 242 Ceramics II
Introduction to basic methods of working clay using the wheel. Studio fee.

VAH 101 Introduction to the Visual Arts
Thematically-based, non-chronological introduction that covers the fundamental and varied roles that the visual arts have played and continue to play in the human experience. Open to all students.

VAH 201 Survey of Art I
Survey of Western art from pre-history through the late medieval period. Open to all students. Fee.

VAH 202 Survey of Art II
Survey of Western art from the late medieval period through the Baroque. Open to all students. Fee.

VAH 203 Survey of Art III
Survey of Western art from the eighteenth through the twentieth centuries. Open to all students. Fee.

VAH 350 Western Architecture
Introduction to the history, theory, and practice of Western architecture from pre-history through the contemporary period. Open to all students. Fee.

VAH 370 American Art
Introduction to American art and architecture from the colonial period to the present. Open to all students. Fee.

VAH 382 History of Photography I
History of the cultural, social, and aesthetic roles of photography from the camera obscura to 1945. Emphasis on the changing practice and perception of the medium. Open to all students. Fee.

VAH 480 Twentieth-Century Art I
Study of the major movements and artists in the painting, sculpture, architecture, and other media from 1900 to 1945. Open to all students. Fee.

VAH 482 History of Photography II
The history of photography from 1945 to the present. Examines the medium as a potent force in modern and contemporary culture and as a constantly evolving form of art and tool of communication. Open to all students. Fee.

VAH 483 Twentieth-Century Art II
Study of the major movements and artists in painting, sculpture, architecture, and other media from 1945 to the present. Open to all students. Fee.

VAP 101 Foundation Photography
Fundamentals of black-and-white still photography, including camera function, exposure, film processing, and printing, with an emphasis on learning the visual language of photographic imagery through a series of creative assignments. Studio fee.

Additional Courses
The entities responsible for courses in the arts, i.e. the Departments of English, Music, and Visual Arts, and the Theatre Program in the Department of Communication, may designate additional courses as suitable for the proposed CAP as long as those courses incorporate the common elements identified above, address at least one of the seven Student Learning Outcomes, and are open to all students without prerequisites, although some music courses require auditions. These departments and the Theatre Program will also encourage faculty to develop and deliver new courses specifically with the CAP in mind, with a particular emphasis on interdisciplinary and collaborative teaching and learning.

NOTE: Although the Arts Working Group has not seen anything in the CAP documents to make this clear, we assume that the proposed CAP arts requirement will be for three credit hours. With this in mind, we wish to note that all the courses listed above are for three credit hours, with the exception of MUS 195 & 196, which are for one credit hour, MUS 191, and the dance courses (THR 201, 251, 261 & 271), which are for two credit hours. We anticipate, however, the possibility that some other courses that are for fewer than three credit hours, including music ensembles and individual studio music instruction, which may be .5-, 1-, or 2-hour courses, may also be appropriate within the proposed CAP and may be added per the paragraph immediately above. It should therefore be understood that students who wish to use such courses towards the fulfillment of the proposed CAP arts requirement will need to repeat them or take alternative courses to the extent that such course work adds up to three credit hours.
ARTS COURSES IN THE PROPOSED COMMON ACADEMIC PROGRAM (CAP)
AND THE SEVEN STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES FROM “HABITS OF INQUIRY AND REFLECTION”

1. **Scholarship:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity through the production of a body of artistic, scholarly or community-based work intended for public presentation and defense.

Scholarship and the Proposed CAP Arts Courses: The proposed CAP Arts Courses, most of which are at the introductory level, are not intended to enable students to “develop and demonstrate advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity.” They do, however, provide some of the basic knowledge, skills, and understanding upon which advanced work may be subsequently developed in more advanced course work. Very few students who take CAP Arts Courses will have even rudimentary abilities in the arts, so it is unrealistic to expect them to become capable of advanced work in a single semester. Nonetheless, given the nature of work in the arts, and especially in studio and performance areas, such work is generally intended for some form of presentation, either within the class or within some more public forum.

Relevance* of CAP Arts Courses to this Outcome (leaving aside the issue of “advanced” abilities): 1 2 3 4 5

2. **Faith traditions:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to engage in intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical inquiry regarding major faith traditions. Students will also be familiar with the basic theological understandings and central texts that shape Catholic beliefs and teachings, practices, and spiritualities. Students’ abilities should be developed sufficiently to allow them to examine deeply their own faith commitments and also to participate intelligently and respectfully in dialogue with other traditions.

Faith traditions and the Proposed CAP Arts Courses: The vast majority of work in the visual arts, music, theatre, and literature in all cultures before the modern era reflected and directly addressed faith traditions. It is therefore essential to the understanding of this immense resource, which has continued to be influential into the present, to have a significant appreciation for and understanding of those traditions. The history of pre-modern art thus requires students to inquire into and reflect upon issues of faith and ways in which faith is represented, expressed, and interpreted. Other areas within the arts, including medium-specific studio and performance studies, are less likely to do this.

Relevance* of CAP Arts Courses to this Outcome (pre-modern art & music history courses): 1 2 3 4 5
Relevance* of CAP Arts Courses to this Outcome (all other arts courses): 1 2 3 4 5

3. **Diversity:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical understanding of the cultures, histories, times, and places of multiple Others, as marked by class, race, gender, ethnicity, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, and other manifestations of difference. Students’ understanding will reflect scholarly inquiry, experiential immersion, and disciplined reflection.

Diversity and the Proposed CAP Arts Courses: The arts are deeply and comprehensively eclectic, drawing as they do upon the full range of human cultures throughout history and around the globe as they also function largely in “languages” that, with certain notable exceptions, know no national or cultural borders. Artists in all media seek inspiration, models, images, tools, and techniques from whatever sources are likely to yield something of interest. The “histories, times, and places of multiple Others” are expressed through the arts of Others and they thereby become resources available to all artists. Similarly, “class, race, gender, ethnicity, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, and other manifestations of difference” are also reflected in and enormously enrich the arts. Indeed, so great is the scope and influence of diversity in the arts that no single course can do more than touch on some aspects, but it is equally true to say that no course in the arts can fail to address diversity and demonstrate its importance to any informed understanding of the arts.

Relevance* of CAP Arts Courses to this Outcome: 1 2 3 4 5

4. **Community:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate understanding of and practice in the values and skills necessary for learning, living, and working in communities of support and challenge. These values and skills encompass productive, discerning, creative, and respectful collaboration with persons from diverse backgrounds and perspectives for the common purpose of
learning, service, and leadership that aim at just social transformation. Students will demonstrate these values and skills on

campus and in the Dayton region as part of their preparation for global citizenship.

**Community** and the Proposed CAP Arts Courses: Unlike most traditional academic subjects, most arts study obliges students to work
together in shared facilities and to place their work frequently before peers and teachers for critical evaluation. Working in communal
spaces and sharing responsibility for the proper and respectful use of those spaces creates in students a heightened awareness of the
central role of community in arts learning. Studios for drawing, painting, sculpture, and ceramics, as well as photographic darkrooms
and group computer labs are social spaces in which people cooperate and collaborate. Ensembles and choruses, theatre rehearsals and
dramatic productions are primary examples of creative work that is founded on commitments to community. The arts are also uniquely
committed to engaging and interacting with the broader communities of people who attend performances and exhibitions.

**Relevance** of CAP Arts Courses to this Outcome: 1 2 3 4 5

5. **Practical wisdom:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate practical wisdom in addressing real human problems and
deep human needs, drawing upon advanced knowledge, values, and skills in their chosen profession or major course of study.
Starting with a conception of human flourishing, students will be able to define and diagnose symptoms, relationships, and
problems clearly and intelligently, construct and evaluate possible solutions, thoughtfully select and implement solutions, and
critically reflect on the process in light of actual consequences.

**Practical wisdom** and the Proposed CAP Arts Courses: The writer Henry Miller observed: “You can’t do anything to [reality]; you can’t
add or subtract, you can only become more and more aware.” Even if one disagrees with Miller’s initial premise, and believes that it is
possible to alter reality for better or for worse, it would seem impossible to refute the idea that among the most important thing one can
learn is to become “more and more aware.” It would be difficult to argue that the arts contribute a great deal to the realm of practical
wisdom as this is defined in the outcome statement above. But the arts offer limitless opportunities for cultivating awareness,
engagement, sensitivity, empathy, and insight. It may be reasonably argued that all of these qualities are needed in order for practical
wisdom to be applied wisely, meaningfully, and effectively.

**Relevance** of CAP Arts Courses to this Outcome: 1 2 3 4 5

6. **Critical evaluation of our times:** Through multidisciplinary study, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate habits of
inquiry and reflection, informed by familiarity with Catholic Social Teaching, that equip them to evaluate critically and imaginatively
the ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, and ecological challenges of their times.

**Critical evaluation of our times** and the Proposed CAP Arts Courses: The arts have long been regarded by many as the most
comprehensive, accurate, and valuable reflection of the civilizations from which they have emerged. Even when the arts are not
intended explicitly to perform this function, they cannot do otherwise than to embody the values and beliefs, the hopes and fears, the
daily life and the most vivid dreams of those who make art and those who enrich their lives through the arts. In addition to this intrinsic
capacity to serve as a mirror of the times in which they are made, the arts are often used to offer both subtle and pointed critiques, to
challenge the status quo, to propose alternative perspectives, to question conventional wisdom and the presumptions of the powerful,
and to provoke thought and stimulate ideas in ways that cannot be accomplished as effectively through purely rational and intellectual
discourse. The outcome as written appears to narrow the definition of “critical evaluation” with the qualification that it should be
“informed by familiarity with Catholic Social Teaching,” but it should be understood that the kinds of critical evaluation that may be
revealed and practiced through the arts transcend all cultures and faith traditions.

**Relevance** of CAP Arts Courses to this Outcome (arts history & theory courses): 1 2 3 4 5

**Relevance** of CAP Arts Courses to this Outcome (studio & performance arts courses):
1 2 3 4 5

7. **Vocation:** Using appropriate scholarly and communal resources, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to
articulate reflexively the purposes of their life and proposed work through the language of vocation. In collaboration with the
university community, students’ developing vocational plans will exhibit appreciation of the fullness of human life, including its
intellectual, ethical, spiritual, aesthetic, social, emotional, and bodily dimensions, and will examine both the interdependence of self
and community and the responsibility to live in service of others.
**Vocation** and the Proposed CAP Arts Courses: Many parents of students who wish to pursue an education in the arts express concern about career prospects for their children. It is widely believed that it is difficult to earn one’s livelihood in the arts, and the dominant view of the role of higher education is that it should prepare one for a remunerative career. Regardless of whether one supports or rejects these views, it is true that a degree in the arts, in itself, means relatively little to prospective employers and clients; what matters is one’s ability to produce good work. The primary function of an education in the arts is to provide students with the best possible opportunities to develop skills and the ability to demonstrate those skills at the highest level of which they are capable, i.e. to produce good work. In order to achieve excellence in the arts, one must devote enormous amounts of time and energy without any guarantee that such an investment will result in a secure and well-paid career. The student most likely to succeed in the arts is the one with a compelling sense of dedication to the practice itself. That is also the student for whom the very practice of the arts, and not its remunerative value, is its own primary reward. In other words, the artist is one who, almost by definition, is one who is deeply engaged in the practice of vocation. It therefore follows that any thoughtful study of this field will enable one to become aware of this vocational aspect of the arts.

**Relevance** of CAP Arts Courses to this Outcome: 1 2 3 4 5

* Scale for evaluating the relevance of CAP Arts Courses to each particular Learning Outcome: 1 = minimally relevant, 2 = somewhat relevant, 3 = may be relevant in some courses, 4 = relevant in most courses, 5 = highly relevant in most or all courses
CROSSING BOUNDARIES WORKING GROUP PROGRESS REPORT

I. Introduction

The Crossing Boundaries Working Group has been charged with the task of developing criteria for four courses which make up part of the CAP Draft Proposal. These courses include one on diverse religious traditions, one on practical ethical action, an inquiry course that requires students to select a course outside their own academic disciplines to better understand the ways of knowing found in other specialties, and an integrative course that requires faculty and students to transcend disciplinary boundaries. We have been asked to consider closely the ways in which student learning outcomes related to faith traditions, diversity, practical wisdom, critical evaluation of our times, and vocation can be reflected in the criteria we design.

In order to fulfill these responsibilities, we have met approximately biweekly throughout the fall term; have studied our charge, the CAP Draft Proposal, the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection, and summaries of the comments on the CAP Draft Proposal; and have consulted regularly with colleagues in the College and the Professional Schools. As a result of these efforts we present this progress report.

II. Problems with the Charge

A. We appreciate the university's goal of implementing the learning strategy laid out in Habits of Inquiry and Reflection, as well as the efforts of the Task Force in producing a stimulating proposal for a common academic program. However, it appears to us that this proposal generally, and the Crossing Boundaries section particularly, is not a realization of that strategy. The HIR itself makes this point explicitly:

"The learning outcomes presented below are intended to function at the level of the common academic program. They could be promoted in different ways, through different structures and activities, in the student's major, in General Education and the Competencies programs, in co-curricular programming, and in learning experiences that transpire outside the formal curriculum. They are not to be regarded as the exclusive responsibility of a limited segment of the university community. Rather, they should shape all intentional planning for students' educational experience in every division of the university.

"The proposed outcomes do not necessarily map onto unique elements of the common academic program, and they do not exhaust the goals of the academic program for students." (Section 5, paragraphs two and three)

The seven learning outcomes of the HIR were never intended to translate into curricular elements or a prescribed General Education program; rather they were intended to guide curricular revision as a whole. Translating them into “unique elements” as the document says, may actually be the least effective way of implementing the intention of HIR, which recognized the educational potential of learning activities outside the classroom. As one comment in the responses to last year’s proposal put it, "The current CAP proposal is trying hard to do something we shouldn’t be doing in the first place, i.e. designing a curricular response to a set of goals that cannot be adequately addressed through curriculum alone."
B. Has an analysis of the problems with the existing general education program been conducted? If so, why are so few faculty aware of the results of this analysis? And if not, any scholar would identify this as the place to begin. Then, the CAP proposal must explicitly demonstrate how it aims to solve the weaknesses the analysis turned up. It must make clear to any reader why such a radical overhaul is necessary. Wouldn't a simpler, less resource intensive, more flexible revision of general education address the learning outcomes of HIR?

In conversations with the Task Force and addresses from the Provost, the following shortcomings have been identified:

1. **The existing general education program is too old.**
   Age itself is no weakness. If general education requires revision because a new generation of faculty is coming of age at UD, then more of them should have been brought into the design phase of CAP. We are all reluctant to add to duties of untenured faculty, but a sample of them could have joined the design team, receiving course reductions for this service.

2. **Students' synthetic thinking skills are inadequate.**
   So far as we are aware, the only study suggesting this is the NESI national survey, but its methodology was far too general to establish this conclusively. And HIR suggests other means for addressing this possible shortcoming besides a radical overhaul of general education, for example, developing a larger number of interdisciplinary majors and minors.

3. **UD needs to move from a teacher-centered educational paradigm to a learning outcomes-centered educational paradigm.**
   Professor Biddle of the SOEAP made a devastating critique of CAP’s inadequacy in this respect in the CAP feedback from 2008-09. He said, in part, “The second big impression from re-reading the CAP Draft was that it seems be remain tied to conceptions driven by the teaching paradigm. This is not to say that the Draft ignored the learning-based pedagogy; it spoke to the need for pedagogical engagement and student outcomes rather than teacher delivery. But overall, the thrust of its recommendations were rooted in curricular conceptions focusing on course designs and linear/concrete student learning outcomes. ... To move to a focus on student learning requires a relaxation of control mechanisms; it requires the willingness to believe that significant academic learning can occur beyond established curricular vehicles. As noted in both HIR and CAP, learning outcomes should be expanded beyond courses and course delivery systems.” (“Complete CAP Feedback,” pages 166-67)

C. We also believe that the limited time allotted for the completion of the working groups’ charges has precluded a thoughtful and creative consideration of issues central to curricular design. The Provost has said that "We have been working on this two or three years. It is time to move on the change." If true, those two or three years have not been used productively. Where have the genuine opportunities for faculty development in this new teaching paradigm been? By 'genuine,' we mean opportunities beyond brown bag meetings and departmental statements about the desirability of adopting a new
approach to education. Something akin to Dr. Wilhoit's "Writing Across the Curriculum" seminars, in which faculty meet regularly, produce their own examples of revised classes, and are financially rewarded for their participation would have better prepared UD faculty for this change. We do not need to wait until after some common academic program has been adopted to design such seminars. We know that any new curriculum will involve embracing new models of classroom organization. These past years could have prepared a core of faculty in each department who could have been advocates for the new educational paradigms. This would have prepared the way for faculty acceptance of such an ambitious program. Offering grants and workshops after CAP has been imposed on a reluctant faculty (as demonstrated in the Complete CAP feedback from 2008-09) will not produce the faculty buy-in to this change that is necessary for its success.

Another way that the "two or three years" that "we've been working on this" could have been used productively was by incorporating an explicit expectation that candidates for tenure and promotion will demonstrate their adoption of learning-based pedagogy in their courses in order to win advancement. We have just gone through a rewriting of the T&P process, but did not set up a notice that such course revision would be necessary and would be rewarded. Of course, that will undoubtedly be initiated within the next few years, but knowing this change was in the works, administrators should have made this an important element in the revised P&T documents, again preparing faculty for the radical change that CAP represents.

We have been offered financial resources to compensate for the lack of time for creative input. But this ignores the realities of faculty life. We need to incorporate time for extended retreats into our course planning in advance of the beginning of the semester, much less two or three weeks after a semester begins. Who will take over our classes when we’re gone? How will we manage our domestic responsibilities for a weekend’s absence? The Task Force Work Plan also mentions "support for consultants." Why weren't such consultants brought in to an earlier part of the planning process? Wouldn't a consultant worth his or her wages have anticipated many of the problems we are identifying here? Certainly faculty identified them in the CAP feedback last year. Finally, in a meeting with the CAP Chairs on October 29, the Provost said that compensation might take the form of release time. But there is no way to make this possible during the tenth week of a semester! By that point, the coming term has already been planned, so that introducing release time for the faculty involved in CAP working groups would pose considerable challenges to chairs. If the so-called two or three years of preparation had been used effectively, then the working groups would have been organized months in advance, to give the members enough advance notice to plan for introducing some balance in to their lives instead of simply dumping additional duties on top of their existing responsibilities.

For these reasons, we have concluded that demands that the working groups complete their efforts in the course of twelve weeks are not reasonable.

D. Another way in which limited time for implementation of CAP is a problem is that the timeline neglects the possibility of moving incrementally toward the ambitious change
this proposal envisions. This would permit time to recognize failings which the proposal had not anticipated and creatively plan for a course correction. The CORE program is widely recognized as one of UD's exceptional offerings, but the CORE program has been shaped over a dozen years. The CAP proposal should identify only one or two priorities and put those into practice and then build from that foundation.

E. We plan to address the resource issues associated with an expansion of team teaching and interdisciplinary education below. Here, however, we will point out other roadblocks to a speedy introduction of these models.

It should be noted that the success of team-teaching is highly dependent on the "chemistry" between the cooperating faculty and their mutual enthusiasm for the project. For this reason, team-teaching will not be successful if it is mandated from above. So a "bottom up" process should be implemented, in which faculty are strongly encouraged to seek each other out and invent courses of mutual interest.

In addition, training for careers at the doctoral level is intensive in a single discipline. Graduate programs do not, as a rule, attract people who anticipate substantial commitment to teamwork in their work lives. Some faculty do make this adjustment and discover that they find it fulfilling, but a few faculty workshops will not produce such a substantial change in faculty culture, given that the academy attracts researchers whose strengths reside in individual effort. We have already seen with the [implied] failure of the clusters that forcing faculty into an interdisciplinary environment motivates them to do the minimum when it comes to working with colleagues and making connections across disciplines. We have every reason to believe this will also be the case with CAP, producing a future version of general education that turns away from interdisciplinary teaching.

F. Much of the CAP proposal, and especially the charge to the Crossing Boundaries Working Group, seems to undervalue expertise within a single scholarly discipline. As Sean Wilkinson, the Graul Chair in Arts and Languages, noted in his response to last year's CAP draft,

"One of the stated, central premises of the CAP is that, 'A truly interdisciplinary learning experience in a common academic program mirrors the complexity of the world in which UD students will work and live in community.' This sounds like a splendid idea until one recognizes that one of the most distinctive features and greatest strengths of academic institutions is precisely that they dismantle the complex components of the world outside the academy in order for us to examine them more closely. There are good reasons why universities do not, in fact, mirror the world around them. If this were their purpose, they could not justify their existence. It is exceedingly difficult even as an individual to be immersed in 'the complexity of the world' and to cultivate 'habits of inquiry and reflection' at the same time. The challenge for this and for any other university is to enable students to employ the latter toward an enlightened and constructive engagement with the former. One of the things that make a university education particularly valuable is the creative tension between these two conditions, so it would be
unwise to seek to focus on one at the expense of the other, especially the one that is least suited to a university environment."

In our progress report, we have tried to introduce greater flexibility into the intellectual experience students will have at UD. Still, we believe that interdisciplinary learning requires that students have a thorough grounding in the knowledge and the methodology of the disciplines in their own majors before they engage in multidisciplinary study. Much of what we have been asked to address by our charge could be more profitably achieved by offering students a variety of multidisciplinary capstone experiences from which to choose, along the lines suggested in Habits of Inquiry, section VI.D.2: "Create multidisciplinary capstone course(s) in General Education." Simultaneously, the faculty from each major could be left to develop whatever capstone seminars/projects (if any) seem appropriate to their own disciplines.

G. We believe that the CAP Draft Proposal does not encourage students to take active ownership of their learning. CAP is another curriculum design that demands that students follow prescribed paths of requirements rather than to engage themselves in the pursuit of their education. The latter is better achieved in a system of distribution requirements than it is in such a tightly ordered curriculum.

In addition, while recognizing that the changing nature of general education might require curricular modifications, we are deeply concerned about the impact of the new CAP on UD’s reputation as a liberal arts institution with a Catholic identity. Unless distribution requirements of some kind are introduced, students will not be provided with the foundation in disciplines, such as religious studies, philosophy, and history, which are central to Catholic intellectual traditions. In addition, some departments have spent many years building up faculty that serve both their majors and UD’s mission. Many excellent young scholars have been hired that uniquely contribute to the intellectual character of a Catholic and Marianist University. If curricular changes and their impacts on departments central to UD’s identity are not carefully managed, we risk losing these and other faculty who serve UD well. UD could well find itself unable to advertise itself as offering a robust liberal arts curriculum and staff that is consistent with its Catholic and Marianist identity.

H. As the working group with the strongest representation from the professional schools, we must also point out that their curricula are designed to meet the accreditation requirements imposed by their professional association and/or the state of Ohio. For this reason, the above-mentioned inflexibility in CAP acts to disadvantage the professional schools particularly.

III. Resources That Will Be Required to Implement These Courses

The Charge to the Crossing Boundaries Working Group asks us to “identify the resources and faculty development needed to deliver these courses, as well as a suggested assessment plan for this component of the CAP, and submit it to the Coordinating and Writing Task Force by March 22, 2010.” Nonetheless, we have decided that it is necessary to make some preliminary
comments on necessary resources at this time. We find the size and complexity of the CAP Draft Proposal daunting. It will require more financial resources than we perceive to be available, despite the Provost’s reassurances. How much of those resources will be consumed by the bureaucracy and support personnel which will be set up to administer the common academic program? How much will be left to compensate faculty for their efforts to provide interdisciplinary education?

Courses which require significant innovation and cooperation between Faculty, such as team-taught courses, jigsaws, and courses with associated mini-seminars will require resources and solving some problems in the current structure of General Education:

A. All faculty in team taught courses should receive workload credit for a full course if course enrollment reaches ten students. If enrollment does not reach 10 students, the course should be cancelled if both professors cannot be fully compensated. In the development phase, initial funding and a course reduction for each of the two semesters of work on course development should be provided. This could be modeled on the Humanities Fellows program.

B. In addition to adjusting faculty workloads, team-taught courses will require solving these problems:

1. Ways will have to be found to pay faculty from different schools and different departments within the college working as one interdisciplinary team.

2. The Registrar will have to be able to make appropriate scheduling adjustments where necessary. For example, jig-saws will require two or more courses to be scheduled at the same time, and a room large enough to hold the combined classes will have to be made available at the appropriate times.

3. Some entity, such as the proposed CAP Review Committees (specific to university units) and CAP Course Approval Committee (part of the Senate APC), will have to be set up to receive, evaluate, approve, and fund applications to construct pilot courses integrating the suggested features

4. While other models are conceivable, much of the value of team taught courses is the interaction, from differing disciplinary perspectives, of the faculty members and the students. This is not possible if both faculty are not present in the classroom where they can model such interactions for the students. In addition, if teams are not both present in the classroom together from start to finish, then professors have to meet outside of class to coordinate and exchange ideas on what has happened in the class-room when one professor is absent. So both professors should be in the classroom together and should not alternate. In addition, team teaching requires as much or more work as teaching alone, hence our comments in section IIIA, above.

5. The departments of each team teacher will have to receive full student credit hours for teaching the course.

6. In order to guarantee the integrity of General Education, all faculty teaching inquiry-integrative courses should be full-time (tenured and tenure-track faculty).
C. Guest lecturing also has a place in integrative learning, but for the best learning outcomes, it would be better employed in courses with more stable subject matter than in the inquiry/integrative courses.

D. In order to provide adequate resources for the “Diverse Religious Traditions” course below, resources sufficient to fund tenure lines for scholars in Islamic Studies, Judaic studies and Asian religions will be necessary. Additionally, since Islamic Studies is a highly competitive field in academia, the resources must be sufficient to attract qualified scholar. This may require revision in or exceptions to standard salary structure in the College.”

E. Some integrated courses will require materials to support the projects. Some projects will undoubtedly have a sponsor who will purchase the needed materials but others will require laboratory materials to support the applied components of the course. Funding should be made available to cover such requirements. Alternatively, he recurring costs of materials for courses for non-engineers? This might be accomplished to charging the students a lab fee similar to that charged to engineering students.

IV. Criteria for CAP Classes

In the course criteria described below, we have sometimes provided examples of existing courses at UD which already fulfill the criteria we have defined. These examples represent only a small sample of what is already available at UD and is not intended to be an exhaustive list.

A. Practical Ethical Action Course

1. **CAP Charge**: "develop criteria for a practical ethical action course designed to bridge the theoretical and the practical and the liberal arts and the applied fields. Such a course should offer an opportunity for faculty to cross the boundaries of their own disciplines to dialogue with faculty from other disciplines in ways that enrich their own understanding of important ethical issues and that enrich the courses they offer to students."

2. **HIR Learning Outcomes**: This course primarily aims at HIR #5 "Practical Wisdom" and #6 "Critical Evaluation of Our Times"

**Practical wisdom**: All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate practical wisdom in addressing real human problems and deep human needs, drawing upon advanced knowledge, values, and skills in their chosen profession or major course of study. Starting with a conception of human flourishing, students will be able to define and diagnose symptoms, relationships, and problems clearly and intelligently, construct and evaluate possible solutions, thoughtfully select and implement solutions, and critically reflect on the process in light of actual consequences.

**Critical evaluation of our times**: Through multidisciplinary study, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate habits of inquiry and reflection, informed by familiarity with Catholic Social Teaching, that equip them to evaluate critically and imaginatively the ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, and ecological challenges of their times in light of the past.
3. **Partial and Provisional Criteria:**
   a) Engage students in thick description and analysis of ethical issues via concepts central to the study of ethics (such as “justice,” “rights,” “natural law,” “conscience,” “forgiveness,” etc.) by instructors who are adequately trained to guide ethical argumentation. (When necessary, this can be accomplished creatively by means of the Jigsaw model or via team teaching, etc.) The “thickness” of discussion will arise from both relevant special interdisciplinary knowledge as well as awareness of the professions, economic institutions and practices, political institutions and practices, or cultural institutions and practices.
   b) Provide sufficient normative content from which reflection on value judgments and ethical reasoning can begin and in light of which students can be directed in how to apply them. Said differently, this course aims to extend student learning to those steps that follow the making of moral decisions. For example, students in education need to move from thinking about advocacy of children to learning how to be advocates for children to actually practicing advocacy.

4. **Examples of courses on the books that likely already meet these criteria:**
   Philosophy Department
   
   - PHL 316 Engineering Ethics
   - PHL 313 Business Ethics
   - PHL 307 Philosophy and Women
   - PHL Social Philosophy
   - PHL 312 Ethics
   - PHL 314 Philosophy of Law
   - PHL 315 Medical Ethics
   - PHL 317 Ethics and Modern War
   - PHL 318 Family Ethics
   - PHL 319 Information Ethics
   - PHL 321 Environmental Ethics
   - PHL 331 Science, Objectivity, and Values
   - PHL 332 Science, Technology and Values
   - PHL 364 Race, Gender, and Philosophy
   - PHL 371 Philosophy and Human Rights;
   - PHL 372 Values and Economics
   - PHL 327 Philosophy of Peace
   - PHL 328 Philosophy of Punishment

   Religious Studies Department
   
   - REL 262 Scripture And Justice
   - REL 263 History Of Catholic Social Action
   - REL 264 U.S. And World Poverty
   - REL 363 Faith And Justice
   - REL 364 Current Moral Issues
   - REL 365 Christian Ethics And The Environment
   - REL 366 The Holocaust: Theological And Religious Responses
REL 367 Christian Ethics And Health Care Issues
REL 368 Christian Ethics And The Business World
REL 369 Christian Ethics And Engineering
REL 472 Ecology And Religion

Other sample courses:
EGR 320 Christian Ethics and Design (Murray, Kallenberg)
ASI 37x Professional Ethics in a Global Society
SEE 401, 402 Sustainability Research I & II (Fouke, Sidhu)
POL 308 Morality Policy

B. Criteria for the Diverse Religious Traditions Course

1. CAP charge: "develop criteria for a second course on religious traditions designed to offer a comparative approach that allows students to reflect on and place their own religious belief and experience in a broader historical or cultural context."

2. HIR Learning Outcomes. This course is aimed primarily at HIR #2 “Faith Traditions” and #3 Diversity

Faith traditions: “All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to engage in intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical inquiry regarding major faith traditions. Students will be familiar with the basic theological understandings and central texts that shape Catholic beliefs and teachings, practices, and spiritualities. Students’ abilities should be developed sufficiently to allow them to examine deeply their own faith commitments and also to participate intelligently and respectfully in dialogue with other traditions.”

Diversity: “All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical understanding of the cultures, histories, times, and places of multiple others, as marked by class, race, gender, ethnicity, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, and other manifestations of difference. Students’ understanding will reflect scholarly inquiry, experiential immersion, and disciplined reflection.”

3. Partial and Provisional Criteria:
a. Any course which either (a) places religious traditions within their historical context; or (b) examines their philosophical foundations or the internal logic of religious thought, language, and practice; or (c) compares religious traditions by examining their philosophical foundations, historical origins, artistic expressions, canonical texts, and/or storied practices; or (d) examines at least one religious tradition with which students are unfamiliar (e.g., World Catholicism, Christian Ecumenism, or a non-Christian tradition) by examining its philosophical foundations, historical origins, artistic expressions, canonical texts and/or storied practices.
b. Course must resonate with the content of REL 103. For example, REL 103 might serve as the basis for comparison and contrast.
c. Students’ abilities should be developed sufficiently to allow them to examine deeply their own faith commitments and also to participate intelligently and respectfully in dialogue with other traditions.
4. **Examples of courses on the books that likely already meet these criteria.**

Existing Religious Studies Courses that already meet these criteria, especially when courses are taken by students unfamiliar with the religion in question:

- REL 304 Hinduism
- REL 305 Eastern Orthodoxy
- REL 306 Buddhism
- REL 307 Judaism
- REL 308 Islam
- REL 309 Afro-Latin Religions
- REL 326 Protestant Christianity
- REL 327 U.S. Religious Experience
- REL 328 U.S. Catholic Experience
- REL 329 African-American Religion
- REL 358 Liberation Theology
- REL 429 Modern Catholicism
- REL 474 Women and the Global Church

Existing Courses outside REL that likely meet these standards

**Philosophy Department**
- PHL 311: Philosophy of Religion
- PHL 355 Asian Philosophy
- PHL 373 Philosophy and Cultural Diversity
- PHL 363 African Philosophy
- PHL 350 Classical Greek Philosophy (which informs the medieval tradition and Catholic Doctrine)
- PHL 451 Medieval Philosophy (which is the philosophical foundation for Catholic Doctrine put in historical context).

Philosophy could also offer courses on the philosophical foundations of Buddhism, Hinduism, Taoism, Confucianism, and Native American religion

**History Department**
- HST 302 History of Ancient Greece (see PHL 350, above)
- HST 303 History of the Roman Republic and Empire (See PHL 451, above)
- HST 305 Medieval Europe (see PHL 451, above)
- HST 307 Renaissance and Reformation (see PHL 451, above)
- HST 331 History of India
- HST 333 Modern Middle East
- HST 332 Modern China and Japan
- HST 336 History of Africa to the Nineteenth Century
- HST 337 History of Africa 19th Century to the Present
- HST 358 Social and Cultural History of Latin America
- HST 372 History of Religion in the United States
- HST 380 Native American History

**English Department**
- ENG 335 Modern Black Literature
ENG 339 American Indian Literature
ENG 345 Colonial and Postcolonial Literature

Visual Arts
Could develop courses on religious art

Sociology
SOC 334 Religion and Society

Political Science
POL 300 Religion and Politics

Psychology
PSY 451 Psychology of Religion

A. Criteria for a Hybrid Inquiry/Integrative Experience

1. CAP charge: "Develop criteria for an Inquiry course that requires students to select a course outside their own division to better understand the ways of knowing found in other academic specialties. Students in the professional schools may benefit from a range of courses in the College that expand their horizons and inform their views of the social world or their own professions. Students in the humanities, arts, social and natural sciences may benefit from courses in the professional schools or outside their own units in the College. While the possibilities are numerous, some suggestions offered from the professional schools in their feedback include courses related to physical health and wellbeing from the School of Education and Allied Professions, systems design from the School of Engineering, and financial and economic literacy from the School of Business Administration."

CAP charge: "Develop criteria for an Integrative course that requires faculty to develop, and students to select, courses that transcend disciplinary boundaries and explicitly examine significant social issues or problems in a multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary framework. Faculty from numerous departments could develop new courses or redesign existing courses to explicitly incorporate a broader multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary perspective. Courses that provide for collaborative or team-teaching, that link foreign language study with culture or history, that incorporate study abroad, immersion or service-learning experiences are all possible ways to facilitate integration."

The Crossing Boundaries Working Group was unable to define a set of criteria for an inquiry course that could apply across all units of the university. According to the charge, the inquiry course should require “students to select a course outside their own division to better understand the ways of knowing found in other academic specialties.” Given that the entire CAP program – indeed General Education in any form – asks students to take courses outside their majors, it seemed to us that the charge sought something more from us than simply justifying a requirement that students take a course outside their majors. We agreed that the most effective way for a person to come to understand another “way of knowing” would be to immerse oneself in a project which applies the methodologies of that discipline.

Where we disagreed however, was how feasible this would be for students who had not had foundational training in that “other” discipline. Generally, faculty representing the professional schools and the arts were doubtful that students could accomplish such
projects without more basic training in their methodologies. Thus, faculty from the professional schools looked more favorably on survey courses as a response to this element of the charge. Since the arts working group is already working on criteria for an introductory survey or surveys for CAP, any inquiry course in that area could not be shaped until the introductory course is developed.

Faculty representatives from the rest of the College believed that immersion in a project might work for inquiry courses in their areas. For example, Natural Science faculty members are highly supportive of an inquiry course. Scientific inquiry is generally built into most laboratory courses and is becoming an ever greater part of lecture as well. Sciences faculty think that courses which promote the use of scientific methodology in investigations of the natural world are appropriate in this category. The Natural Sciences CAP Committee specifically recommends the design of courses that follow the SENCER (Science Education for New Civic Engagements and Responsibility) model. Quoting directly from the SENCER website, “SENCER applies the science of learning to the learning of science, all to expand civic capacity” and “improves science education by focusing on real world problems and, by so doing, extends the impact of this learning across the curriculum to the broader community and society” (http://www.sencer.net/About/projectoverview.cfm).

The Natural Sciences CAP Committee is also investigating ways in which an inquiry course can be integrated into the general education requirements for non-science majors (currently the Integrated Natural Science Sequence). Revised models of science education for the non-major include a tighter linkage of laboratory and lecture classes, greater emphasis on cross-disciplinary teaching (especially across science departments), and inclusion of SENCER-type classes that promote greater student responsibility in the scientific discovery process.

An additional concern was raised by the professional schools: an increase in the number of required general education courses would make it impossible for their students to satisfy all the courses required by their major.

Thus, we have come to the conclusion that it is not possible to arrive at any uniform set of criteria for an inquiry course and that the additional hours required by such a course are incompatible with the curricular requirements in the professional schools. **Combining the inquiry and integrative courses and then giving students a variety of options for satisfying that requirement was our solution to this puzzle.**

2. **HIR Learning Outcomes:** These courses/experiences are aimed primarily at HIR #1 “Scholarship.” In addition, depending on the combinations of disciplines and organization, these experiences may also fulfill the other outcomes.

Scholarship: “All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity through the production of a body of artistic, scholarly or community-based work intended for public presentation and defense.”

3. **Provisional and Partial Criteria:**
   Students will pursue a problem-based, interdisciplinary study in a field outside of their majors. This study may be accomplished in any of a variety of ways:
   - Team Taught Course Focused on Student Research Projects
Example: SEE 401 and 402 (Sustainability Research I & II) provide a rationale that might serve as a model for such courses: “it is clear that technical and scientific knowledge cannot, by themselves, provide reasons for utilizing that knowledge for ethical purposes. Likewise, ethical reasoning cannot operate in a vacuum. In this course we assume that we cannot have a duty to do what it is impossible to achieve. We cannot have a duty to eliminate pollution if it is beyond our technical capabilities and scientific knowledge to do so. Technical and scientific knowledge along with moral reasoning must be brought to bear on environmental issues if we are to be serious about dealing with them, and this is what our collaboration is designed to achieve. By making undergraduate research the foundation of this course we propose to center it around enquiry-based learning in the strongest sense. Such an approach to general education will create, quite literally, a "community of learners" engaged in dynamic enquiry and research, providing each other a variety of disciplinary perspectives from engineering, the natural sciences, economics, and the humanities. Making undergraduate research the focus of General-Education Courses will make possible natural connections between students and the surrounding community, eliminating artificial distinctions between "service-learning" and learning in the classroom. This will empower students and make them better citizens. Requiring students to take some responsibility for their learning also will develop skills which will serve them throughout their lives.

- Enroll in a hybrid integration-inquiry course that pursues inquiry into the nature of a discipline outside a student’s division by pursuing (a) a project or (b) smaller tasks which applies the methodologies of that discipline. These projects will culminate in a work, either by individual students or teams of students. This work or works might be the creative production of a work of art, a scientific investigation of a particular problem in the sciences, pursuit of a solution to a problem of engineering design, a work of research into a particular problem in the humanities, or whatever is the characteristic production of a professional in that discipline. The point of the inquiry would be to pursue, on the level of a student, what is typically pursued by professionals in that discipline according to the methodologies of that discipline. These problems could be of varying sizes and have local origins and involve community-based research or service.

Example: EGR320 Christian Ethics and Design (currently a Berry Scholars Course). Students of many majors learn the process of engineering design through repeated team projects that take the students through the conceptual phase of engineering design in an environment that mimics the real-world feel of competition for scarce resources. Along the way aspects of ethics are made explicit which often go unnoticed in less realistic classroom environments. (For example, poor intra-team relationships produces poor design results which ultimately impacts grades. In ordinary classes, inter-student relationships are not
explicitly called out and discussed for their ethical content. Or, the default manner of inter-team bargaining can only be criticized when stakes are high enough to force these patterns of interaction to surface.

- Enroll in a hybrid integration- inquiry course that links either participation in an international experience or service learning with an inquiry into the nature of a discipline outside a given student’s division by pursuing a project which applies the methodologies of that discipline. These projects will culminate in a work, either by individual students or teams of students. This work might be the creative production of a work of art, a scientific investigation of a particular problem in the sciences, pursuit of a solution to a problem of engineering design, a work of research into a particular problem in the humanities, or whatever is the characteristic production of a professional in that discipline. The point of the inquiry would be to pursue, on the level of a student, what is typically pursued by professionals in that discipline, but focused on a particular problem. This problem could be defined as one with local origins, either here or abroad, and could involve community-based research.) of culture and/or history

- Participate in an international experience, either education abroad or an immersion or service learning experience that links foreign language study with an immersion into the culture and history of the same region.

- Participate in a multi-course integrative curriculum that already counts as fulfilling the CAP charge.
  - Example: Global Manufacturing Systems Engineering Technology: Industries are experiencing a critical shortage of qualified manufacturing professionals who have the ability to take a concept from art-to-part, develop a product and design the manufacturing process to produce it in the shortest time, at minimum cost and with the highest quality. In the Global Manufacturing Systems Engineer Technology Program, students gain a strong foundation in global manufacturing systems through technical courses in design, problem solving and practical application of manufacturing principles. The curriculum also includes course work in engineering materials, manufacturing processes and information systems, CAD/CAM/CIM, industrial automation, product design for manufacturability, robotics and computer numerical control, data acquisition and measurements, metrology and quality assurance. Lean and environmentally responsible engineering concepts are stressed. Multidisciplinary teamwork and project management are included throughout the curriculum. Students can expand their technical experience into the global environment through a study abroad program, international service experience, international workgroup, or other international or multicultural experience. Students will also have the opportunity to learn a second language or credit their proficiency in another language toward the program requirements.
• Take a hybrid integration-inquiry course that looks at themes or problems in your own discipline from another disciplinary perspective. This will promote a broader understanding of the liberal arts. For example, maps are both accurate scientific depictions of the Earth’s surface and beautiful pieces of artwork.
  o Example: The Integrated Arts and Technology Program offers an opportunity for a student in Engineering Technology to take classes in the arts and receive elective credit for them toward their degree. It could offer an opportunity for students in the College to take courses in Engineering Technology for a Certificate or even a Minor in a selected Engineering Technology field.

• Enroll in an interdisciplinary major or minor. Certificate programs (such as the Integrated Arts and Technology program described above) will also meet this requirement

• Participate in a Jig-Saw style course which focuses on student research projects which are presented at the common times. A “Jig-Saw” is two or more classes scheduled at a common time which share a common theme or problem which they approach from different disciplinary perspectives. Periodically the courses meet together to hear a common speaker, to have students present work, or engage in another activity.

• Participate in a Course with an Associated Mini-Seminar. For a course in a given discipline, take a 1 credit mini-seminar conducted by a professor in another discipline which investigates the issues from another perspective.
  o Example: Professors Chiodo and Crum are currently experimenting with a course in which a VAH major who will have completed ITA 141 will work with a new Italian language and culture text entitled (in translation) Italian through Art History. The text, published in Italy, is a short history of Italian art written in Italian with particular attention paid to helping foreign language students comprehend the text, learn terminology of the art world, and improve their language skills. There are similar texts in Italian, such as Italian and the Opera and Italian Cinema, that combine a particular content with development of language competence. Such mini seminars offer a means for non-language majors to integrate their background in a foreign language with their major.
  o In another example of the potential for this combination, a course on environmental ethics could be attended by a mini-course investigating the limits of statistical modeling in risk characterization.
ENGLISH 100 PROPOSAL

FORM # 1- This form is to be used for all AAC proposals related to courses (proposal for new course; change in course number, catalogue description, credit hours, etc for current course) and for all courses that are also proposed for GENERAL EDUCATION approval (including approval for clusters). Complete the appropriate portions of this form in support of the stated topic.

(1)  DEPARTMENT:
Departmental Contact (chairperson or faculty member): Sheila Hassell Hughes or Susan Trollinger

(2)  TOPIC: (e.g., proposal for new course; change in course title, course number, catalogue description, credit hours)
Proposal for pilots with new course number: ENG 100.

For courses submitted for General Education approval:
  Domain of Knowledge: N/A
  Cluster(s): N/A

(3)  RATIONALE: See Form 2, submitted with this proposal.

(4)  INFORMATION ITEMS (complete as appropriate for the topic):

A. Catalogue Description (Follow Bulletin style, include course number, title, description, prerequisite(s) and/or corequisite(s), semester hours):
ENG 100 Writing Seminar I (3hrs)
Introductory composition course focused on personal and academic literacies, with an emphasis on expository writing. Instruction and practice in developing college-level reading, writing, research, and critical thinking skills. Emphasis is on a process approach to writing effective academic prose. Students must pass the course with a grade of “C-” or higher to satisfy the University requirement in general reading and writing competencies. (3 hrs)

B. Grading Option (check one):  XX A through F     _____S or NC    _____Both

C. May this course be repeated for additional credit?  _____Yes     XX No

D. Twenty-Space Title (for new course or change in title as it would appear in composite and transcripts):
ENG 100 Writ Sem I

E. Available Faculty and Faculty Qualifications for this Course:
English Department faculty members, adjuncts, and TAs have taught introductory writing courses and will continue to do so based on the assignments of the Chair.

F. Identify those academic units that might avail themselves of this course:
Students from all units take this course.
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G. Which departments have been consulted? What other consultations have been completed (programs, clusters, other units)? What were the results (provide documentation)? Note that all appropriate consultations are required before a course can be approved.

Former English Department Chair, Brian Conniff, and former Director of Writing Programs, Elizabeth Wardle, presented the original proposal to the College Chairs and Program Directors. They then emailed the proposal to each CAS chair and requested a written endorsement. Endorsements have been received from:

- Frances G. Pestello, Chair, Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work
- Paul Eloe, Chair, Department of Mathematics
- Julius Amin, Chair, Department of History
- Rex Berney, Chair, Department of Physics
- Don Yoder, Chair, Department of Communication
- Sandra Yocum Mize, Chair, Department of Religious Studies
- Bill Richards, Chair, Department of Philosophy
- Francisco J. Peñas-Bermejo, Chair, Department of Languages

Statements of support from these CAS chairs are attached as Appendix C. No objections to this proposal have been raised by any department. We continue to seek additional endorsements.

Wardle and the Composition Committee also met multiple times with the CAS assistant deans to discuss issues of placement, transfer, and credit. Their endorsements and comments are also included in Appendix C.

Wardle and/or Conniff also met with representatives of the Schools of Engineering and of Education and Allied Professions. Both sets of meetings yielded endorsements. Pending approval by the AAC this year, we intend to submit this proposal to the curricular bodies of the Schools of Engineering, Business, and Education and Allied Professions for official endorsement.

In spring 2008, Conniff and Wardle gained permission from the AAC to run pilots of ENG 100 using the ENG 101 course number. Twenty-three pilots of ENG 100 were run the following fall, and assessment was conducted of those pilots.

In spring 2009, Sheila Hassell Hughes presented to the AAC a report on assessment from the preliminary ENG 100 pilots. The report indicated significant success in student achievement of learning outcomes. With that report, the AAC authorized the continuation of pilots of ENG 100 with the ENG 101 course number in the fall 2009 semester. The English Department is currently running those pilots, conducting assessment, and revising the courses and assessment plan as needed. The report that Sheila Hassell Hughes submitted to the AAC appears in Appendix D.

H. What were the results of consultation within the department in which the course is to be taught?

In April 2007, the English Department voted by written ballot in favor (17-0 with one abstention) of moving forward with this proposal. On January 11, 2008, the Department took a final vote in favor of the proposal for ENG 100, thereby formally approving the new course by a vote of 21-1.

I. Will additional resources be required? If so, has a budget been submitted? To whom has the budget been submitted?
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The Department of English has submitted budgets to the Dean’s office annually, for the past three years, to support faculty development around the proposed curriculum. To date, ENG 100 sections have been piloted only by Dr. Bryan Bardine, Director of TA Training, and by the Teaching Assistants in the Department, and their work is supported through existing professional development structures in the Department. We have been able to draw upon some of the funds allocated to ENG 100-200 development to offer additional workshops for TAs and faculty on the new ENG 100 curriculum.

The change from ENG 101/102 to ENG 100/200 does not entail additional resources in terms of ultimate implementation and continuation.

All students, whether they place in ENG 100 or 200, will take only one composition course in their first year. Therefore, they will be able to enroll in that course during either the fall or spring semester. Currently, by contrast, all incoming students, except those few who place out of the composition requirement with an AP score of 5, must take ENG 101, ENG 114, or ENG 198 in the fall term. This makes for many last-minute adjustments as final numbers of incoming students change, and it makes it difficult to maintain a ready staff of part-time instructors, since far fewer are needed in the spring semester than in the fall. With the new sequence, the English Department should be able to move toward offering roughly the same number of sections of both courses in each semester. This should make the process of scheduling and hiring for composition courses much more balanced, predictable, and stable.

The CAS Dean’s Office is working with the English Department to revise our placement practices, which are outdated and imprecise. When the new placement practices are adopted, we expect that more students will take the full ENG 100/200 sequence than currently take the ENG 101/102 sequence. The proposed change in placement procedure should not impact decisions concerning ENG 100/200 since the placement procedure will change whether we move to the new sequence or not.

Finally, the addition of ENG 100A and ENG 100B (stretch) will entail some additional resources. The English Department has consulted with the CAS Dean’s office and Associate Provost Deb Bickford and has their support for this change and the additional resources it will require.

J. Date Course Approved by College or School (to be completed before submitting to the Committee on General Education and Competencies):

(5). EVALUATION ITEMS:

A. Course Objectives and Rationale:

1. Student Outcomes (clearly stated in terms of specific knowledge and skills attained):

ENG 100 would closely resemble ENG 102 and 114 as they are currently taught. Like ENG 102 and 114, ENG 100 would emphasizes expository writing, analysis of argument, and a process-based approach to academic writing and research. In keeping with UD’s liberal arts and general education mission, the goal of ENG 100 would be to help students develop reading, writing, and information literacy competencies as they encounter varied “domains of knowledge” and disciplines for the first time in general education courses at the college level. Thus, ENG 100 would provide ample opportunity for students to
develop the general reading and writing competencies. Achievement of those competencies is incorporated into the student learning outcomes for ENG 100. See section 2 below.

Students in their first semester at UD are typically only a few months out of high school, and the transition to college-level writing is a challenge for many of them. With this in mind, the goal of English 100 would be to build a bridge from students’ past literacy experiences to the literacy practices that will be expected of them at the University. The theme of literacy provides opportunity for faculty members and teaching assistants to introduce concepts such as “discourse community” and “genre” that help students understand how and why language habits, practices, conventions, and values differ from one context or community to another. In ENG 100, students would explicitly consider their own literacy histories and practices in order to explore how different discourse communities—academic, public, and personal—inform their academic practice and performance in college.

ENG 100 is also designed to enable students to consider writing and, specifically, the theme of literacy in relation to the Humanities Base question, “What does it mean to be human?” Thus, student learning outcomes for ENG 100 set forth the expectation that students will engage the Humanities Base question through the Humanities Base text featured in the course.

The 2008-09 academic year was the first year that the ENG 100 pilots (run with the ENG 101 course number) were offered. During that year, the teaching assistants and Bryan Bardine were challenged with teaching first-semester students how to read critically a long list of academic essays on the topic of literacy. As a result, they were unable also to incorporate the Humanities Base text, which includes substantial selections of both literary and scholarly works. Thus, the ENG 100 pilots did not achieve the student learning outcome related to the Humanities Base. To remedy this, the English Department has reduced the number of other texts students are expected to read in the course. This change will allow for time to incorporate the Humanities Base text. In addition, the Composition Committee is working to propose a new Humanities Base text that will engage the Humanities Base themes in a manner more consistent with this course.

ENG 100 is designed to support six of the seven student learning outcomes articulated in the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection (HIR) document. As a first-year course that teaches reading, writing, and critical thinking abilities, as well as rhetorical sensitivity within the context of an extended inquiry into literacies and the conventions of discourse communities, ENG 100 prepares students to achieve the following HIR outcomes: scholarship, diversity, community, practical wisdom, critical evaluation of our times, and vocation.

Below is a list of the student learning outcomes for ENG 100. Below each ENG 100 student learning outcome is the list of HIR student learning outcomes that the ENG 100 outcome supports.

Student learning outcomes include the ability to:

1. Critically think, read, listen, and write;
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• Scholarship, community, practical wisdom, critical evaluation of the times, and vocation
• Critical thinking, reading, listening, and writing enables students to conduct scholarship, to engage others in community, to interrogate theoretical concepts and consider their application in practical contexts, to critically evaluate their contemporary context, and to consider the relationship between work and calling.

2. Understand their personal literacy histories and current literacy practices;
• Diversity, community, vocation
• By coming to an understanding of their own literacy histories and how their literacy practices have been shaped by context and community, students are prepared to consider the differences in reading, writing, and speaking practices of others as also contextually shaped. Students also become sensitive to the fact that literacy expectations and practices are community specific. Finally, students become aware of their own literacy practices. This ability enables them to consider their strengths as readers and writers and the relationship between those strengths and calling.

3. Rhetorically analyze a variety of texts and arguments, including scholarly ones;
• Scholarship, diversity, community, and critical evaluation of the times
• The ability to analyze a variety of texts and arguments with rhetorical sensitivity (which is to say a sensitivity to audience and strategy) helps students to conduct scholarship across disciplinary boundaries, to engage the texts and arguments of diverse people and communities in serious and sensitive ways, and to consider thoughtfully contemporary controversies.

4. Understand and thoughtfully respond to various viewpoints, including those with which they do not agree;
• Scholarship, diversity, community, critical evaluation of the times
• This outcome enables students to conduct scholarship that takes opposing viewpoints into account, to respond to diverse people with whom students may disagree, to develop community within the context of significant differences, and to consider alternative responses and solutions to contemporary issues.

5. Locate and evaluate scholarly sources using the library catalog and databases;
• Scholarship, critical evaluation of the times
• The ability to conduct library research is crucial for engaging in scholarship generally and, more specifically, for researching questions pertaining to contemporary issues.

6. Write persuasively, using rhetorical moves appropriate to academic work;
• Scholarship, practical wisdom, critical evaluation of the times
• Achieving the ability to write persuasively with rhetorical sensitivity to the academic context makes it possible for students to communicate the results of their scholarship and to convey the significance of their research to relevant audiences.

7. Adopt a process approach to writing;
• Scholarship, practical wisdom
• With a process approach to writing, students can reliably produce professional texts to convey the results of their research and to communicate the significance of ideas and concepts in any context.

8. Explore the Humanities Base themes through the lens of literacy;
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Diversity, vocation
Thinking and writing about the relationship between literacy and the human condition encourages students to develop sensitivity to the ways in which even very different kinds of people share fundamental faculties as human beings. Additionally, exploring the centrality of writing and literacy for human existence enables students to consider the role of writing in their own lives and the ways that they make meaning of their world.

9. Learn concepts linked to academic integrity, such as plagiarism and proper documentation;
   • Scholarship, community
   • This outcome delivers fundamental skills students must have to engage in and share scholarship. It also provides awareness of community standards and expectations for producing scholarship. Finally, it lays the groundwork for ethical conduct in any community context.

10. Learn how to recognize what various rhetorical contexts demand and to write appropriately in response;
    • Scholarship, community
    • The ability to write strategically and appropriately across varying contexts is essential for scholarship, especially in the context of different disciplines. Further, writing that is sensitive to rhetorical context has the ability to build community.

11. Write well-crafted essays, using structure, style, and grammar as appropriate to the purpose and audience of the text;
    • Scholarship, community
    • The ability to write well-crafted essays appropriate to the purpose and audience of the text enables scholarship to be communicated and to build community within the academy and elsewhere.

12. Synthesize and rhetorically analyze multiple scholarly sources;
    • Scholarship
    • This outcome provides the foundation for scholarship because scholarship depends upon consulting multiple sources.

Initial assessment of ENG 100 pilots conducted in the 2008-09 academic year indicates that this course is well designed to achieve the student learning outcomes. In just its first year of piloting, students achieved seven out of the twelve outcomes to the level stipulated in our assessment plan.

Students nearly achieved two more outcomes at the level stipulated in our assessment plan. Seventy-four percent of students were able to locate and evaluate scholarly sources using the library catalog and databases. In addition, 73% were able to recognize what various rhetorical contexts demand and write appropriately in response. The Department believes that with increased attention to library research and rhetorical analysis in the teaching of ENG 100 this term, we will reach our assessment plan goal of 80% in both of these outcomes.

As indicated above, the Composition Committee is in the process of selecting a new Humanities Base text that will effectively serve the Humanities Base outcome for the course. Also, by reducing the number of other texts studied in the course, the
Department believes there will be adequate time in the course to focus on a new Humanities Base text during the first unit of the course.

The Composition Committee will continue to monitor the course’s ability to deliver two learning outcomes (numbers 4 and 12) that were not met in the course, according to assessment data. It will also consider the relationships among these two outcomes and the course as it is being delivered.

The outcome concerning students’ ability to understand and thoughtfully respond to various viewpoints including those with which they do not agree (outcome number 4) is addressed in the research unit (Unit 3). Nearly half of the students who took the ENG 100 pilot in the 2008-09 academic year achieved that outcome. The Department is hopeful that with an increased focus on research, students will better demonstrate this outcome. As we await those results, the Composition Committee will also discuss this outcome, its appropriateness for the course, and how the course might better deliver that outcome.

The outcome concerning students’ ability to synthesize and rhetorically analyze multiple scholarly sources is addressed by Units 2 and 3. Unit 2 involves a rhetorical analysis of one scholarly text. Unit 3 obliges students to rhetorically analyze several scholarly texts in the course of conducting the research project. Again, with increased attention to the use of scholarly sources in the research project, the Department is hopeful that the ENG 100 pilots running this semester will deliver this outcome at the level stipulated by our assessment plan. In addition, the Composition Committee will evaluate the appropriateness of this outcome as it is currently phrased, given the manner in which the course is being delivered.

2. How do these outcomes meet General Education requirements? (For courses submitted for GE approval, identify the segment of the General Education document (1991) to which the outcomes apply)

ENG 100 is a Humanities Base course and its design enables it support 4 out of the 7 outcomes of the General Education program as well as 3 of the 5 goals (and their corresponding outcomes) of the Humanities Base. ENG 100 lays the groundwork for students ultimately to write across disciplinary contexts because it explores the centrality of writing and literacy for human existence and introduces students to the idea that writing differs across contexts. Thus, at the heart of this course is the question of what it means to be a human being who seeks through writing to address meaningfully varying discourse communities, some of which are academic.

As stated above, ENG 100 supports 4 out of the 7 outcomes of the General Education Program. Below is a list of those 4 General Education outcomes and the ENG 100 outcomes (in parentheses) that support each.

- Realize that they are members of a community of learners participating in inquiry about the most fundamental questions of humankind (1, 2, 4, 8);
- Develop their ability to think critically and creatively (1, 3, 4, 5, 12);
- Be familiar with the principal domains of, or approaches to, knowledge as they contribute to an understanding of the person and the world (2, 3, 4, 8, 10);
- Develop an integrated view of knowledge (3, 4, 5, 10, 12).
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ENG 100 also supports the goals of the Humanities Base within General Education. More specifically, the learning outcomes of ENG 100 prepare students to achieve 3 of the 5 goals of the Humanities Base and each of the outcomes associated with those goals. Below is a list of those 3 goals, their outcomes, and the ENG 100 outcomes (in parentheses) that support each Humanities Base outcomes.

Goal 1: Students will begin to develop and formulate their own conception of what it means to be human.

- Outcome A: In their course work and in their classes, students will demonstrate the ability to critically examine the Humanities Base themes (1, 2, 8);
- Outcome B: In their course work and in their classes, students will articulate their conception of what it means to be human (2, 6, 7, 8, 11).

Goal 3: Faculty and students will form a community of learners through the examination of selected texts and common themes.

- Outcome A: Faculty and students will form a community of learners through the examination of selected texts and common themes (1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9);
- Outcome B: Students will agree that the study of the Humanities Base themes and texts have contributed to their sense of participating in a community of learners (1, 2, 4, 8, 10)
- Outcome C: Students will combine learning in the classroom with learning outside the classroom (2, 5, 7, 11).

Goal 5: Students will develop general level competencies in reading, writing, and information literacy in conjunction with the Competency Program.

- Outcome A: In their course work and in their classes, students will demonstrate general level competencies in reading, analyzing, and evaluating texts from the humanities base disciplines;

Note: The outcomes of ENG 100 were specifically designed to support all but one of the General Reading and Writing Competencies. As designed, ENG 100 does not include a unit on literary analysis. Therefore, if the University adopts this new writing sequence, we will need to revisit the second General Competency. Below is a list of the General Competencies and the ENG 100 outcomes (in parentheses) that support each Competency.

- Critically read, analyze, and evaluate non-fiction prose (1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 12);
- Critically read, analyze, and evaluate fiction (ENG 100 does not support this Competency);
- Write college-level expository and argumentative/persuasive essays (1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12);
- Write essays appropriate for a variety of purposes (1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12);
- Write essays appropriate for a variety of audiences (1, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10);
- Engage in basic research activities (1, 3, 5, 9);
- Utilize existing and emerging technologies when completing their
writing assignments (5, 7, 11); 
  • Demonstrate fundamental critical thinking skills (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12).

• Outcome B: Students will be able to write college-level expository, argumentative, and informative prose in both formal and informal contexts for a variety of audiences (3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12);
• Outcome C: Students will demonstrate the ability to gather, evaluate and analyze information from a variety of sources (1, 3, 5, 9, 12).

3. Is the course part of a General Education Cluster? (If so, identify the cluster and show how the student outcomes support the goals and objectives of that cluster.) No.

B. Supporting Data: [In completing the following items, show how each item helps to foster the proposed student outcomes (5.A.1.).]

1. Detailed Topical Outline:

ENG 100 includes three units that, taken together, deliver all of the student learning outcomes identified for the course. Below is a list of the units and the outcomes each unit achieves.

Unit 1: Personal literacy history
  • Literacy narrative and analysis of personal literacy practices
    o Outcomes: 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11

Unit 2: Literacies of the university
  • Rhetorical analysis of scholarly essay from discipline of student’s choice
    o Outcomes: 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12

Unit 3: Research on literacy of a discourse community
  • Annotated bibliography on a literacy-related topic
    o Outcomes: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
  • Discourse community ethnography that analyzes literacy practices of a particular community
    o Outcomes: 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
  • Research paper reporting student’s research on discourse community
    o Outcomes: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12

2. Teaching Methodologies:
   Lecture, discussion, individual research projects, workshops, in-class writing, and analysis.

3. Procedures for Evaluating Student Performances:
   Written assignments, quizzes, and participation.

4. Texts and Supplementary Materials:
   • Books for the course:
     Department of English Humanities Base Text; Lunsford, Andrea A. The Everyday Writer with Exercises. 4th ed. Boston:
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A collection of scholarly articles:


Klein, Michael. “What Is It We Do When We Write Articles Like This One—and How Can We Get Students to Join Us?” *The Writing Instructor* 6 (1987): 151-161. Print.


Print.
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ENGLISH 200 PROPOSAL

(1) DEPARTMENT:
Departmental Contact (chairperson or faculty member): Sheila Hassell Hughes or Susan Trollinger

(2) TOPIC: (e.g., proposal for new course; change in course title, course number, catalogue description, credit hours)
Proposal for pilots with new course number, ENG 200.
For courses submitted for General Education approval:
   Domain of Knowledge: N/A
   Cluster(s): N/A

(3) RATIONALE: See Form 2, submitted with this proposal.

(4) INFORMATION ITEMS (complete as appropriate for the topic):
A. Catalogue Description (Follow Bulletin style, include course number, title, description, prerequisite(s) and/or corequisite(s), semester hours):

   ENG 200 Writing Seminar II (3 hrs)
   Variable theme composition course focused on academic discourse, research, and argumentation. Instruction and practice in developing reading, writing, and research skills introduced in ENG 100 and employed across the curriculum. Emphasis is on rhetorical analysis and a process approach to writing effective academic arguments. Students must pass the course with a grade of "C-" or higher to satisfy the University requirement in general reading and writing competencies. Prerequisite: Eng 100 (or ENG 100A and B) and sophomore status, or placement as determined by the Dean’s office. (3 hrs)

B. Grading Option (check one): XX A through F _____ S or NC _____ Both

C. May this course be repeated for additional credit? ____ Yes __ XX No

D. Twenty-Space Title (for new course or change in title as it would appear in composite and transcripts):

   ENG 200 Writ Sem II

E. Available Faculty and Faculty Qualifications for this Course:

   English faculty members, and adjuncts have taught introductory writing courses and will continue to do so based on the assignments of the Chair.
FORM # 1 - This form is to be used for all AAC proposals related to courses (proposal for new course; change in course number, catalogue description, credit hours, etc for current course) and for all courses that are also proposed for GENERAL EDUCATION approval (including approval for clusters). Complete the appropriate portions of this form in support of the stated topic.

(1) DEPARTMENT:
Departmental Contact (chairperson or faculty member): Sheila Hassell Hughes or Susan Trollinger

(2) TOPIC: (e.g., proposal for new course; change in course title, course number, catalogue description, credit hours)
Proposal for pilots with new course number, ENG 200.

For courses submitted for General Education approval:
   Domain of Knowledge: N/A
   Cluster(s): N/A

(3) RATIONALE: See Form 2, submitted with this proposal.

(4) INFORMATION ITEMS (complete as appropriate for the topic):

A. Catalogue Description (Follow Bulletin style, include course number, title, description, prerequisite(s) and/or corequisite(s), semester hours):

ENG 200 Writing Seminar II (3 hrs)
Variable theme composition course focused on academic discourse, research, and argumentation. Instruction and practice in developing reading, writing, and research skills introduced in ENG 100 and employed across the curriculum. Emphasis is on rhetorical analysis and a process approach to writing effective academic arguments. Students must pass the course with a grade of "C-" or higher to satisfy the University requirement in general reading and writing competencies. Prerequisite: Eng 100 (or ENG 100A and B) and sophomore status, or placement as determined by the Dean’s office. (3 hrs)

B. Grading Option (check one): XX A through F _____S or NC _____Both

C. May this course be repeated for additional credit? ____ Yes _____ XX No

D. Twenty-Space Title (for new course of change in title as it would appear in composite and transcripts):
ENG 200 Writ Sem II

E. Available Faculty and Faculty Qualifications for this Course:

English faculty members, and adjuncts have taught introductory writing courses and will continue to do so based on the assignments of the Chair.
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F. Identify those academic units that might avail themselves of this course:

Students from all units take this course.

G. Which departments have been consulted? What other consultations have been completed (programs, clusters, other units)? What were the results (provide documentation)? Note that all appropriate consultations are required before a course can be approved.

Former English Department Chair, Brian Conniff, and former Director of Writing Programs, Elizabeth Wardle, presented the proposal to the College Chairs and Program Directors and followed up by emailing each CAS chair the proposal and asking for a written endorsement. Endorsements have been received from:

- Frances G. Pestello, Chair, Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work
- Paul Eloe, Chair, Department of Mathematics
- Julius Amin, Chair, Department of History
- Rex Berney, Chair, Department of Physics
- Don Yoder, Chair, Department of Communication
- Sandra Yocum, Chair, Department of Religious Studies
- Bill Richards, Chair, Department of Philosophy
- Francisco J. Peñas-Bermejo, Chair, Department of Languages

Statements of support from these CAS chairs are attached as Appendix C. No objections to this proposal have been raised by any department. Additional endorsements are being sought.

Wardle and the Composition Committee also met multiple times with the CAS assistant deans to discuss issues of placement, transfer, and credit. Their endorsement and comments are included in Appendix C.

Wardle and/or Conniff also met with representatives of the Schools of Engineering and Education. Both sets of meetings resulted in preliminary endorsements. Pending approval by the AAC this year, we intend to submit this proposal to the curricular bodies of the Schools of Engineering, Business, and Education and Allied Professions for official endorsement.

In spring 2008, Conniff and Wardle gained permission from the AAC to run pilots of ENG 200 using the ENG 102/114/198 course numbers in 2008-09. In summer 2008, the English faculty generated several themes. Nine were approved by a Department committee, and pilots of those themes were run in the 2008-09 academic year (in sections of ENG 114 and ENG 198 in the fall and in sections of ENG 102 in the spring). The themes included “The Politics of Food,” “Education in the Classroom and Beyond,” “Pain,” “Anxiety,” “Money,” “The Amish in Consumer Culture,” “Technology and Society,” “The Environment and Sustainability,” and “Gender Dialogues.”

Assessment was conducted of the fall pilot offerings over the fall and spring of 2008-09, and assessment of the spring offerings continued through the summer of 2009. In spring 2009, Sheila Hassell Hughes presented to the AAC a preliminary report on assessment from the fall ENG 200 pilots. The report indicated strong success in student achievement of learning outcomes. With that report, the AAC authorized the continuation of pilots of ENG 200 with the ENG 102/114/198 course numbers in the fall 2009 semester. The English Department is currently running those...
pilots, conducting assessment, and revising the courses and assessment plan as needed. The report that Sheila Hassell Hughes submitted to the AAC appears in Appendix D.

H. What were the results of consultation within the department in which the course is to be taught?

In April 2007, the English Department voted by written ballot in favor (17-0 with one abstention) of moving forward with this proposal. On January 11, 2008, the Department took a final vote in favor of the proposal for ENG 200, thereby formally approving the new course by a vote of 21-1.

I. Will additional resources be required? If so, has a budget been submitted? To whom has the budget been submitted? No.

J. Date Course Approved by College or School (to be completed before submitting to the Committee on General Education and Competencies):

(5). EVALUATION ITEMS:

A. Course Objectives and Rationale:

1. Student Outcomes (clearly stated in terms of specific knowledge and skills attained):

   English 200 is designed to build on the skills and concepts taught in English 100 (or ENG 100A-B) and to provide a sequence of instruction grounded in the scholarship on transfer of knowledge and cognitive development. The course, if adopted by the University, would be a required, themed writing seminar in the liberal arts tradition, focusing on academic research and argumentation.

   Piloted themes have emerged out of faculty expertise and interests and were developed with the overriding aim of inspiring student interest and abilities in writing across the curriculum. The themes were proposed by faculty as well as evaluated and approved by a Department committee. Approved proposals demonstrated that the proposed theme and its execution in the course would achieve all ENG 200 student learning outcomes.

   In the course of these pilots, each section of the course examined one theme for the duration of the semester. Such extended examination of one theme allowed students ample opportunity to develop the depth of understanding necessary to engage critically the issues involved. In addition, students conducted research on the course theme. Students who completed one of the 23 ENG 100 pilots in the fall term and then took one of these pilots in the spring semester had the opportunity to build on the research skills they learned in the ENG 100.

   According to the course design, the theme in each of the ENG 200 pilots was examined from at least three disciplinary perspectives. Thus, students wrote researched arguments that drew on a variety of sources (including scholarly sources) from multiple disciplinary perspectives.

   Although the pilots centered on themes and inter-disciplinary inquiry, learning outcomes for all sections focus on writing, research, and rhetorical analysis, asking students to consider how language is used in various ways to persuade and inform about the theme under consideration. Students learned how different disciplines approach the theme they studied; students also analyzed how style, documentation,
structure, and conventions of texts vary across disciplines and genres. Students were challenged in all of these pilots to develop their abilities to conduct research and rhetorical analysis, to construct compelling arguments well supported by credible evidence, and strategically to shape their arguments and writing style for a university audience.

As a writing seminar for sophomores, ENG 200 is designed, in part, to coincide with the cognitive and academic development of typical undergraduate students. Research shows that most first-year students are not ready to engage with the kind of disciplinary rhetorical awareness necessary to navigating the range of reading and writing activities required in college. ENG 200 teaches this after most such students have matured another year and been exposed to a wider range of college courses, disciplines, and discourses.

Some students, however, will take ENG 200 in their first year. For Honors students and others whose placement and entering credits determine they may fulfill the University writing requirement with a single 3-credit hour composition course, it does not make sense to suspend enrollment in ENG 200 until the sophomore year. Years of teaching such students in ENG 114 have shown that honors-level students who currently take ENG 114 or 198 are typically better prepared for this kind of work, and our preliminary assessment of pilots conducted in sections of ENG 114 last fall confirm this. Therefore, a significant minority of students will take ENG 200-H, an honors-designated section of ENG 200 restricted to first-year students, in either the fall or spring of their first year.

ENG 200 is designed to encourage undergraduate research of such a quality that it could be presented at an undergraduate research conference. This goal was inspired by the “Habits of Inquiry and Reflection” (see page 8 of that document). The Department is pleased to report that this outcome was reached by students enrolled in Akhila Ramnayaran’s fall 2008 pilot, which focused on “The Politics of Food.” Her students presented at the Stander Symposium in the spring. Students enrolled in her spring 2009 pilot (with the same theme) attended the session and asked pertinent questions. The Department hopes to see more students from ENG 200 pilots participate in Stander in this way. The Department also remains interested in creating a peer-reviewed student publication that would not only recognize outstanding student work, but also follow national trends for publishing exemplary student work at schools such as Stanford University and Duke University. Deb Bickford, Associate Provost, has agreed to support such a publication.

Importantly, ENG 200 is not designed to be a specialized writing-in-the-disciplines course. Students would not be expected to write as if they were writing papers for their majors. Teaching students how to write in such specialized ways is the domain of the disciplines and of the expert faculty teaching in them. While, for example, students in ENG 200 might draw on historical material on a theme related to World War I, they would not be writing as historians. They would, however, be required to recognize and distinguish historical discourse from other discipline-specific modes. Students would draw on resources from a variety of perspectives to write formal English essays, arguments, and research papers.

With approval from the AAC for this proposal, the English Department would look
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forward to offering pilots under the new numbers and to identifying the themes of the courses in registration materials beginning in fall 2010. Thus, students would have the opportunity to enroll in sections of the course that investigate themes of interest to them.

ENG 200 is designed to support six of the seven student learning outcomes articulated in the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection (HIR) document. As the second of two rhetoric and composition courses in a two-year sequence, ENG 200 is designed to build on critical reading and thinking abilities from ENG 100 as well as to challenge students to move from an inquiry into their own literacy history and practices and the practices of a particular discourse community to an inquiry into the rhetorical conventions of university reading and writing across disciplinary contexts. With awareness of the fact that disciplines vary in their understanding of what constitutes knowledge and evidence as well as how arguments may be credibly made, this course prepares students in the liberal arts tradition to move among disciplines and speak to a variety of academic audiences. In particular, ENG 200 prepares students to achieve the following HIR outcomes: scholarship, diversity, community, practical wisdom, critical evaluation of our times, and vocation.

Below is a list of the student learning outcomes for ENG 200. Below each ENG 200 student learning outcome is the list of HIR student learning outcomes that the ENG 200 outcome supports.

Student learning outcomes include ability to:

1. Critically examine one theme from various disciplinary perspectives;
   - Scholarship, diversity, community, practical wisdom, critical evaluation of our times, vocation
   - By critically examining one theme from various disciplinary perspectives, students learn that disciplines with significantly different approaches and methodologies nevertheless inquire into similar questions and objects of study. Thus, they learn that disciplines are and ought to be in conversation with one another and that they have much to learn from each other. Coming to this awareness prepares students for their future scholarship, which is likely to be increasingly interdisciplinary. Moreover, it enables them to appreciate the different disciplines so that they can engage not just their own discipline but also a wider and diverse academic community that engages in discussion from significantly different perspectives that often contest one another. In addition, by recognizing that the various disciplines share certain concerns even as they inquire into them in different ways, students will learn that in the end scholarly inquiry provides practical wisdom for contemporary concerns. Further, by recognizing the benefit of scholarly conversation across disciplines, our students will be able to appreciate the enhanced value of critically evaluating our times from different disciplinary perspectives. Finally, such interdisciplinary examination will initiate students into the question of what disciplinary perspective(s) best suit their questions and modes of inquiry as they consider their life vocation.

2. Learn to recognize and analyze texts from various disciplines and thoughtfully write about and with those texts;
   - Scholarship, diversity, community, critical evaluation of our times, vocation
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• This student learning outcome is closely related to the previous outcome and further enhances students’ abilities to engage in scholarly conversation within and across disciplines and diverse academic communities. As students analyze and write about texts from various disciplines on a single theme, they learn in concrete and specific ways how disciplines construct knowledge, support claims, and produce evidence. They also learn how to put the arguments and insights from various disciplines to work for their own interdisciplinary arguments on a theme. By analyzing and writing with texts from a variety of disciplines, students gain the abilities named above (scholarship, diversity, community, practical wisdom, critical evaluation of our times, vocation) in a more intense way since writing about and with texts demands significant intellectual engagement with them.

3. Rhetorically analyze arguments from a variety of perspectives;
   • Scholarship, diversity, community, critical evaluation of our times
   • This outcome concerns students’ ability not only to understand that arguments are constructed from a variety of perspectives but also that those perspectives (with their distinctive histories, foci, methods, and aims) have different purposes and use varying strategies. By becoming able to recognize and engage arguments with sensitivity to purpose, audience, and strategy, students will become less inclined to reject an argument because it sounds strange or uses unfamiliar evidence or employs different methods than the student understands. Instead, students will be able to listen better for the value of even a seemingly strange argument and, thereby, give it a fairer hearing. As with the previous outcomes, so too this one will enable students to engage in their own scholarship better as they learn the rhetorical conventions of their discipline as well as participate more productively and ethically in a broad scholarly community that includes diverse perspectives and arguments. Again, with awareness that different perspectives yield different kinds of evidence and conclusions, students ultimately will be prepared to produce more creative solutions to the issues and problems of our times.

4. Conduct deep research on a theme of interest;
   • Scholarship, vocation
   • Of course, conducting deep research on a theme of interest in ENG 200 will introduce students early to the challenges and pleasures of scholarly work. As students learn how to construct a research question, seek knowledge as offered by different disciplines, apply that knowledge to their question, and consider possible answers to their question, they will develop crucial abilities that they will use in all of their future scholarship. In the course of their research process, they will learn that effective research strategies make it possible for us to inquire into any question of our choosing. Thus, students will be encouraged to think about the place of deep research in their developing vocation.

5. Write researched arguments using multiple sources;
   • Scholarship
   • All scholarship demands the use of multiple sources. Thus, this outcome develops a fundamental ability required for all future scholarship. Moreover, when students learn how to use multiple sources, they are also learning how to discover relevant sources, how to understand their claims and evidence,
and how to structure their own arguments and cases in light of those sources. All of these abilities that are involved in the use of multiple sources are crucial for scholarship.

6. Write to inform and persuade;
   • Scholarship, diversity, community
   • Scholarship always involves the purposes of informing and persuading. Scholars inform whenever they invite the audience of their work into a particular view of the world, and they persuade whenever they call upon their audience to accept their conclusions about that world. By learning to write to inform and persuade, students will be prepared to produce scholarship that can effectively convince scholarly audiences. Also, because writing with purpose should involve audience analysis, students will also become more sensitive to the importance of being sensitive to diversity within and among audiences and to speaking to community through scholarship in ways that make significant meaning.

7. Write well-crafted essays, crafting structure, style, and grammar as appropriate to the purpose and audience of the text;
   • Scholarship, community
   • To succeed in producing scholarship and, especially, scholarship that addresses a community in meaningful ways, students must learn how to write well-crafted essays that take into account the rhetorical context for their scholarship. This ability is crucial for enabling students’ scholarly work to be heard and engaged by a broad range of scholarly and other communities.

8. Become rhetorically aware of discourse conventions, including multiple citation styles;
   • Scholarship
   • For student research and scholarship to become public, it must respond effectively to the discourse conventions of scholarly communities. As students become rhetorically aware of varying discourse conventions (including multiple citation styles), they acquire a fundamental ability that will make it possible for them to meet those varying expectations.

9. Explore the Humanities Base question, “What does it mean to be human?” using the Humanities Base text as chosen by the department.
   • Diversity, vocation
   • In ENG 200-H sections (offered to first-year students who place in ENG 200), students will study the Humanities Base text. Thinking and writing about the relationship between literacy and the human condition encourages students to develop sensitivity to the ways in which even very different kinds of people share fundamental faculties as human beings. Additionally, exploring the centrality of writing and literacy for human existence enables students to consider the role of writing in their own lives and the ways that they make meaning of their world.

Assessment data from the 2008-09 academic year indicate that 80% or more of students (our assessment plan goal) enrolled in ENG 200 pilots achieved all but 2 of the student learning outcomes for the course. Concerning outcome number 8, which calls for students to “become rhetorically aware of discourse conventions, including multiple citation styles,” although most student portfolios clearly demonstrated “rhetorical awareness of discourse conventions” only 7% specifically addressed “multiple citation styles.” About
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70% of student portfolios (10 percentage points below our assessment plan goal) demonstrated engagement with the Humanities Base theme(s) (outcome number 9).

The English Department is addressing the outcome related to multiple citation styles by clarifying the outcome itself (so that it better matches our real goal) and by offering faculty development workshops on teaching citation of sources. One such workshop was offered at our fall 2009 day-long composition conference for faculty. Another is scheduled for November 17, 2009. The English Department is also addressing the issue of the Humanities Base themes by, as indicated in our proposal for ENG 100 pilots, selecting a new Humanities Base text that will be used in all ENG 100 sections as well as in all ENG 200-H sections, which will enroll only first-year students. The new Humanities Base text will focus on the relationship between writing and the question, “What does it mean to be human?” ENG 200-H sections, like ENG 100 sections, will begin with this text as part of a unit on personal and university literacies.

2. How do these outcomes meet General Education requirements? (For courses submitted for GE approval, identify the segment of the General Education document (1991) to which the outcomes apply)

ENG 200 and 200-H support 4 out of the 7 outcomes of the General Education program. Below is a list of those 4 General Education outcomes and the ENG 200 and 200-H outcomes (in parentheses) that support each.

- Realize that they are members of a community of learners participating in inquiry about the most fundamental questions of humankind (1, 2, 4, 8, 9);
- Develop their ability to think critically and creatively (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9);
- Be familiar with the principal domains of, or approaches to, knowledge as they contribute to an understanding of the person and the world (1, 2, 3, 4, 9);
- Develop an integrated view of knowledge (1, 2, 3, 4, 9).

ENG 200-H, unlike other sections of ENG 200, will ultimately be proposed as part of the existing Humanities Base curriculum, and will support the seven student learning outcomes (as indicated above) that emerged from Habits of Inquiry and Reflection to guide the current CAP proposal process.

Because no sophomore sections of ENG 200 will be piloted in 2010-11, however, we do not need the H-designation for any ENG 200 sections in this phase of piloting. We have met with some success in addressing the Humanities Base themes in our 200 pilots thus far, but have not yet incorporated the English Humanities Base text, which is currently a 176-page multi-genre collection of literary, scholarly, and other texts focused on literacy issues. The Department will revisit the Humanities Base text this year, with the goal of selecting a new text that is better suited to use in both ENG 100 and in first-year sections of ENG 200 as we pilot them next year. Based on our assessment of that approach, we will be prepared to propose a more specific approach to ENG 200-H before we bring it as a new course proposal for AAC, Gen-Ed, and Senate approval.

That said, ENG 200-H supports 3 of the 5 goals (and their corresponding outcomes) of the Humanities Base. Through its introductory unit on literacies and its focus throughout the term on an interdisciplinary approach to exploring a theme, this course prepares students to think, read, and write across disciplinary boundaries. In its unit on literacies, it...
engages the question of what it means to be human from the perspective of reading and writing. Through the exploration of a theme by way of multiple disciplinary perspectives, this course enables students to see that disciplines within the humanities (and beyond) share a common interest in the question of what it means to be human but engage it from different perspectives. Below is a list of those 3 Humanities Base goals, their outcomes, and the ENG 200-H outcomes (in parentheses) that support each Humanities Base outcomes.

Goal 1: Students will begin to develop and formulate their own conception of what it means to be human.
- Outcome A: In their course work and in their classes, students will demonstrate the ability to critically examine the Humanities Base themes (1, 9);
- Outcome B: In their course work and in their classes, students will articulate their conception of what it means to be human (9).

Goal 3: Faculty and students will form a community of learners through the examination of selected texts and common themes.
- Outcome A: Faculty and students will form a community of learners through the examination of selected texts and common themes (1, 2, 3, 6, 9);
- Outcome B: Students will agree that the study of the Humanities Base themes and texts have contributed to their sense of participating in a community of learners (1, 9)
- Outcome C: Students will combine learning in the classroom with learning outside the classroom (1, 2, 3, 4, 9).

Goal 5: Students will develop general level competencies in reading, writing, and information literacy in conjunction with the Competency Program.
- Outcome A: In their course work and in their classes, students will demonstrate general level competencies in reading, analyzing, and evaluating texts from the humanities base disciplines (1, 2, 3, 7, 9);

Note: The outcomes of ENG 200/200-H were specifically designed to support all but one of the General Reading and Writing Competencies. As designed, ENG 200/200-H (like ENG 100) does not include a unit on literary analysis. Therefore, if the University adopts this new writing sequence, we will need to revisit the second General Competency. Below is a list of the General Competencies and the ENG 200/200-H outcomes (in parentheses) that support each Competency.
- Critically read, analyze, and evaluate non-fiction prose (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9);
- Critically read, analyze, and evaluate fiction (ENG 200/200-H does not support this Competency);
- Write college-level expository and argumentative/persuasive essays (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9);
- Write essays appropriate for a variety of purposes (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8);
- Write essays appropriate for a variety of audiences (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8);
- Engage in basic research activities (1, 4, 5);
- Utilize existing and emerging technologies when completing their writing assignments (4, 5, 7, 8);
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Demonstrate fundamental critical thinking skills (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9).

Outcome B: Students will be able to write college-level expository, argumentative, and informative prose in both formal and informal contexts for a variety of audiences (2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8);

Outcome C: Students will demonstrate the ability to gather, evaluate and analyze information from a variety of sources (2, 3, 4, 5, 8).

Because the current Competencies document says that the composition courses should be completed by the end of the first year, this policy would need to be revisited if and when the proposed ENG 100-200 sequence is approved for full implementation.

3. Is the course part of a General Education Cluster? (If so, identify the cluster and show how the student outcomes support the goals and objectives of that cluster.) No.

B. Supporting Data: [In completing the following items, show how each item helps to foster the proposed student outcomes (5.A.1.).]

1. Detailed Topical Outline:

The writing assignments are designed to build on the skills and strategies students bring with them from ENG 100 or, in the case of ENG 200-H, from advanced or AP high school English courses, as well as to move from less difficult to more difficult. In the course, students are asked to write extensively in a variety of genres using sources from a variety of disciplines. Course assignments can include:

- Several source-based, researched essays and arguments, using sources from a range of disciplines;
- Sequences such as research proposals, annotated bibliographies, and reviews of literature; and
- Analysis of discourse conventions used to write in different disciplines.

Sample outline for ENG 200:

Note: If this course or any proposed ENG 200 were to be taught as an ENG 200-H Honors section once the full program change is implemented, it would begin with a unit on personal and academic literacies that would include reading the Humanities Base Text for the English Department and at least one writing assignment that focuses on the question of what it means to be human as a reader and writer of texts.

Theme: “Passing and the Fictions of Identity”
A light-skinned negro passes for white in jazz-age Harlem. A young woman in medieval Europe passes as a boy in order to escape unwanted marriage. A gay teacher passes as straight out of fear for his job. This course explores the issue of identity “passing.” The most prominent and widely theorized forms of passing include race, gender, sexuality, dis/ability—but other, less sensational or “exotic” forms of passing will be considered as well, including the subtle forms of shifting self-representation in which most of us engage. The issue of passing is especially relevant to the goals of ENG 200 because it has been addressed across a wide range of disciplines and speaks directly to our notions about what it means to be human. There is a broad range of research across the social sciences, humanities, and law on various forms of passing. Our focus will be on three kinds of
discourse and method: sociological, legal, and representational (literary and film studies),
drawing insights, as well, from interdisciplinary studies on women and gender, disability,
and race, to explore the meaning of passing and to examine the social structures that
render it both necessary and effective in certain contexts.

I. Rules of Discourse, Rules of Social Identity

Introduction to the goals, theme, and some key terms for the course
Key terms: literacy & literacies, discipline, discourse, rhetoric, argument,
documentation, social identity, power, privilege, oppression, social mobility, and
passing
Assignments: working definitions, literacy narrative, “field observations journal”

II. Forms and Means of Passing

Each subunit will include readings from a range of historical and cultural contexts,
representing a variety of related issues and the central disciplines identified above. As we
explore these various forms of passing, we will also consider the various tools and rules
which enable successful passing in different contexts. These include things such as bodily
modification—both permanent (e.g. surgical) and performative (such as gesture,
comportment, etc.)—dress and other aspects of visual “style,” speech patterns, social
roles and behaviors (e.g. marriage), silence (“don’t ask, don’t tell”), and basic common
assumptions about social normativity. In addressing these readings, we will attend to the
various ways scholars in different disciplines—and other meaning makers (novelists,
filmmakers, etc.)—frame, construct, and support their arguments about identity and
power.

1. Literacy and passing
2. Racial, ethnic, and religious passing
3. The closet: passing for straight
4. Gender passing and trans-identities
5. The whole body: dis/ability and in/visibility

Assignments: rhetorical analysis 1 (sociology or law article); rhetorical analysis 2
(narrative or film); annotated bibliography

III. Constructing a Researched Argument about Passing

Assignments: research proposal; annotated bibliography; argumentative research paper

2. Teaching Methodologies

Discussion, mini-lecture, workshops, in-class writing activities, Isidore tutorials, and
individualized research

3. Procedures for Evaluating Student Performance

Formal and informal writing assignments; observation of participation in and reflection upon
writing process and classroom activities.
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4. **Texts and Supplementary Materials**

- *English Department Humanities Base Text* (if taught as an ENG 200-H Honors section)
- Nella Larsen, *Passing* (1929)
- Douglas Sirk, dir., *Imitation of Life* (1959)
- A custom reader of scholarly articles, such as the following:
  

In addition to using the handbook required by the Department, the Humanities Base Text (if the course is being taught as an ENG 200-H Honors section), and other readings selected by the faculty member from the three or more disciplines featured in the course, faculty will have the option to choose from a list of appropriate argumentation texts such as the following:
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Updates to the Interim Report Submitted December 15, 2009

The following comments are made in response to the feedback shared from the task force, in the document “Major Capstone WG Feedback Jan 4.doc”. The Capstone working group met on January 5, 2010 to discuss this feedback, and acknowledged the input from the task force.

The one significant change the working group would like to make to the interim report relates to the rubric containing the mapping of HIR learning outcomes to the individual elements of the CAP. The working group recommends the following changes be made to this rubric:

a) Modify the rubric so that the Capstone Experience includes check marks next to each and every HIR learning outcome.

b) Insert a footnote to the table indicating the following:
   “Depending on their nature, capstone experiences can meet one or more of the HIR learning outcomes and can vary across majors and even between students in the same major.”

We believe the data gathered from our fall 2009 survey already indicates a wide variety of learning outcomes are being met by existing capstone experiences. Although the criteria the working group has defined specifies that these student experiences should reflect the HIR learning outcomes, it is clear that different majors will align with different choices of outcomes, and that even within a major, different student capstone experiences will vary. The histogram given below shows the distribution of HIR learning outcomes in the existing capstone experiences (data collected as part of the survey described in the interim report).
Report of the Common Academic Program Mathematics Working Group
December 15, 2009

I. Introduction
The Common Academic Program Mathematics Working Group (MWG) was assigned to create a proposal for the mathematics component of the Common Academic Program. We were charged to create, for each major, a single mathematics course which would be designated the CAP mathematics course for the students in that major. In designating these courses we were to consider the requirements of the Quantitative Reasoning Competency (QRC), and the seven learning outcomes of the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection. We were to show which of these outcomes would be met by the various courses, and were to develop an assessment tool. This report gives the results of our work. It lists the designated courses and maps the seven learning outcomes to those courses. Reasons for choosing the courses are given, and the rationale for the mapping of the outcomes. Further comments, concerns, and suggestions are given at the end of the report.

II. Process
a. The courses that satisfy the current QRC are MTH 114, MTH 129, MTH 137, MTH 138, MTH 148, MTH 149, MTH 168, MTH 169, MTH 205, MTH 207, and MTH 218. A student satisfies the QRC by passing one of these courses with a grade of C- or better. Every major in the university requires their students to take at least one of these courses. So we began by thinking of these as the CAP mathematics courses.

b. Each department Chair or program Director was contacted to determine whether the current mathematics requirements were satisfactory. Most replied, and all who did affirmed that the current mathematics courses required of their majors were satisfactory.

c. We then considered the seven learning outcomes of the Habits of inquiry and reflection to determine which of them fit into the eleven courses listed above to make sure that these courses not only satisfied the major requirements, but also contributed to the Common Academic Program.

d. The MWG was to consider the possibility of courses delivered outside the Mathematics Department as CAP mathematics courses. We decided not to include any such courses for the following reasons. All courses that satisfy the current QRC are taught by the Mathematics Department. If courses from outside the department were included as CAP mathematics courses, then some students could be required to take two mathematics courses where before they took only one. Another reason for keeping the courses in the Mathematics Department is that it is easier to oversee content of the courses and easier to assess outcomes than when they are scattered among several departments. Also, we viewed the CAP mathematics courses as designed to ground students in the skills and concepts and attitudes of mathematics, and that faculty members
who are hired specifically for their expertise in mathematics would be the best to deliver this fundamental knowledge.

III. The Proposed Courses and the Learning Outcomes

The proposed CAP mathematics courses are MTH 114, MTH 129, MTH 137, MTH 138, MTH 148, MTH 149, MTH 168, MTH 169, MTH 205, MTH 207, and MTH 218. The following chart shows which learning outcomes fit into each course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
<th>Faith Traditions</th>
<th>Diversity</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Practical Wisdom</th>
<th>Critical Evaluation of Our Times</th>
<th>Vocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scholarship:** Each course demands that the students master the content. The students are expected to understand the underlying concepts and to develop the skills necessary to apply them. Students are expected to develop the ability to think abstractly, to put the essential elements of a problem into an abstract mathematical setting, and to choose and apply the appropriate techniques to solve the problem.

**Practical Wisdom:** In each course students see how mathematics can be applied to different problems, and how it can be used to create solutions. The description of this learning outcome in the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection asserts that “students will be able to define and diagnose symptoms, relationships, and problems clearly and intelligently, construct and evaluate possible solutions, thoughtfully select and implement solutions...” This is exactly what mathematicians do and what we try to instill in our students. Students are expected to be able to construct and analyze a mathematical model for a real-world situation.

**Critical Evaluation of our Times:** Many critical issues require statistical or mathematical analysis. The students in these courses learn the skills that they will need to do such analysis, or to understand the analysis done by others. They learn to detect well done analysis from that which is sloppily or even deceitfully done. The mathematics required to create accurate models for economic systems, climate systems, disease propagation, or energy sources is far too complex to master in a CAP mathematics course, but
students in these courses will appreciate that mathematics is capable of describing and analyzing such complex issues.

IV. Further Comments

a. We interpret the learning outcomes broadly, here. The scholarship may not always be prepared for public presentation, unless one counts quizzes or tests, but certainly scholarship is involved in mastering the mathematics contained in these courses. The courses may not always involve direct discussion of a current critical issue, and the practical wisdom may not always be applied to a problem that addresses the human condition, but the skills and the approach to problem solving and the rigor of thought that students learn in these classes can be applied such problems. It is not expected that every course will completely cover a given learning outcome. These mathematics courses are designed to provide a solid basis from which students can grow into a full appreciation of the outcomes. They will give students the skills and concepts that are necessary to truly satisfy the outcomes.

b. One object of the Common Academic Program is to more closely involve the majors in the general education of University of Dayton students. The mathematics courses give the majors an opportunity to do that. We quickly rejected the idea of a single course that all students must take. When it comes to mathematics, the skill level and specific knowledge needed to succeed varies greatly from major to major. A single class would be impossible for some students and academically unchallenging to others. Rather, we believe that the different majors and programs should work with the Department of Mathematics to develop courses that will meet the needs of their majors, while introducing them to mathematical thought.

c. The mathematical needs of a department or program could change over time. Therefore the system which declares courses as CAP mathematics courses should allow for change that is not too cumbersome.

d. We recommend that credit by examination or transfer credit of equivalent courses be accepted as CAP mathematics courses. This continues the current policy of accepting EM or transfer credit in satisfaction of mathematics requirements.
Reading the Science of the Times:

Toward a Common Academic Program in the Sciences

Adopted by consensus

CAP - Natural Sciences Working Group

January 14, 2010
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Committee Organization

Committee Membership
The membership of the CAP-NSWG was selected to represent the full spectrum of the Science Subcouncil, including chairs of all the science departments except for Math, as follows:

• Rex Berney (PHY*), Dale Courte (CPS*), Carl Friese (BIO), Said Elhamri (PHY), Aparna Higgins (MTH), Mark Masthay (CHM*), Al McGrew (GEO*; Working Group Chair), Jayne Robinson (BIO*), Michael Sandy (GEO), Jennifer Seitzer (CPS), Shawn Swavey (CHM). Asterisks (*) denote Department Chairs serving on the committee.

Charge to CAP Natural Science Working Group
On September 2, 2009, Pat Donnelly delivered the following charge to the CAP-Natural Sciences Working Group:

1. Select a chair from among the working group members and devise a procedural plan for the Working Group. The Working Group Chair will meet every three weeks with the Coordinating and Writing Task Force.

2. Familiarize itself with the opening sections of the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection document, particularly the seven student learning outcomes that are now at the heart of the University’s assessment plan; the CAP Draft Proposal; and the Coordinating and Writing Task Force’s summary of the comments on the CAP Draft Proposal, and CAP Work Plan.

3. Develop the Natural Science component for the CAP by:
   a) Establishing criteria for the natural science component that incorporate the appropriate student learning outcomes and disciplinary objectives;
   b) Developing a minimum of two courses in the Natural Sciences that meet these criteria to serve as the natural science course requirement within the CAP. The particular courses will vary based on the students’ major and will be taken in the semesters appropriate for that major. They may be new courses or they may be variations/modifications of existing courses that are revised to reflect the student learning outcomes. Note that HIR states that courses that explore the distinctive methodologies and habits of mind in scientific fields may be particularly well suited to address the outcomes related to scholarship, community, practical wisdom and critical evaluation of our times.

In completing its assignment, the Working Group should:
• consult regularly and substantively with their colleagues in the departments they represent;
• consult with other units served by natural science courses;
• Review the Integrated Natural Science Sequence to determine whether the student learning outcomes are presently, or could be more effectively addressed in these courses.

This proposal should be submitted to the Coordinating and Writing Task Force by December 15, 2009.

4. Identify the resources and faculty development needed to deliver these courses, as well as a suggested assessment plan for this component of the CAP, and submit it to the Coordinating and Writing Task Force by February 1, 2010.
Criteria for the Common Academic Program in the Sciences

A key aspect of the charge provided to the CAP-NSWG is to establish “criteria for the natural science component that incorporate the appropriate student learning outcomes and disciplinary objectives.”

Pertinent HIR Outcomes

In the charge provided to the Natural Sciences Working Group it was suggested that four HIR outcomes might be especially appropriate to consider in the context of delivering the scientific component of the Common Academic Program. In the September 16 CAP-NSWG meeting all seven HIR student learning outcomes were considered with the result that we selected the same four HIR outcomes originally identified for the sciences by the CAP Coordinating and Writing Task Force, i.e., Scholarship, Community, Practical Wisdom, and Critical Evaluation of our Times. All CAP science courses for non-STEM majors, regardless of the target audience (B.A., Education, Business or other professional programs) will need to document how they meet these four critical outcomes. In addition, the CAP-NSWG identified two outcomes, Vocation and Diversity that the natural sciences will contribute to in ways that will be supportive but nonessential to the delivery of these outcomes through the Common Academic Program.

The HIR outcomes that we expect to fulfill through the CAP-science curriculum for Science and Engineering disciplines differ slightly from those above due to the distinctive nature and purpose of general science courses for science and engineering students. To assure a critical breadth of scientific understanding, these students should fulfill their CAP-science requirement through rigorous, basic scientific course work in science disciplines outside their own major field of study. Such courses commonly focus on developing technical skills, scholarly attitudes, practical aptitude, and a critical understanding of the applicability of the sciences to timely issues in society, so the outcomes of Scholarship, Practical Wisdom and Critical Evaluation of the Times still pertain. However, due to the particular importance for these students to develop an understanding of community and vocation within the context of their own majors, the science and engineering disciplines commonly build community and an understanding of vocation through seminars or other course work offered within their own major fields of study. Thus, while these outcomes are certainly extremely important for science and engineering majors to achieve, we expect that each major field of study in the sciences and engineering will document how they achieve these outcomes within the context of each individual major rather than through introductory level CAP-science course work outside their majors.

In what follows, each HIR outcome is quoted in italics followed by a brief discussion of how we expect the Common Academic Program in the Sciences to relate to that outcome. Detailed discussion of specific course criteria that will support each of the selected “target” outcomes is reserved for the sections that follow.

1. Scholarship: All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity through the production of a body of artistic, scholarly or community-based work intended for public presentation and defense.
Discussion: The Science CAP will play a necessary though not sufficient role in supporting the scholarly development of students by familiarizing them with the most fundamental modality of inquiry through which modern human beings understand the history, operation and structure of the physical universe surrounding them and the flow of information in that universe. While supporting scholarly development by challenging students to develop critical thinking skills and scientific modes of thought, we do not expect that Science CAP will fully actualize this outcome through production of work for public presentation or defense. However, Science CAP should play an important developmental role in building essential skills through written assignments and classroom or laboratory presentations.

2. Faith traditions: All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to engage in intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical inquiry regarding major faith traditions. Students will be familiar with the basic theological understandings and central texts that shape Catholic beliefs and teachings, practices, and spiritualities. Students’ abilities should be developed sufficiently to allow them to examine deeply their own faith commitments and also to participate intelligently and respectfully in dialogue with other traditions.

Discussion: We expect that Science CAP will play a limited and nonessential role in supporting student understanding of faith. To the extent that Science CAP will interface with faith development it will be by contrasting the distinctive roles and independent realms occupied by faith and science. Whereas science deals primarily with what human beings believe and act upon in the presence of physical evidence, faith deals primarily with what human beings believe and act upon in the absence of physical evidence. Science is a methodology to explore the natural world and is constrained to invoke natural causation whereas Faith is primarily an approach to conceptualizing or spiritually experiencing the supernatural world. Faith is ill-equipped to address functional questions about physical reality, whereas science, unless complemented by humanistic or spiritual values, is ill-equipped to address fundamental questions such as, “What is just? What is beautiful? What is meaningful? What is right?”

3. Diversity: All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical understanding of the cultures, histories, times, and places of multiple others, as marked by class, race, gender, ethnicity, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, and other manifestations of difference. Students’ understanding will reflect scholarly inquiry, experiential immersion, and disciplined reflection.

Discussion: We do not expect the Common Academic Program in the sciences to play a crucial role in actualizing the outcome of Diversity, except in the sense that it will enrich exposure to the diverse modalities of human inquiry. Nonetheless, we expect that Science CAP can and will play a significant supporting role by placing human diversity in the broader framework of biodiversity, and by emphasizing the ways that geodiversity and the distribution of resources and hazards shape and contextualize human cultures. Moreover, certain concepts such as environmental justice and the ever-growing integration and globalization of culture through technological innovation will be placed in a scientific context. Finally, the scientific method will
be emphasized as a modality of inquiry open to all human beings and enriched by diverse human cultural experiences and patterns of thought.

4. **Community**: All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate understanding of and practice in the values and skills necessary for learning, living, and working in communities of support and challenge. These values and skills include accepting difference, resolving conflicts peacefully, and promoting reconciliation; they encompass productive, discerning, creative, and respectful collaboration with persons from diverse backgrounds and perspectives for the common purpose of learning, service, and leadership that aim at just social transformation. Students will demonstrate these values and skills on campus and in the Dayton region as part of their preparation for global citizenship.

Discussion: The Common Academic Program in the sciences will build an essential though not in itself sufficient platform for developing student conceptions of community and student skills for working in community. The sciences embrace and can convey a distinctive conception of community that involves working together on problem-solving teams to address widespread societal problems. In the context of science education, the development of community-building skills is most fully actualized in laboratory settings that frequently involve team work. Moreover, understanding science is essential to understanding our relationships to each other, to widespread (often global) societal problems, and to our surrounding physical environment. The Marianist conception of community cannot be actualized in its full richness without considering the physical context in which human relationships flourish. Science contributes to this full understanding of community in myriad ways, by emphasizing that we share common aquifers, common watersheds, common ecosystems, and a common globe. We suffer collectively from disease and environmental ills, and are all constrained by fundamental limitations of resources and the laws of physical reality. Science also empowers human beings to work collectively to transcend these limitations, to defeat disease, to create livable environments, and to use technological tools to build new forms of community through electronic media. In short, science provides both methodologies to diagnose the ills that plague human communities and also the practical tools to correct them.

5. **Practical wisdom**: All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate practical wisdom in addressing real human problems and deep human needs, drawing upon advanced knowledge, values, and skills in their chosen profession or major course of study. Starting with a conception of human flourishing, students will be able to define and diagnose symptoms, relationships, and problems clearly and intelligently, construct and evaluate possible solutions, thoughtfully select and implement solutions, and critically reflect on the process in light of actual consequences.

Discussion: A fundamental understanding of Science is essential to developing practical wisdom in addressing the profound physical needs of human beings and the world they occupy. By practicing the scientific method students will learn the most powerful methodology available to human beings today to “diagnose symptoms, relationships and problems clearly and intelligently.” Moreover the profound predictive power of science provides effective tools to
model and project the impact of proposed remedies to diagnosed problems. It is in developing the practical wisdom of students that the CAP-Science program may have its most profound and lasting impact.

6. Critical evaluation of our times: Through multidisciplinary study, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate habits of inquiry and reflection, informed by familiarity with Catholic Social Teaching, that equip them to evaluate critically and imaginatively the ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, and ecological challenges of their times in light of the past.

Discussion: From global climate change and other environmental challenges to emerging technologies and the ever-present realities of human disease, the Common Academic Program in the Sciences will play a profound and essential role in equipping students “to read the science of the times.” Indeed, without a sound grounding in science students would have little capacity to assess many of the most profound challenges of the rising century.

7. Vocation: Using appropriate scholarly and communal resources, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to articulate reflectively the purposes of their life and proposed work through the language of vocation. In collaboration with the university community, students’ developing vocational plans will exhibit appreciation of the fullness of human life, including its intellectual, ethical, spiritual, aesthetic, social, emotional, and bodily dimensions, and will examine both the interdependence of self and community and the responsibility to live in service of others.

Discussion: In general, the Common Academic Program in the sciences will not play a central role in engaging students’ vocational aspirations, but all students should emerge from Science CAP with an enriched understanding of the vocation of science and the diverse roles that scientists play in service to the wider human community. In particular, for students called to be scientists, it is essential that each major program of study within the sciences should provide a rich diversity of opportunity for students to explore their vocation.

Specific Criteria for the Common Academic Program in the Sciences
Below we specify criteria for the common academic program in the sciences, including a brief indication of the rationale for each criterion.

1) The science component of the Common Academic Program will actively engage students in “reading the science of the times” by challenging them to explore the scientific dimensions of complex, controversial or unresolved problems facing human society.

2) Science CAP will support a robust and substantive foundation for scientific inquiry by developing an enriched understanding and respect for the integrity of the distinct scientific disciplines while building a foundation of scientific knowledge to be applied to interdisciplinary problems. Students will be challenged to understand both the commonality and the diversity of the scientific disciplines by emphasizing the ways that those disciplines approach problem-solving.
3. The Common Academic Program in the Sciences will cultivate scholarly development and practical wisdom by challenging students to achieve an enriched understanding of the scientific method through applying it to real issues of broad public interest. In doing so, the Common Academic Program in the Sciences will emphasize the broad, unifying themes of Practical Wisdom and Critical Evaluation of the Times.

4. The science component of the Common Academic Program will ensure that all students will engage in experiential, team-based learning through laboratory experience at some point in their passage through the science curriculum. Through hands-on laboratory experience, students will develop practical wisdom in applying scientific reasoning and experimentation while simultaneously developing an appreciative understanding of the scientific conception of community through working together in teams. To assure exposure to scientific laboratory experience, we strongly recommend that CAP expand the current General Education requirement in the sciences to seven hours in order to include at least 1 sem-hr of laboratory experience. We suggest that the requirement be stated as follows: “Students must take two lecture courses in the physical or life sciences or computer science, at least one of which should be accompanied by a corresponding laboratory section.” Finally, to assure full integration of the learning experience in science, we strongly recommend that inquiry-based learning in laboratory courses be co-requisite or integrated with corresponding lecture sections. Exceptions to this recommendation should be approved only with compelling pedagogical or logistical justification.

5. In order to enrich student understanding of the diverse disciplinary perspectives and dynamic interplay of the sciences, the Common Academic Program should assure that each student is exposed to at least two of the five disciplines: Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geology, and Physics. Additionally, it is assumed that all students will gain basic exposure to Mathematics through the Mathematics component of the Common Academic Program.

6. The science component of the CAP will support the development of quantitative skills by exposing students to the application of quantitative methods to solve scientific problems.

7. The Common Academic Program in the sciences will demonstrate both the power and the limitations of science by revealing the diverse aspects of public issues that either can or cannot be resolved through application of quantitative or scientific methodologies. In doing so, we aspire to free students both of unfounded fear and unquestioning awe of science.

8. To support an integrative view of the sciences, we welcome (but do not require) interdisciplinary faculty collaboration in delivering CAP-Science courses in two different ways: modular teaching or team-teaching. In either case, new administrative mechanisms need to be put in place to accommodate this kind of collaboration. For these purposes, we define “modular teaching” to mean that each faculty member would participate in the course primarily through the delivery of his or her own module. In modular courses, student credit hours (SCH’s) should be allocated between instructors proportionately to the fraction of the course that each faculty member delivers (in most cases that we have considered this would involve a 50-50 split between
participating departments). Thus, modular teaching would involve no new call on University resources. In contrast, by “team-teaching” we mean that all participating faculty members would make the commitment to participate throughout the delivery of the course. In this case, we recommend that the count of SCH’s for the course should be doubled and then divided equally between participating faculty and their respective departments. For example, in a course team-taught by two faculty members, each would claim the full count of SCH’s for the class. In a course team-taught by three faculty members, each of the three would claim 2/3 of the SCH’s for the class, and so forth.

**Review of the Current General Education Program in the Sciences**

The current General Education program in the sciences is defined as follows in the August, 2009 University of Dayton Bulletin:

> Physical and Life Sciences: The physical and life sciences and technology have affected the quality of life in every age, but never more than in the present. The potential of science and technology for both good and evil will undoubtedly increase in the future. It is essential, therefore, that educated citizens understand the methods of science and its application through technology. For these reasons students must take two courses in the physical and life sciences and technological applications.

Although this is the only University-wide requirement, in practice, most schools and programs have specified a higher level of exposure to the sciences. Programs in the sciences and engineering tend to meet the University General Education requirements through general science courses approved for General Education that are also required by their major field of study. Typically, their experience in science courses outside their major exceeds the University-wide minimum specified above. B.A. students in the College of Arts and Sciences and students in the School of Education and Allied Professions (SOEAP) normally meet the General Education requirement through the Integrated Natural Science Sequence (INSS), a sequence of three lecture courses and two laboratory courses totaling 11 hours. The INSS is described and critiqued in more detail below. In contrast, students in the School of Business Administration and professional programs in Fine Arts, and Music typically follow the University-wide minimum, meeting their General Education requirement in the sciences through two courses chosen from a cafeteria-style menu. Several of the courses in this menu have a long history in General Education dating back 30-years or more to earlier models for General Education at the University of Dayton. Finally, certain science courses have been approved as “cluster courses” and are commonly taken to fulfill the cluster requirement. Taken together, the existing science General Education program is something of a patchwork, with students in different divisions of the University meeting their science requirements in dramatically contrasting fashion. A key question considered by the CAP-NSWG is whether these differences are pedagogically and/or philosophically justifiable.

**Courses Approved for General Education**

Science courses identified in the 2009 Bulletin as being approved to meet General Education requirements in Physical and Life Science are listed on the following page with annotations indicating courses approved for one or more thematic cluster.
Physical & Life Science

All students must complete two Physical and Life Sciences courses to satisfy General Education Requirements. This requirement may be satisfied by Physical and Life Science courses that are included in or independent of a thematic cluster. Students should consult with their advisors about specific requirements or recommendations related to their majors.

ASI 346  SPECIAL TOPICS IN PHYSICAL AND LIFE SCIENCE
Restrictions: Specific topics approved for designated cluster. Consult semester class schedule.

BIO 101  GENERAL BIOLOGY I
BIO 151  CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY I
BIO 152  CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY II
BIO 340  CULTURE, BIODIVERSITY, AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (PGEI, VTS Clusters)
BIO 360  ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL BIOLOGY (PGEI Cluster)
BIO 395  GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BIOLOGY (PGEI, VTS Clusters)

CEE 390  ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION CONTROL (PGEI, VTS Clusters)
Restrictions: not for CEE majors

CHM 115  COLLEGE PREPARATORY CHEMISTRY
CHM 123  GENERAL CHEMISTRY
CHM 124  GENERAL CHEMISTRY
CHM 200  CHEMISTRY AND SOCIETY (PGEI Cluster)
CHM 496  PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES SEMINAR
Restrictions: for CHM only

EGR 320  SYSTEMS DESIGN SCHOLARS' SEMINAR
Restrictions: Berry Scholars only

GEO 103  PRINCIPLES OF PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY
Restrictions: not for BIO, CHM, GEO, PHY, or those who have taken GEO 109 or GEO 115

HSS 305  HUMAN ANATOMY
Restrictions: for HSS, MUT only

SCI 190  THE PHYSICAL UNIVERSE Restrictions: INSS
SCI 210  THE DYNAMIC EARTH Restrictions: INSS
SCI 220  THE WORLD OF CHEMISTRY Restrictions: INSS
SCI 230  ORGANISMS, EVOLUTION & ENVIRONMENT Restrictions: INSS
Critique of the Current General Education Program

The current General Education program in the sciences has many areas of strength, but there are also significant areas in which it might be improved to facilitate a more coherent and better integrated educational experience in the sciences or to better support the key student learning outcomes specified by *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection*. Because students in different areas meet their General Education requirements in such radically different ways, it is not possible to formulate a single broad assessment of General Education at the University of Dayton. Rather, in what follows we consider the strengths and weaknesses or deficiencies in the programs being delivered to students in each school or division. It could be argued that the complexity of the current General Education program in the sciences, with radical disparities between the science curricula for those in different schools, is itself a significant weakness of the system. However, some of these differences have clear practical or pedagogical justifications.

The Integrated Natural Science Sequence: General Education for B.A. and SOEAP Students

All B.A. students and most Education students currently meet their General Education requirements in the sciences through the Integrated Natural Science Sequence (INSS). Development of the INSS represents a transformative landmark in the history of Science education for non-science majors at the University of Dayton. It was developed and implemented in the mid-1990’s in response to a charge from former Dean Paulorman to enhance the scientific literacy of our students by developing a coherent, integrative sequence of courses in the natural sciences to replace the patchwork of General Education courses that were then offered to students from a cafeteria-style menu. The INSS consists of a three course sequence presented in two tracks, the Environmental track and the Human Environment track (a health-oriented sequence), as illustrated in the graphic on the following page.

A key feature of the sequence is a developmental approach focused on building quantitative skills and conceptual knowledge throughout the sequence starting from fundamental principles introduced in SCI190: the Physical Universe. The compelling vision animating the sequence is one of “vertical integration” in which knowledge builds cumulatively upward through the sequence, with each successive course echoing and applying fundamental scientific principles introduced earlier in the sequence while simultaneously elaborating the distinctive modalities of inquiry characteristic of each discipline. Thus the students develop a rich appreciation for the dynamic interrelationships between the different scientific disciplines. Introduction of the Integrative Natural Science Sequence was a truly transformative advance in the development of scientific literacy for University of Dayton students, and it continues to serve students well. A quantitative measure of the value of the INSS is provided by the success of Teacher Education students in passing the Science component of the PRAXIS exam, and any revisions of the INSS should be careful to preserve the value of the course sequence for Teacher Education students.

The Integrated Natural Science Sequence is a robust and fundamentally sound component in the educational experience of B.A. and SOEAP students, and represents a clear advance over the system
that preceded it. However, to say that the INSS is fundamentally sound is not to imply that it could not or should not be improved. Rather, the INSS represents the proud achievement of the innovative spirit of the Sciences at UD, and that same spirit should be harnessed to assure that UD solidifies its reputation as an innovative leader in science education in the 21st century, as it has been in the recent past. Despite its many successes, certain flaws in the INSS paradigm have become apparent over the years, and the sequence undoubtedly needs to be re-tuned to more fully accomplish the key learning outcomes spelled out by the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection. In addition, the maintenance of integration across the sciences demands constant, vigilant attention and vigorous interdisciplinary coordination, efforts that have flagged since the loss of the INSS coordinator position in 2008.

Critique of the INSS

While the INSS continues to successfully deliver a strong science education to BA and SOEAP students, a number of mostly logistical flaws detract from the delivery of the program. It should be noted that these flaws are largely a matter of implementation, not fundamentally of curricular structure.

1) **Lack of Integration between Lecture and Lab Courses.** Originally conceived as a three course/three lab sequence of 12 hours, the INSS was subsequently pared back to 11 hours, with students choosing two of the three labs. Moreover, laboratory courses are not co-requisite with lectures, with the result that students may take lab courses before the corresponding lecture courses or vice versa, and in some cases the corresponding lab and lecture sections may even be taken years apart. These circumstances severely undermine any potential for consilience between laboratory and lecture sections. Instructors in lecture cannot assume that all students

---

**SOEAP specific requirements:**

- Early Childhood (preschool to grade 3) - 3 INSS courses and 3 INSS labs
- Middle Childhood (grades 4 to 9) - science concentration - 4 INSS courses and 4 labs.
- Middle Childhood (grades 4 to 9) - Math, Social Studies, and Reading and Language Arts - SCI 190 and SCI 210 lecture sections with corresponding labs.
- Adolescent to Young Adult (grades 7 to 12) - Math, Social Studies, Language Arts - 2 INSS courses and 2 labs.
- Adolescent to Young Adult (grades 7 to 12) - Science concentration - no INSS; they take courses for science majors.
- Intervention Specialists (Special Ed) - 3 INSS courses and 2 labs. (A complete 11 hour INSS track)

*Note: PHY, GEO and BIO have recently offered "Education only" sections of the INSS*
are in the corresponding laboratory and vice versa. As specified in the criteria previously presented, we recommend that this situation be corrected.

2) **Disparity between tracks.** Due largely to a prejudicial fear of Chemistry relative to Geology at the second-tier of the sequence, the two branches of the sequence have never been equally populated. Apparently there was never an expectation that the two branches would be equally populated from the outset, but the disparity is so profound (85% to SCI210: The Dynamic Earth vs. 15% to SCI220: The World of Chemistry), that it eliminates any meaningful opportunity for cross-integration between the two tracks.

3) **Nonrepresentation of Computer Science.** The INSS was conceived, designed and implemented as a natural science sequence and as such serves well to highlight the integrative character of those sciences that focus on the investigation of the natural world. However, that conception left little rationale for the inclusion of the important but distinctive abstract science of Computer Science. Be that as it may, in the intervening years Computer Science has emerged as one of the most ubiquitous and transformative forces shaping 21st Century society. For the University of Dayton to continue the omission of Computer Science in the new Common Academic Program would constitute a gross misreading of the ‘signs of the times.’ At the same moment, however, the Committee notes that the distinctiveness of Computer Science from the natural sciences remains a reality, and we emphasize that exposure to Computer Science should not be purchased at the expense of the natural sciences. Rather, integration of Computer Science into the CAP-science curriculum must be accomplished in a way that augments and enriches rather than detracts from the delivery of the natural sciences.

4) **No Framework for Interdisciplinary Teaching.** Despite its “Integrated” moniker, the INSS is a firmly discipline-based sequence with little or no opportunity for team-teaching between disciplines. Some view this as a key strength of the sequence, and to a significant degree our group concurs and supports discipline-based instruction in the sciences. However, we also see value in building on disciplinary foundations through development of thematically-focused courses that challenge students to view the large-scale scientific problems facing human society today from multiple disciplinary perspectives. In many cases, such interdisciplinary perspectives may be most richly developed through pedagogies based in team-teaching approaches, though we hasten to add that such approaches should be welcomed and facilitated but never mandated.

5) **Pipeline Issues.** In part because of the existence of other non-prerequisite General Education offerings in the sciences (i.e., those for the professional programs), the INSS suffers from a “leaky pipeline.” This is particularly evident in the third course in the sequence, SCI230: Organisms, Evolution and Environment, or SCI240: Organisms, Evolution and Health. Relatively few students take the corresponding labs for these courses, having fulfilled their laboratory requirements earlier in the sequence. In addition, too many students never progress through to the final courses in the sequence at all, instead fulfilling their requirements inappropriately with
out-of-sequence courses. The consequence of this is to undermine the integrative nature of the sequence.

6) **Flagging Integration and Coordination following the Loss of INSS Coordinator Position.** Though not a curricular problem with the sequence *per se*, the committee notes that integration of the INSS has been hampered and diminished in recent years due to the loss of the INSS coordinator position. This position played a key role in facilitating integration between the courses by arranging faculty workshops, coordinating the review leader program, supporting interdisciplinary collaboration and scholarship of teaching grant-writing, web page development, and managing continuous assessment of the program.

Ultimately, this committee believes that the INSS is a fundamentally sound structure that already supports many of the HIR outcomes and can be effectively adapted to the Common Academic Program in the future. However, we are also cognizant of recent discoveries and advances in understanding how students learn science, and, without putting at risk the achievements of the recent past, we are anxious for the Science Division at UD to cement its position as a leader in education for scientific literacy by building on a rich tradition of innovation, self-assessment and continuous improvement. We believe that a careful, vigorous and intentional program of continuous improvement can transform the INSS into a national model for the delivery of science education.

In the final analysis, the most fundamental question to ask about the Integrated Natural Science Sequence is, “Does it support the crucial outcomes specified by the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection?” We believe it does so now to a considerable degree, but with appropriate future adaptation its impact on the achievement of the critical HIR outcomes for the sciences can be transformational. **Scholarship** – Science courses at all levels teach scientific reasoning and support scholarship by introducing students to the scientific method, which ranks among the most powerful and widely applicable modalities of human inquiry ever devised. In the future, the developmental model that already inspires the INSS can be adapted to intentionally build scholarship through the sequence, culminating in the top-tier courses. **Community** – Many of the INSS courses already use group projects and case studies to explore how science impacts all of the world’s communities. In the future, the community-building pedagogical models that have already been deployed in select courses can be intentionally infused throughout the curriculum. **Practical Wisdom** – Students who learn how to think scientifically about their world are better able to act as informed citizens by analyzing the root causes of fundamental problems and evaluating the relative risks and benefits of diverse proposed solutions. In the future, we propose that the development of Practical Wisdom in addressing the World’s scientific challenges be ensconced near the heart of the INSS and kept before students as a key unifying theme of the sequence. **Critical Evaluation of Our Times** – From resource depletion to the conquest of disease to the causes and implications of global climatic change many of the emergent challenges of the 21st century are directly addressed by the INSS. By equipping students with a scientific perspective they will be able to reflect on how they are living and how they may want to change to ensure a future for our world.
General Education for Professional Programs in Fine Arts, Music, and the School of Business Administration

The INSS was originally piloted in 1994 and 1995 for the School of Education and Allied Professions, and subsequently scaled-up to include all B.A. students in the College of Arts and Sciences. It was anticipated at the time that the program might eventually scale up to include all students in the University other than those in the Sciences and Engineering. However, due to the highly structured curricula and degree requirements of the professional programs in the Fine Arts, Music, and the School of Business Administration, these programs never increased their requirements to embrace the Integrated Natural Science Sequence. Professional students in the Fine Arts and Music had additional constraints imposed by their involvement in time-intensive studio courses. Consequently, in large part these populations of professional students continue to operate under the previous generation of cafeteria-style science courses, some introduced 30 or more years ago during earlier iterations of General Education. We emphasize that these courses are well-taught, and individual instructors have gone to great lengths to make them timely and pertinent to today’s world, but in too many cases great teachers are working within the framework of antiquated courses. Moreover, even in those earlier times, students generally fulfilled their science requirement with accompanying laboratory courses. The SBA and some professional programs in the Fine Arts and Music have dropped the laboratory requirement, and the lecture sections typically have no corresponding laboratory courses. In this respect, the science education of this fraction of the student population has actually been retrogressive rather than progressive. Consequently, while we recognize and appreciate the special time and credit hour constraints of professional students, we do not believe that the current General Education framework adequately meets the needs of these students for basic scientific literacy in the 21st Century, and we recommend reintroduction of a requirement that they experience at least one co-requisite laboratory course in addition to two 3 sem-hr lecture courses.

The Role of Computer Science in the CAP

As noted previously, perhaps the most glaring deficiency in the current General Education program is the complete absence of Computer Science. The omission of Computer Science from the original design of the current General Education curriculum may reflect its relatively ancillary presence in society at that time. Today, however, computer science and information technology are ubiquitous. Computer Science is the discipline that studies, implements, and extends the possibilities of information technology. The vast majority of our words, formal thoughts, technical papers, lectures, music, movies, and public actions are authored, composed, recorded, digitized, transmitted, and stored on computing devices, constituting the most transformative reorganization of information processing and accessibility since the introduction of the printing press. The ancillary, side-lined existence of computers operating in the background has transformed into a central digital circulatory system permeating all aspects of modern society. Computer Science has become the facilitating discipline of all other disciplines. Today, to exclude Computer Science from the Common Academic Program would be a travesty.

Ironically, UD’s General Education requirements list Information Literacy as one of the four General Competencies to be achieved by all UD students along with Reading and Writing, Oral Communication, and Quantitative Reasoning. It mandates that
Students develop effective strategies for using information technologies when seeking knowledge; understand the structure, form, and access methods of recorded information; demonstrate the ability to evaluate and analyze the information gathered from a variety of sources; use information and information technology responsibly and ethically; and demonstrate an interest in and ability for life-long learning about information technology.

http://www.udayton.edu/gened/competencies.php

This fourth competency, however, is the only one in the UD Bulletin that does not include an accompanying list of General Education courses that students may take to build the skills necessary for achievement of the competency. This absence of pedagogical support is glaring and can easily be rectified by including appropriate computer science courses in the new CAP.

Moreover, The University of Dayton seems to be alone in its exclusion of computer science courses from its General Education curriculum. All of the following “Comparison Institutions” provide students at least the possibility of choosing a computing course as part of her/his General Education / Core program of study.

- Boston College
- DePaul University
- Florida University – Saint Thomas
- Marquette
- Miami University (Oxford, OH)
- Notre Dame
- Wright State University

For UD to remain competitive, in the new CAP, we should follow suit and provide this opportunity for students.

The CAP is being defined to realize the seven HIR outcomes: scholarship, faith traditions, diversity, community, practical wisdom, critical evaluation of our times, and vocation. The formal presentation and pedagogy of information technology through computer science will enable us to endow our students with an understanding and perspective of technology couched in these outcomes. By not including formal computing courses covering IT issues in the CAP, we are sanctioning students to haphazardly acquire possibly incomplete, incorrect, and unethical information about technology. CAP approved courses presenting theory, background, programming, and usage of technology will foster technological competence that will encourage students to consider the practicality and morality of technological choices.

However, at the same time that we emphasize the vital importance of Computer Science in contemporary society, we feel compelled to point to the lack of insight revealed by the placement of Computer Science with the four natural sciences in the design of the present CAP working plan. As important as it is, Computer Science is fundamentally distinctive from the four natural sciences with which it has been grouped. Biology, Chemistry, Geology, and Physics all involve the study of nature whereas computer science is fundamentally the study of information and information processes, and so has an abstract character that more closely parallels the role of mathematics in the sciences.
Accordingly, although computers are used extensively in the study of the natural sciences, the fundamental concepts and core principles of Computer Science are distinctive and do not integrate readily with the fundamental concepts and principles of the natural sciences, leaving our group with a quandary that we have not been able to fully resolve. How do we open an opportunity for students to investigate Computer Science without detracting from the integrative delivery of the four natural sciences through the Integrated Natural Science Sequence?

**General Education for Science and Engineering Students**

Like students in Music, Fine arts, and SBA, students in the sciences and engineering commonly meet their General Education requirements under the two-course system. However, due to their specializations, there are some important differences in the fundamental goals of science training for these students, and there is certainly a profound difference in the overall exposure of these students to the sciences and technical education in general. Individual courses within the Common Academic Program for Science and Engineering Majors will need to be reviewed to assure that HIR outcomes are being met, but we envision carrying the current General Education system for the STEM fields forward into the CAP largely intact.

**Summary: Key Strengths and Weaknesses of the Existing General Education System in the Sciences**

Below we summarize several key areas of strength and weakness in the current General Education system. The strengths should be preserved as we seek to remedy the weaknesses in developing the Common Academic Program in the sciences.

**Strengths**

The Integrated Science Sequence provides a coherent, well-reasoned framework for building scientific literacy for non-science majors, and has been particularly effective in supporting Teacher Education. This framework is developmental, integrated, discipline-based, and scientifically sound. The key HIR outcomes are already being met in many cases, and any future paradigm for the Common Academic Program in the Sciences should assure the continuance of these strengths.

We also believe that the current General Education program for science and engineering majors is fundamentally sound, although existing courses need to be modified to fully embrace the key HIR outcomes for the Sciences. Below we offer a proposal for how existing courses for science, engineering, and SOEAP-AYA Science students can be brought into alignment with the Common Academic Program.

**Weaknesses or Deficiencies**

Taken together, we have identified several significant weaknesses in the current General Education system that we seek to rectify in order to bring the curricula into alignment with HIR and the Common Academic Program.

1) **Lack of Representation of Computer Science.** Perhaps the most glaring deficiency in the entire General Education program, even beyond the sciences, is the complete omission of Computer
Science. Despite the ubiquitous presence of computers and information processes in modern society, and despite the fact that UD holds up Information Competency as one of its four core graduation Competencies, there is not a single general education elective in Computer Science.

2) **Lack of Cohesive Philosophy for the different schools at the University.** In the General Education program in the sciences, a particularly salient weakness is the lack of a common conceptual framework or educational philosophy embracing all non-STEM students. In particular, the present INSS does not currently include students in the SBA and professional programs in the Fine Arts and Music. Can it? Should it? Alternatively, can a coherent framework be given to a cafeteria system alongside the INSS?

3) **Lack of Curricular Adoptability.** Though not a problem with the INSS per se, it should be noted that the INSS offers limited opportunity for new curriculum development within its framework. How will innovative new courses in the sciences for science and non-science majors alike be introduced into the curriculum in the future?

4) **Lack of a Framework to Facilitate Interdisciplinary, Team-taught Courses.** There is at present no administrative framework for distributing student credit hours in team-taught courses between the faculty and their respective departments. If such courses are to be part of the galaxy of course selection in the CAP universe, then the central administration must confront and resolve this issue before any further curricular development can proceed.

**Prospective Models for the Common Academic Program in the Sciences**

**Science, Engineering and SOEAP-AYA Science Students:**

University of Dayton students pursuing science and engineering degrees are required to take more rigorous science courses than are required of non-science majors. SOEAP students with science concentrations in the Adolescent-Young Adult degree programs also take courses for science majors. Most of these science and engineering students take at least two courses each in Chemistry and Physics as well as courses from Biology, Geology and/or Computer Science. Accordingly, there does not seem to be any simple way to design two CAP science courses that would universally meet the diverse needs of these students without unduly expanding the required credit hours for the highly-structured degree programs characteristic of these majors. For this reason we have surveyed the introductory major’s courses in each of our disciplines and have chosen to modify these courses to address the three HIR outcomes of Scholarship, Practical Wisdom and Critical Evaluation of the Times as explained on page four of this document. In addition, we believe that the outcomes of Community and Vocation are also vitally important for science and engineering majors to achieve through their science curricula, but we believe that these outcomes will be most suitably achieved within the framework of each individual major rather than in auxiliary science courses outside the major. All science and engineering majors should fulfill their CAP-science requirement by taking at least two courses from outside their own major selected from the list in the following section. Additionally, at least one of these two courses should be accompanied by an associated laboratory course.

Finally, we note that the issue of whether or not to allow advanced placement or transfer credit is likely to arise for many of these courses. Rejecting such transfer credits and forcing students to re-take these
courses at the University of Dayton would place us at a severe competitive disadvantage in attracting many strong students, and we strongly urge that transfer and advanced placement credits for equivalent courses be accepted as fulfilling the CAP-science requirement at the University of Dayton. In any case, we note that this particular population of students will continue to build toward these outcomes throughout their academic careers at the University, so there would appear to be little rationale to compel them to re-take basic science courses that they have previously experienced elsewhere.

**Proposed CAP courses for Science and Engineering Students, by department:**

Each of the courses listed below will be reviewed and, if necessary, revised to assure that they provide adequate support for the three HIR outcomes of Scholarship, Practical Wisdom and Critical Evaluation of the Times. Some courses may also support additional outcomes such as Community, Diversity, and/or Vocation, but they will not be required to do so in order to fulfill the CAP-science requirement. Rather, we expect these outcomes and Faith Traditions to be attained through other dimensions of the Common Academic Program. Faculty teaching the courses listed below should have an opportunity to compete for summer stipend support to re-orient these courses to fully realize the specific criteria outlined earlier in this report.

**Biology** – BIO 151 and BIO151L, BIO152 and BIO152L

**Chemistry** – CHM 123 and CHM 123L, CHM 124 and CHM124L

**Computer Science** – CPS 132, CPS 150, and CPS 151

**Geology** – GEO 115 and GEO 115L, GEO 116 and GEO 116L, GEO 208, and GEO 218

**Physics** – PHY 201 and PHY 201L, PHY202 and PHY202L, PHY206, PHY207, PHY208, PHY210L, PHY 211L, and PHY232

**CAP Proposals for Non-STEM Students**

As noted earlier, students from outside the sciences and engineering currently meet General Education requirements in one of two ways:

a) B.A. and most SOEAP students typically fulfill the General Education requirements in physical and life sciences through the Integrated Natural Science Sequence.

b) School of Business Administration Students and students in professional programs in the Fine Arts and Music do not participate in the Integrated Natural Science Sequence, but rather select from a cafeteria menu of discipline-based courses. Most of these students do not take any science lab courses.

At the end of Fall Semester 2009, the CAP-Natural Sciences Working Group outlined and presented to the Science faculty four alternative conceptual models for delivery of the Common Academic Program in the Sciences for non-STEM majors at the University of Dayton. We presented those models in a well-attended open meeting of the Science faculty on Friday afternoon, December 11, and collected feedback into the first week of 2010. Based on that feedback and our own analysis, we conclude that there is appropriately strong support for the present fundamental conception and implementation of
the Integrated Natural Science Sequence. However, we have also identified a few weaknesses in the current implementation of the INSS which we believe should be rectified in the process of transitioning to the new CAP regime. To be specific, we reiterate these areas of concern below:

1) Lack of coherent coupling between lecture and laboratory courses.
2) Gross disproportionality in the population of the two tracks, with approximately 85% of students tracking through SCI210: the Dynamic Earth as opposed to SCI220: The World of Chemistry.
3) Lack of opportunity for students to inquire into Computer Science, one of the most pertinent modes of inquiry in the 21st Century. At the same time, however, the Committee notes the distinctiveness of Computer Science from the natural sciences, and we emphasize that exposure to Computer Science should not be purchased at the expense of the natural sciences. Rather, it must be developed in a way that augments and enriches rather than detracts from the delivery of the natural sciences.
4) Lack of a framework for interdisciplinary or team-teaching.
5) A “leaky pipeline” with numerous students procrastinating completion of the sequence or fulfilling at least one of the requirements with inappropriate substitutes.
6) Flagging integration of the sequence with the loss of the INSS coordinator position in 2008.

We note that deficiencies 1-4 above may be addressed in part through new curricular development whereas problems 5 and 6 (and, in part, 4) must be addressed primarily through administrative adaptations. In addition, we emphasize that though these deficiencies are worthy of attention, the INSS is a fundamentally sound structure, and any adaptation should proceed thoughtfully and carefully in the context of scientifically rigorous assessment so as not to risk creating new complications or problems that might easily eclipse any of those identified above. Unfortunately, we were unable to formulate a workable plan to bring the SBA and the professional programs in the Fine Arts and Music under the umbrella of the existing INSS. Therefore, we offer different proposals for each program below. However, we also propose piloting an experimental track within the INSS that will, among other things, allow for the experimental inclusion of students from the SBA or professional programs in the Arts.

**CAP for the School of Business Administration and Professional Programs in Fine Arts and Music**

Students in the School of Business Administration and the professional programs in the Fine Arts and Music will fulfill their CAP-science requirement by selecting two science courses from a cafeteria menu of 3 sem-hr lecture courses, with at least one of their two courses having an associated laboratory section. Developing the laboratory sections will require appropriate institutional support for the faculty involved in course development. In addition, Computer Science will commit to developing at least one course to serve this population of students. Finally, each of the natural science departments will need to decide in consultation with the Business School and the professional programs in the arts whether to re-propose existing courses or retire them and replace them with entirely new course proposals. In either case, all courses will need to document how they will meet the course criteria specified earlier in
this report, and in particular how they will meet the four nominative HIR outcomes for the sciences (Scholarship, Community, Practical Wisdom, and Critical Evaluation of the Times).

Finally, in addition to relatively traditional, discipline-based courses in the sciences, we expect to issue a call for a new class of course proposals organized along thematic rather than disciplinary lines, with a focus on large-scale problems of broad societal interest, as inspired by the Science Education for New Civic Engagements and Responsibilities (SENCER) model of science education, an NSF-supported initiative advocating science instruction for civic engagement (see appendix, or visit the SENCER website, http://www.sencer.net/About/projectoverview.cfm). The essential features of these courses should be to bring to life the core precepts of Habits of Inquiry and Reflection in the context of the sciences by designing courses that:

a) Encourage construction of communities of inquiry to support the learning of science.

b) Focus on applying science learning to issues of broad interest in contemporary society (i.e., “reading the science of the times”).

c) Illustrate the interdisciplinary character of the sciences by underscoring how different disciplinary perspectives can be brought to bear on inherently cross-disciplinary problems.

d) Foster the building of practical wisdom in students by focusing them on using scientific principles and processes to recognize and diagnose problems pertinent to society and to evaluate proposed solutions.

e) Build scholarly attributes in students by honing skills of quantitative analysis, critical thinking and written, oral, and/or illustrative communication.

A rubric for evaluation of course proposals in response to this call will establish criteria of evaluation reflecting the five principles outlined above, and faculty will be expected to design assessment plans based on these criteria. Finally, we note that students from the SBA and the professional programs in the Arts will also be invited to participate in the experimental program within the INSS as noted under point (5) in the program outlined for B.A. students below.

**CAP for B.A. Students**

For B.A. students in the College of Arts and Sciences we propose the following:

1) **Retention of the Fundamental Structure of the INSS.** The basic structure of the Integrated Natural Science Sequence, consisting of three lecture and two laboratory courses should be retained under the new CAP.

2) **Retention of the core conceptual model of the INSS.** The essential core concept of the INSS, that of vertical integration achieved through developmental progression, has worked well and should be retained. In this conception, scientific knowledge and quantitative skills are built cumulatively upward through the sequence from a firm foundation established by the root course in the sequence.
3) **Re-centering of the INSS on Four HIR outcomes.** In order to emphasize the realignment of the INSS with the seven Habits of Inquiry and Reflection, we propose adopting Scholarship, Community, Practical Wisdom and Critical Evaluation of the Science of the Times as core outcomes in a revitalized Integrated Natural Science Sequence.

4) **Continuation of the Current Tracks of the INSS.** The better populated “Environment Track” of the INSS should continue essentially as-is with incremental modifications to address some of the shortcomings identified earlier in this document. For example, we recommend making lectures pre- or co-requisite with the corresponding laboratories.

5) **Implementation of an Experimental Pilot Sequence parallel to the INSS.** The above incremental changes do not fully address the shortcomings of the current General Education program as identified on page 20. Yet the INSS remains a fundamentally sound and viable educational model that should not be abandoned lightly. We propose that the curricular development phase of the Common Academic Program be used to implement an experimental pilot sequence parallel to the INSS to run concurrently with the traditional tracks. This experiment should be carefully designed by an interdisciplinary committee of willing science faculty and instructors charged with addressing the following key questions:

   a. Can students be effectively exposed to all five science disciplines in a three course sequence without unduly compromising depth of learning?
   
   b. Can computer science be synergistically integrated into an Integrated Science Sequence?
   
   c. Can courses within the sequence be effectively organized and delivered around themes of timely relevance to contemporary society? Will such courses enhance student engagement and understanding of science in the context of broad civic challenges?
   
   d. Can interdisciplinary team-teaching significantly enhance student understanding of the integrative character of the sciences?
   
   e. Does a tightly integrated lecture/lab structure enhance student learning, community, and development of practical wisdom?

A carefully designed assessment plan will be crucial to track the academic progress of the experimental cohort with respect to a control group moving through the traditional INSS as described under point (4) above. In particular, the progress of these students should be tracked with respect to accomplishment of the four nominative HIR outcomes for the sciences. The smaller, experimental cohort would track through a pilot sequence designed to investigate the four questions outlined above. This experimental pilot sequence could retain one or two existing INSS courses, but should also embrace a potentially more transformative (though scalable) approach. For example, this could include interdisciplinary team-teaching and/or thematically-based classes focused on large-scale problems of contemporary interest to society, as inspired by the SENCER model of science education. In addition, it would be desirable to design this

---

1 See appendix for a description of the SENCER paradigm and some example course sequences that might form the basis for such an experiment.
experiment in such a way that professional students from the Fine Arts, Music, or the School of Business Administration could “opt in” to the first two courses in the sequence, thus maximizing the value of the experiment by facilitating a comparison not only with the traditional INSS cohort, but also with the “cafeteria model” under which the professional students fulfill their science requirement. The progress of students in both cohorts must be carefully, scientifically assessed. Depending on experience with the courses and the results of assessment, the experimental sequence could become a new branch of the INSS, could replace one of the existing branches, or (in the event that it fails) could be abandoned. In this fashion, the sciences will be able to explore and develop a higher risk, though potentially more transformative pedagogical model, without prematurely abandoning or putting at risk a model that is fundamentally sound and has worked well for University of Dayton students for approximately fifteen years.

6) **Restoration of the INSS Coordinator Position.** In order to facilitate and maintain integration of the INSS, it is imperative that the INSS coordinator position be restored, even before considering the ambitious plan outlined above. Effectively managing course development and assessment during the implementation period of this large-scale experiment further amplifies the case for restoration of the coordinator position. In fact, accomplishment of the experiment will be impossible without one. In order to assure appropriate stature and authority the coordinator should be a tenure-line faculty member with extensive experience teaching science for non-science majors. We emphasize that without a restoration of the coordinator position, no meaningful re-centering of the science program to meet the HIR outcomes can be achieved, and even the current integrative character of the INSS is likely to ebb over time.

7) **Extension of Integrated Science Sequence Review Leader Program.** Data collected on the review leader program in the INSS Physics course clearly indicates that it enhances and supports student learning. We strongly recommend that this program be extended to the other disciplines, especially Chemistry.

**CAP for Students from the School of Education and Allied Professions**

The various programs within the SOEAP have particular needs driven by accreditation processes and State of Ohio licensure requirements. The current INSS was originally piloted with SOEAP students, and the perhaps the greatest success of the INSS has been its demonstrable ability to meet the educational needs of these students. Therefore, we do not propose any fundamental change in the INSS for the SOEAP students other than the relatively limited changes contemplated under point 4 in the above section. In recent years, special sections of the INSS have been designated specifically for Teacher Education students, and in one case, GEO204: Geology for Teachers, a new course has even been introduced. We advocate the continuation of this trend.

**Review of Key Recommendations**

Throughout this report we have made a variety of specific recommendations for the realignment of science education at the University of Dayton in the spirit of the seven Habits of Inquiry and Reflection. Today's academic landscape is a dynamic environment. New pedagogies, changes in K-12 education,
improved learning technologies, and increased competition from a variety of educational alternatives make it essential that a viable Common Academic Program have the ability to adapt to changing times. For this reason, it is important that the final CAP proposal include a process for the timely addition and removal of courses from the program. The current processes in place primarily protect the status quo, discouraging experimentation. In the interest of continuous improvement, it is necessary for the CAP to encourage innovations that will allow us to continue to offer distinctive curricula.

Here we summarize the most important recommendations in a single place.

1) We formally embrace the HIR outcomes of Scholarship, Community, Practical Wisdom, and Critical Evaluation of the Times as being particularly pertinent to delivery of the Common Academic Program in the Sciences. However, for Science and Engineering majors we envision that the outcome of Community, together with the additional outcome of Vocation, will be delivered primarily through curricula within each major rather than through the introductory science curricula outside the major.

2) We recommend that the existing General Education requirement of “two courses in the physical and life sciences and technological applications” be expanded to 7 sem-hrs to assure at least one laboratory experience in the sciences for all UD students. We suggest that the requirement be restated as follows:

“Students must take two lecture courses in the physical or life sciences or computer science, at least one of which should be accompanied by a corresponding laboratory section.”

3) We recommend that wherever possible, lecture sections be made pre-requisite or co-requisite to their correlative laboratory sections. Where exceptions to this practice may occur, a specific pedagogical or logistical rationale for the exception should be provided.

4) We recommend that Computer Science be included in the new Common Academic Program, although we emphasize that care must be taken to do so in a fashion that will enrich and not detract from the exposure of students to the natural sciences. We consider that the working plan defining our charge reflected insufficient attention to the ubiquitous importance of computers and information processing in reshaping how we think and communicate in the contemporary world. Moreover, by grouping computer science, an abstract and enabling science more akin to mathematics, with the natural sciences, the working plan presented a challenge that we were not fully able to resolve.

5) We encourage (but do not require) interdisciplinary faculty collaboration in delivering CAP-Science courses in two different ways: modular teaching and/or team-teaching. In either case, new administrative mechanisms need to be put in place to accommodate this kind of collaboration. For these purposes, we define “modular teaching” to mean that each faculty member would participate in the course only during the delivery of his or her own module. In modular courses, student credit hours (SCH’s) should be divided between faculty and their departments proportionately to the fraction of the course that each faculty member delivers (in most cases that we have considered this would involve a 50-50 split between participating
departments). Thus modular teaching would involve no new call on University resources. In contrast, by “team-teaching” we mean that all participating faculty members would make the commitment to participate throughout the delivery of the course. In this case, we recommend that the count of SCH’s for the course should be doubled and then divided equally between participating faculty and their respective departments. For example, in a course team-taught by two faculty members, each would claim the full count of SCH’s for the class. In a course team-taught by three faculty members, each of the three would claim 2/3 of the SCH’s for the class, and so forth.

6) We recommend that all science and engineering majors fulfill their CAP-science requirement by taking at least two approved CAP-science courses from outside their own major. Additionally, at least one of these two courses should be accompanied by an associated laboratory course. We further recommend that for these students appropriate transfer and advanced placement credit should be accepted in fulfillment of the CAP-science requirement.

7) We recommend that students from the School of Business Administration and professional programs in the Arts fulfill their CAP-science requirement by taking at least two approved CAP-science courses chosen from a menu of courses developed for nonscience majors. Additionally, at least one of the two courses should be accompanied by an associated and preferably co-requisite laboratory course.

8) For B.A. and most Education students we recommend that key elements of the Integrated Natural Science Sequence be carried forward into the Common Academic Program, including its integrative philosophy and its systematic, developmental approach to building scientific literacy and competency in non-science majors. However, we do call for re-tuning of the sequence to more fully achieve the four nominative HIR outcomes of Scholarship, Community, Practical Wisdom, and Critical Evaluation of the Times. In addition, we recommend administrative and incremental pedagogical improvements to the existing tracks of the INSS.

9) In addition, we recommend that higher risk, but potentially more transformative pedagogies be explored through piloting an experimental track designed to remedy some of the shortcomings of the General Education program in the sciences. Specifically, the experiment should be defined so as to:

   a. Expose students to all five science disciplines, including computer science.

   b. Embrace interdisciplinary approaches through both course design and team-teaching.

   c. Encourage “reading the science of the times” through thematically organized courses focused on problems of widespread interest to contemporary society (e.g., the SENCER paradigm).

   d. Provide for the tight coupling of corresponding lecture and lab courses

Effective execution of this large-scale experiment will require intensive assessment and a significant commitment of resources.

10) We recommend extension of the review leader program to include other disciplines.
11) We strongly recommend that the position of the INSS coordinator be reinstated to assure the continued integration and innovation that has been the hallmark of this sequence for 15 years.
Appendix 1: What is ‘SENCER’?

This report alludes occasionally to the “SENCER model of science education.” This is a relatively new initiative supported by the National Science Foundation and advocating science education focused on engagement with civic issues. The CAP-Natural Science Working Group finds this paradigm to be particularly compatible with the educational philosophy embodied in Habits of Inquiry and Reflection and has been influenced by it in considering ways that HIR principles might be integrated into the Common Academic Program in the Sciences at UD. More can be learned at the SENCER web site, http://www.sencer.net/ from which we quote below:

About SENCER: Overview

Science Education for New Civic Engagements and Responsibilities (SENCER) was initiated in 2001 under the National Science Foundation's CCLI national dissemination track. Since then, SENCER has established and supported an ever-growing community of faculty, students, academic leaders, and others to improve undergraduate STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) education by connecting learning to critical civic questions. SENCER is the signature program of the National Center for Science and Civic Engagement, which was established in affiliation with Harrisburg University of Science and Technology.

Our Approach

SENCER applies the science of learning to the learning of science, all to expand civic capacity.

John Bransford, a member of the Board on Science Education of the National Academies and Mifflin Professor of Education at the University of Washington, claims that SENCER is "bringing to life the recommendations we made in How People Learn."

In designing SENCER we used methods and strategies derived from existing knowledge concerning undergraduate STEM education so that both the STEM learning and the curricular reforms would be durable. Students and faculty report that the SENCER approach makes science more real, accessible, "useful" and civically important.

SENCER improves science education by focusing on real world problems and, by so doing, extends the impact of this learning across the curriculum to the broader community and society. We do this by developing faculty expertise in teaching "to" basic, canonical science and mathematics "through" complex, capacious, often unsolved problems of civic consequence.

Using materials, assessment instruments, and research developed in the SENCER project, faculty design curricular projects that connect science learning to real world challenges.

Our Aims

Our goals are to: (1) get more students interested and engaged in learning in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) courses, (2) help students connect STEM learning to their other studies, and (3) strengthen students' understanding of science and their capacity for responsible work and citizenship.

What We Offer

SENCER promotes work that increases the STEM knowledge base and broadens the impact of campus work. We support a community of practice by offering faculty development programs through regional symposia and our annual Summer Institutes, and supplement those interactions with a collection of resources, including field-tested featured and emerging course models, backgrounder papers, and a
monthly e-newsletter. We also encourage and participate in the development of assessment strategies and tools that help educators better evaluate and promote student learning and engagement. We also support advanced research in these areas. A new partnership between the Carnegie Foundation’s Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and the National Center for Science and Civic Engagement provides will provide opportunities for the SENCER community to apply the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) approach to their analysis of the effectiveness of the SENCER approach.

Our Partners

Since its inception, SENCER has established formal projects designed to develop and implement SENCER courses with teams that have included more than 1,100 faculty, administrators, and students from over 300 high schools, colleges, and universities located in 166 US congressional districts and 13 foreign nations.

Since its inception, the SENCER ideals, programs, and materials have been shared with thousands more STEM faculty and academic leaders at symposia, poster sessions, disciplinary society meetings and other workshop venues in the US and countries around the world.

Our Background and Intellectual Traditions

SENCER’s particular origins can be found in a course developed at Rutgers University that focused curricular resources on the HIV epidemic. Using the HIV epidemic to teach biological concepts increased student learning. Other faculty members using similar approaches to teaching reported similar results in learning. (For a discussion of the "genealogy" and the philosophy of SENCER can be found in the article "Knowledge to Make Our Democracy, ")

While SENCER’s approach to science education has been called unique, it builds on longstanding traditions from those now denominated as Aristotelian to the Enlightenment linkage of the liberal arts and the natural sciences.

In the more modern era, we find roots in the "extension service" model of practical education and American pragmatism. Our understanding of learning acknowledges a debt to the philosopher, William James, who, in his "Talks to Teachers" wrote:

*Any object not interesting in itself may become interesting through becoming associated with an object in which an interest already exists. The two associated objects grow, as it were, together: the interesting portion sheds its quality over the whole; and thus things not interesting in their own right borrow an interest which becomes as real and as strong as that of any natively interesting thing. The odd circumstance is that the borrowing does not impoverish the source, the objects taken together being more interesting, perhaps, than the originally interesting portion was by itself.*

*This is one of the most striking proofs of the range of application of the principle of association of ideas in psychology. An idea will infect another with its own emotional interest when they have become both associated together into any sort of a mental total. As there is no limit to the various associations into which an interesting idea may enter, one sees in how many ways an interest may be derived.*

Still more contemporaneously, SENCER’s work is informed by the National Academies’ commissioned reports on learning, notably How People Learn and Knowing What Students Know: The Science and Design of Educational Assessment.

Since that pilot project to link biology education to an emerging disease, the SENCER ideals have been applied to develop field-tested courses for many disciplines on a broad range of topics from brownfield reclamation to natural catastrophes, and from nanotechnology, the mathematics of secrecy, water quality, to tuberculosis, diabetes and obesity, to name just a few.

Results So Far

Barbara Tewksbury, the William R. Kenan Professor of Geosciences at Hamilton College and one of the PIs for the "On The Cutting Edge" project, notes that "promoting teaching of SENCER-type courses helps
move faculty away from thinking of teaching science as a way to transmit a body of information and helps students to experience first-hand that science is a way of thinking, of asking and answering questions."

Key findings from the extensive, independent multi-year evaluation of the SENCER project, conducted by Elaine Seymour, Tim Weston and Heather Thiry, confirm this. Their report provides evidence that "SENCER's goal of encouraging faculty to teach courses with civic content and innovative pedagogy is a reality." The researchers also confirm that the SENCER reforms are durable, noting that they found that "92% of instructors believed that their courses would be continued in the future, and 80% considered their course part of the permanent curriculum at their institution." The data provided by 10,000 students in 345 SENCER courses who completed the SENCER-SALG have been analyzed. In addition to the important outcome of helping faculty make "meaningful changes to their instruction," the data tell who gains and what they gain from their study in SENCER courses. There is also evidence that the SENCER approach strengthens learning for women, minorities, and students who major in non-STEM fields, as well as for those who have chosen to major in a STEM field. More detailed information, including the full text of the 2006 final report, can be found in the Assessment section of this website.

Future Challenges and Directions

These results have lead us to propose initiatives that build on what has been accomplished, promise broader and deeper disseminations, enlarge the community of practice, and sustain the project for the future. What made SENCER necessary in 2001 is still true today: more than ever we need to attract more students to the STEM fields, cultivate a basic understanding of science and mathematics in all educated people, and develop a paradigm of science education that prizes rigor and success, as opposed to confusing quality with high casualty rates in introductory courses. SENCER offers a promising pathway to success in all these areas. Cross-cutting issues that animate dimensions of SENCER's current and future work include: (1) increasing the level of science and mathematics learning achieved in SENCER courses and connecting this knowledge to workforce challenges, (2) using the SENCER approach to attract more students to pre-service teacher education (especially at the elementary school level) and exploring the feasibility of developing primary and secondary school SENCER course and curricular projects in college-level courses, (3) extending the SENCER approach to the education of STEM majors, and (4) using the diverse SENCER community to strengthen connections between community and four year colleges. These matters are critical to our nation’s economic competitiveness and civic welfare.
Appendix 2: Comments on the Proposed INSS Experimental Track

As described in our report, the Integrated Natural Science Sequence was a landmark innovation in the history of science education for nonscience students at the University of Dayton, and, despite a few concerns, in large part it continues to serve students well. Though our working group vigorously investigated a variety of models with the potential to address the concerns with the INSS while preserving the core strengths of the sequence, ultimately we decided that it would be imprudent to overturn a basically functional system for an untested model, however promising. Nevertheless, the INSS itself points to the rich tradition of innovation and an ethic of continuous improvement in science education at the University of Dayton, and we perceive the dangers of complacency to be as real as the dangers of a rash pursuit of change for its own sake. Moreover, through our probing we discovered a previously unrecognized strength of the INSS paradigm: it provides a powerful historical model and a continuing robust framework for further curricular innovation. In balancing these competing concerns we struck upon the idea of piloting a new, experimental track of the Integrated Science Sequence to test the extent to which some of the key concerns could be redressed while preserving or even enhancing the core strengths of the sequence. Moreover, this idea provides a framework for building faculty “buy-in” by disseminating ownership of the experimental design to an interdisciplinary team of willing faculty. Below, we outline how we expect to frame the charge to this team and offer a preliminary framework for the execution of the experiment. Clearly, carrying out the proposed experiment will depend on institutional support, but we note that the experiment can proceed even if the progress on the broader Common Academic Program becomes stalled for some reason.

The design team will include a representative recruited from each science department. If one department chooses not to participate, then the experiment can still proceed, but clearly the experiment will be predicated on the participation of at least three departments.

Charge to the Experimental Design Team

1. The members of the INSS Experimental Design team should familiarize themselves with the opening sections of the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection document, particularly the seven student learning outcomes that are now at the heart of the University’s assessment plan. In addition, the team members should familiarize themselves with the recommendations of the CAP-Natural Science Working Group in “Reading the Science of the Times: Toward a Common Academic Program in the Sciences.”

2. The experimental design team is charged with outlining a curricular plan for a three-course/11 sem-hr sequence under the following parameters:
   a. The experiment should be designed to test as many of the following questions as possible:
      i. Can courses within the sequence be effectively organized and delivered around themes of timely relevance to contemporary society? Will such courses enhance student engagement and understanding of science in the context of the broad civic challenges of the 21st century?
      ii. Can students be effectively exposed to all five science disciplines in a three course sequence without unduly compromising depth of learning?
      iii. Can computer science be synergistically integrated into the Science Sequence?
iv. Can interdisciplinary team-teaching significantly enhance student understanding of the integrative character of the sciences?

v. Can a tightly integrated lecture/lab structure support student learning in community and development of practical wisdom?

b. Labs should be co-requisite with the corresponding lecture sections. At the discretion of the design team, the 3-hour course could either be a traditional 3 hour lecture section or could follow a “2+1 model” (i.e., 2 sem-hrs of lecture with 1 hr of lab).

c. At the discretion of the design committee, the experimental sequence may include one existing course (most likely but not necessarily SCI190: the Physical Universe), but the experiment should involve the introduction of at least two new courses.

d. The design team should consider the creation of one or more courses to be delivered via interdisciplinary team-teaching. Modular teaching (as described in the *Reading the Science of the Times* report) may also be considered.

e. Ideally, the experiment should be designed such that professional students in the School of Business Administration or Fine Arts or Music could fulfill their CAP-science requirement through the first two courses of the sequence.

f. Serious consideration should be given to developing the experiment within the context of a Living-Learning Community in order to assure timely progression through the sequence. In such a case, the control group should also have their own LLC.

3. A rigorous assessment plan to evaluate the results of the experiment must be formulated and should be benchmarked against a control group passing through the traditional INSS.
Progress Report

CAP-Science Sequence Design Team

Team Members: Allen McGrew, Chair; Carl Friese, Biology; David Johnson, Chemistry; Barbara Smith, Computer Science; Umesh Haritashya, Geology; Todd Smith, Physics.

Introduction

The CAP-Science Sequence Design team listed above was constituted in May, 2011 in response to a call to design a new experimental sequence to rectify some of the identified shortcomings of the existing Integrated Natural Science Sequence while adapting science education at the University of Dayton to the new outcomes-oriented framework of the Common Academic Program. The team met frequently through the early part of the summer, and all attended the 2011 SENCER Summer Institute at Butler University in Indianapolis, July 21-25. The Recommendations on the following pages summarize the work of the Design Team this summer.

The CAP-Science sequence outlined below represents the culmination of two years of conversations across the sciences. In the Spring semester of 2011, four conceptual models for delivering this sequence were circulated to all the science departments for consideration, and the faculty of each science department were polled to select a single model for an “experimental sequence” to be introduced in the Fall of 2012. This summer the design team has worked to further refine the details of the selected model as summarized in the graphic below. Following a suggestion from last year, we recommend that the name “Global Citizens Science Sequence” be adopted for this experimental curriculum.

The Global Citizens Science Sequence

The above model is designed to sustain the developmental model of science education at the University of Dayton that was introduced with the Integrated Natural Science Sequence while
simultaneously developing a more deeply integrated approach that culminates in a diverse suite of inquiry-oriented experiential learning opportunities for students. Key strengths of this model include:

a) The sequence emphasizes a natural developmental trajectory from the “foundation sciences” of Physics and Chemistry to the “systems sciences” (Earth, Life and Computer Science) ultimately culminating in a scientific inquiry course that will immerse every student in the experience of scientific discovery and the application of science to fundamental challenges facing human society today.

b) Our ambition is that by the time they complete the full sequence, every student will not only have completed their CAP-science requirement but also at least one of the Crossing Boundaries requirements, in the Integrative, Inquiry or Practical Ethical Action categories. Thus this sequence will better integrate students’ educational experience in science with the rest of their educational program.

c) All students will gain exposure to all four of the natural sciences and the opportunity of exposure to computer science (the present framework only provides exposure to three of the four natural sciences, with no opportunity of exposure to computer science).

d) All labs will be inherently integrated with the accompanying lectures, and all students will be exposed to at least one laboratory experience.

e) When fully scaled up, we believe that this curriculum will be adaptable enough to accommodate all non-STEM students at the University of Dayton.

The pages below summarize the specific recommendations emerging from this summer’s work by the CAP-Science design team.

**Key Recommendations of CAP-Science Experimental Design Team**

1) *The first two courses should be delivered as 4 sem-hr integrated lecture and lab courses meeting 6 contact hours per week (3 hrs lecture plus 3 hrs lab).* Rationale: Integrating lecture and lab is both pedagogically more effective and more efficient. Since the instructor will know that all students are in lab, the lecture can build on the lab and vice versa, thus more effectively integrating the learning experience while also providing the instructor with the option of leaving some information to be covered in lab rather than lecture, or vice versa. In addition, by adding an extra contact hour of lab per week, instructors will have an opportunity to partially offset some of the lost time due to the sharing of the courses between two disciplines. Where appropriate, instructors should have freedom to deliver lab component in a studio fashion & implement other innovative course designs within the 6 contact hour framework. Various schedules are possible, but we suggest that three two-hour blocks (MWF schedule) or two three-hour blocks (MW or TH) would likely be most efficient and easiest to accommodate within student schedules.

2) *Course pairings and order* – The design team believes that the most pedagogically effective pairing for the trial would be Physics with Chemistry (with Physics being delivered first) followed by a course in Biology and Earth Science (with the order of delivery not being particularly critical). As the program evolves other approaches may be possible.
3) **Structure and Implementation of the Sequence** – The design team recommends initially running two sections of 40 students each in order to have a sufficiently large cohort for meaningful assessment. For the experimental sequence, these classes should meet either twice weekly for three hours each or three times a week for two hours each. We suggest that these sections should be offered in the room best equipped for a studio course format (probably SC066). In the future, other schedules could be experimented with, and class sizes could potentially be increased. If students do not wish to continue in the experimental sequence, they should be allowed to switch into SCI210 after the first course in the sequence.

4) **Textbook** – For the experimental sequence, the design team has selected the textbook, *Conceptual Integrated Science* by Hewitt et al. to cover the first two courses in the sequence, although some parts of the text may need supplementation. We believe that the selection of a single text for the first two courses will be attractive to students and will encourage students to proceed through the sequence in a timely fashion.

5) **3rd Tier “Inquiry in Science” Courses** – To accommodate the inquiry-oriented pedagogy envisioned for the third-tier courses, we anticipate that most of these courses will be 3 sem-hr courses taught in a Studio format, which, at the option of the proposing instructor(s), could include an integrated lab component (with appropriate lab fees collected). Many of these courses will likely be deeply informed by the latest research on the science of teaching and learning, and we expect most to fulfill a Crossing Boundaries requirement as well as culminating the science requirement. The Crossing Boundaries courses in the categories of “Integrative,” “Inquiry,” and “Practical Ethical Action” may be particularly appropriate.

6) For the validity of the experiment, the design team recommends that every effort be made to have students in the sequence move through the sequence as a cohort, although some attrition will be unavoidable. With this in mind, the team recommends that students in the experimental cohort be strongly encouraged to select third tier courses from a set of three that the team proposes to develop to be offered initially in the Fall of 2013:

   a. **Computing and the Information Society** – Computing and the Information Society will provide the student with a foundation of key concepts of computing and build on those key concepts to engage in the study of robotics and data mining. Students will be exposed to programming concepts in a language such as Python and will write programs to control simple robots.

   b. **Environmental Health** – This course will explore the scientific relationship between human health issues and the environment with special focus on the ways future developments may influence environmental health problems. The course will examine a variety of issues in environmental health from chemical, biological and geological points of view, such as air, water and soil contamination, hazardous wastes, risk assessment, and policy and decision-making in local, regional, and global contexts.

   c. **Earth and Sky** – An exploration of the origins and history of the Universe, the solar system and planet Earth, this course is conceived to meet the content requirements of pre-service teachers but will also be appropriate for students in any major.
7) **Integration with a Living-Learning Community** – To encourage students to continue directly through at least the first two courses in the sequence, we recommend that the experimental sequence be integrated with a Living Learning Community.

8) **Integration of SOEAP (School of Education and Allied Professions) students** – The design team suggests that the proposed sequence could be beneficial for the SOEAP and they should be offered an opportunity to participate in the experiment provided that appropriate 300-level courses could be developed to meet any content areas required by state licensure requirements. Below we propose the development of a new SCI 300-level to partially meet the content area requirements for pre-service teachers.

9) **The SBA (School of Business Administration) and BFA (Bachelors of Fine Arts) students (7 hour requirement)** - The design team expects that the content of the first two courses in the sequence would also be appropriate for SBA and BFA students. However, we recommend that SBA & BFA students not be included in the initial experiment because having different cohorts within the same sequence, some of whom would not complete the full sequence, would unduly complicate and perhaps invalidate the assessment process. However, if the decision is taken to scale up the sequence, we envision that SBA and BFA students could either take the first two courses in the sequence (totaling 8 hours), or they could proceed to a restricted number of choices of SCI 300-level courses that would specify only the SCI 100-level (Physics + Chemistry) course as a prerequisite. These courses should be designed to build on the foundation developed by Physics and Chemistry, and should assure in-depth exposure to the “systems sciences” of Biology, Geology, and/or Computer Science, but without assuming prior knowledge of these disciplines. The team believes that with careful planning it should be possible to develop a few courses in these disciplines (or crossing the scientific disciplines) that will achieve robust learning outcomes in scientific inquiry while also fulfilling criteria within the Crossing Boundaries category, and we expect that the computer science course currently being developed will meet these criteria.

10) The team believes that we have now reached a stage in the planning process where incorporating student input and feedback would be helpful.

11) The team recognizes the crucial nature of assessment in the development of this program and has worked to outline a Preliminary Assessment Plan, attached below. However, we also see a variety of challenges and we request assistance in fleshing out a detailed assessment plan with specific measures and assessment tools. In addition to seeking help from assessment experts within our own scholarly community, we request to bring an outside expert to campus in the area of assessment of learning outcomes in the sciences, possibly in the context of a SENCER House Call.
Preliminary Assessment Plan

The CAP-Science experimental design team recommends that assessment be based on four major outcomes each assessed through at least three measures as outlined below. These same outcomes and measures should be used to assess student performance in a control group consisting of a cohort of students in the traditional Integrated Natural Science Sequence at the same time. As in the case of the of FINS I & II, the INSS control group should be organized into a Living Learning Community to help assure that they stay together as a cohort. As it will involve human subjects, this large-scale experiment needs to be taken to the Institutional Review Board for approval. In order to better refine and improve this assessment plan we recommend additional consultation with assessment experts both within UD and from outside UD. One possibility is a “SENCER House Call” with one or more assessment experts recommended by the National Center for Science and Civic Engagement.

Assessment Schedule

All outcomes should be assessed as the initial student cohort passes through each course in the sequence, beginning in the Fall, 2012. A summative assessment of the sequence as a whole will also need to be completed early in the Spring Semester, 2014, and based on this assessment a decision process will need to be implemented to decide (a) whether and how to scale the sequence up, or (b) whether to adapt the new CAP-Science sequence based on the current INSS framework, and (c) what modifications and adaptations are necessary whichever sequence is chosen for full scale-up in the Fall, 2014.

Outcome 1 - Foundations of Integrative Science

Students will develop an integrated foundation of scientific knowledge and the ability to apply that knowledge. **HIR Goals:** Scholarship, Practical Wisdom. **Delivery:** Lecture & Lab*

**Measures**

- Students will demonstrate improved performance on key pre- and post test questions in each course, and at the end of the entire sequence.
- Given a few well-chosen sample problems or scenarios, students will demonstrate improved ability to apply scientific principles to analyze them.
- On surveys such as SENCER-SALG students will indicate enhanced confidence in processing scientific issues.

Outcome 2 - Quantitative Skills

Students will show improved ability to understand and apply basic quantitative methods to analyze and interpret data or to model scientific processes. **HIR Goals:** Scholarship, Practical Wisdom. **Delivery:** Lab* & Lecture
Measures

- Given a few well-chosen quantitative sample problems or scenarios (e.g., graph interpretation problems), students will demonstrate improved ability to apply quantitative skills to analyze them.
- Students will show improved performance on quantitative questions and tasks in post-tests as compared with pre-tests.
- In the SENCER-SALG inventory students will report increased confidence in their ability to work with and interpret quantitative data.

Outcome 3 – The Nature and Practice of Scientific Inquiry

Students will demonstrate a deeper understanding of the essential nature of science and an enhanced ability to engage in the process of scientific inquiry. HIR Goals: Scholarship, Practical Wisdom. Delivery: Lab* & Lecture

Measures

- Given particular scenarios, students will show an improved ability to differentiate science from pseudoscience and to justify their judgment.
- Students responses on the Views of the Nature of Science (VNOS) inventory (or similar assessment tool, such as the Views About Science Survey, VASS) will demonstrate enhanced understanding of the nature of science as compared with the performance of entering students.
- Students will demonstrate improved ability to identify and/or explain key elements of the nature of science in the SENCER-SALG inventory.

Outcome 4 – Reading the Science of the Times.

Students will demonstrate improved ability to express how science relates to their own lives and to issues of contemporary relevance in broader society. HIR Goals: Community, Practical Wisdom, & Critical Evaluation of the Times Delivery: Lecture & Lab

Measures

- Given a particular scenario such as a brief contemporary news account, students will show an improved ability to articulate how the various sciences play a role in understanding the context and processes operating in the events described in the account.
- In the SENCER-SALG inventory students will demonstrate an enhanced appreciation for and an improved ability to articulate how science relates to their lives and to the concerns of broader society.
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Background and Rationale

Effective oral communication is an essential educational need for all college students. Knowledge or skill in all disciplines is important, but expertise in a field is only effective via the ability to communicate that information and to work with others. Put simply, strength in oral communication is what makes knowledge in all other fields functional. Not surprisingly, the literature on what employers want in new hires shows knowledge and skill in oral communication is overwhelmingly the top choice.

The National Communication Association articulates the importance of oral communication in its “Policy Platform Statement on the Role of Communication Courses in General Education,” from which we highlight two points:

- “Oral communication education, taught by those trained in the discipline, is essential to the general education of college and university students.”
- “Preparation for life in the modern world requires communication with a cross section of diverse people who often have conflicting needs and interests. Perhaps more than ever, educated persons need to communicate with sensitivity and skill with those of widely different backgrounds, cultural experiences, and values. Effective communication helps maintain a sense of community and an ability to craft consensus in an increasingly diverse and complex world. An oral communication course brings together students from across the institution and provides direct experience in communication within a diverse speech community.”
I. FOUNDATIONAL COURSE

Need for an Oral Communication Course in the Common Academic Program

- Following the traditions of a Catholic and Marianist university
  - The learning outcomes established in HIR require a specific way of communicating with others, a type of communication that departs from what people often do. In order for us to offer a program that honestly meets the goals of HIR, students need coursework that enables them to engage others in a manner fitting the Marianist character, rather than in the manner most often modeled in society.

- Making UD competitive
  - Knowledge and skills in communication is an essential outcome of a college education. Employers continue to demand excellence in oral communication—in presenting ideas clearly and persuasively, listening effectively, working with others in groups and teams, maintaining effective relationships in the workplace, and showing leadership on the job.
  - Employers were asked to rate the importance of job-related skills in the 2008 National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) Job Outlook Survey. Oral communication comprised 3 of the top 5 needs: (1) Communication skills [general], (2) Teamwork skills, and (5) Interpersonal skills.
  - Faculty responses to “What basic competencies or skills should every college graduate have?” consistently include: skills in communicating, interpersonal skills (e.g., participating in and leading groups), as well as two other topics important to UD: appreciation of cultural diversity, and ability to adapt to innovation and change (Diamond, 1997).
  - A compelling oral communication class could be a strong selling point for incoming students. If UD offers powerful knowledge and skills that are not in the base curriculum at other universities, we can gain a competitive and marketable advantage. We think that the course we are proposing offers this advantage.

Specific needs addressed with this course proposal

The course we propose is designed to meet fundamental goals of the Common Academic Program, both in its commitment to providing a Marianist education and in its goal of developing outcome-based classes that prepare students for the challenges of the 21st century. Within the vast range of possibilities that would fit the goals of CAP, we selected content and pedagogy that best meet the needs we found from our interviews across the university. The range of needs expressed across the university was more than could be fit into one class, so we focused on needs that were most widely expressed and were most foundational. That approach provides a base on which departments can further develop their students’ knowledge and skills in oral communication with the second part of our proposal.

Essential Needs Expressed in HIR

A close reading of HIR shows that its goals can only be met with certain strengths in oral communication.

1. Dialogue. Most essential is the ability to engage in dialogue with people of differing perspectives. Dialogue, which is both a specific knowledge base in communication as well as a unique set of skills, is infused throughout HIR. A few examples include:
• “A Catholic university thrives on dialogue and collaboration among persons with diverse backgrounds, values, cultures, and abilities.” (sacramentality, p. 5)
• “This means that students, faculty, and staff alike must grow in their capacities to welcome collaboration in the face of differences, to sustain dialogue even when disagreements seem insurmountable….” (community, p. 5)
• “Students’ abilities should be developed sufficiently to allow them…to participate intelligently and respectfully in dialogue with other traditions….” (faith traditions, p. 8)
• “[Essential skills include]…productive, discerning, creative, and respectful collaboration with persons from diverse backgrounds and perspectives…. (community, p. 8)
Dialogue is also an essential element in conflict resolution, an issue HIR talks about as follows:
• “These values and skills include accepting difference, resolving conflicts peacefully, and promoting reconciliation.” (community, p. 8)

2. **Public oral presentations.** Dialogue can take place across wide-ranging contexts, from dyadic conversations to discussions among larger groups of people (as the working groups and APC have attempted to do in their CAP discussions). However, HIR is clear that public speaking is essential when it comes to scholarship. Scholarship does not just involve doing research or writing, but it also includes sharing and defending that work in a public forum. According to HIR, student scholarship is:
   • “…scholarly or community-based work intended for public presentation and defense.” (scholarship, p. 8)

3. **Critical thinking and critical analysis of arguments.** Another important element in HIR that requires expertise in oral communication relates to critical analysis of messages. Although these messages may sometimes be written, more often in our society they are oral messages—in personal settings (such as in conversations or meetings at work), through public speeches, or encountered through media channels. Critical analysis of arguments requires different skills in oral communication than in writing, because analysis of oral arguments prohibits re-reading the case and requires immediate comprehension and analysis. The power of great speakers comes from their ability understand a situation, critically evaluate arguments, and craft appropriate responses on their feet. HIR addresses critical analysis of arguments in comments such as the need to:
   • “…equip them [students] to evaluate critically and imaginatively the ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, and ecological challenges of their times” (critical evaluation of our times, p. 8)

*Essential Needs Expressed at UD*

The faculty we interviewed across the university expressed a wide-ranging set of oral communication needs for their students. Taken as a whole, though, three basic needs seemed most prominent (not necessarily in any order).

1. **Development and critical analysis of persuasive arguments.** This need was identified most often as a priority in the humanities and social sciences, where the acts of crafting and critiquing arguments are a fundamental method by which knowledge is advanced.

2. **Explaining complex concepts to non-experts.** This need was identified most often as a priority in the natural sciences and engineering. People in these professions frequently have to
explain their ideas to non-experts who may select best options or implement those ideas, and so the ability to explain clearly and succinctly, with appropriate presentational aids, and using language and concepts that a general audience can understand is essential to what these students will need to do.

3. *Dialogue.* Some units identified dialogue by name; others talked about its essence without identifying it as such. However it was labeled, the values and skills of dialogue were identified as essential for students across almost all units. We heard needs for true, deep listening to people you’d initially judge poorly (social sciences), respectful conflict (humanities), and listening before formulating responses (education), among many other expressed needs relating to dialogue.
Course Proposal

Goals of the course

We propose a course that is designed to meet the needs articulated in HIR and by the departments, and to do so in a manner that is substantive in communication theory and develops oral communication skills significantly.

Our hope is that the class we propose helps provide students with communication knowledge and skills that model an approach to human interaction that make the intent of HIR possible. We also hope that this course provides students with a powerful means of communicating more ethically and effectively in their everyday lives. And, we hope that these knowledge and skills enrich their education here at UD. If applied well, students should work together more effectively, listen better and with a more open mind, and critique and respond to oral arguments more readily. In fact, if faculty across UD understand principles of dialogue and implement those norms within their classes, we think the change in communication could have a profound and positive impact in campus climate and educational outcomes at UD.

General outline of the course

Overview

Goals of the course. The course will be grounded in concepts of dialogue and debate, with the goals of engaging in constructive mutual dialogue in conversations and meetings; developing the ability to publicly articulate, analyze, and defend a position in a public forum; understanding the differences between dialogue and debate; and understanding relative advantages and disadvantages of each mode of communication. As essential parts of engaging in both of these forms of communication, students will focus on issues both of critical analysis of argument and of explaining complex ideas to non-experts, as well as some fundamental aspects of public communication, such as effective use of presentational aids and managing speech anxiety.

Nature of dialogue. Dialogue is a complex construct that cannot be fully captured in a few sentences. Dialogue is a conversation between two or more parties--usually on a topic in which there is a difference of viewpoint--in which the people involved both speak and listen with the ultimate goal of common understanding. Agreement is nice, but is not a required outcome. Dialogue requires treating all parties with respect, having strong listening skills, giving full attention to the process, and developing high levels of both self- and other-awareness, among other actions.

Use of dialogue runs counter to many people’s natural tendencies and is antithetical to most communication modeled in mass media. However, it is extremely powerful in bringing people of diverse ideas together, building relationships characterized by mutual respect between people with significant differences, and establishing and maintaining cooperative and nonviolent human relations. It is essential to strong and healthy community.

Pedagogy: General layout of the class

• Class “destination”: The class will develop knowledge and skills that build toward a final assignment in which students debate a socially significant and controversial topic. These debates will require students to articulate, analyze on their feet, and defend a position.
After the debate concludes, the students will then switch modes of communication and engage in a class-wide round-table where students discuss the issue in a dialogic manner.

• *Progression of the course:*
  
  i. *Theory and practice of dialogue*
    - Readings would introduce the general approach of dialogue, philosophical and theoretical foundations, and specific communication behaviors necessary for success.
    - Practice would involve use of dialogue skills, either with in-class skill-building activities or through formal graded assignments.
    - Rationale for this material: Dialogue is a primary foundation of HIR and Marianist education, and it reflects a significant need across the university. Although dialogue may take place in individual and small group settings, it is just as relevant in public forums. The skills of dialogue—meaningful and open-minded listening, giving full attention to an interaction, asking questions for greater understanding, and more—will enhance students’ educational outcomes in all their classes if used well.

  ii. *Some fundamentals of public presentation -- managing speech anxiety, audience analysis, effective use of presentational aids*
    - Unless limited by time constraints, practice would likely be a formal speech, focusing on explaining a complex idea to the class and doing so with effective presentational aids.
    - Rationale for this material: The ability to explain complex ideas was most often noted as of great importance by the sciences here at UD, but it is essential in all fields. And, both dialogue and debate of ideas require the ability to clarify ideas as well as to consider persuasive reasons. So, this is both a necessary end for some professions and an essential means to an important end in others. Although the communication skills emphasized in this course are applicable to any context, there are certain fundamentals of public speaking (such as managing anxiety and making effective use of presentational aids) that are essential for any college educated person to master.

  iii. *Analysis of oral arguments*
    - Readings would include theories of persuasion, fundamentals of reasoning, and prevalent fallacies in reasoning.
    - Practice would include analysis of arguments (likely using examples from the media) and ultimately, the final debate/dialogue assignment.
    - Rationale for this material: The ability to understand a controversial issue, articulate a reasoned position, and then defend that position on your feet through oral debate is a crucial skill that will benefit all students. Although departments in the humanities and social sciences noted this as a most essential inquiry skill in their fields, persuasion is fundamental in every career. If UD’s graduates can think on their feet and speak persuasively, they will be more successful and represent the university better than if they lack these attributes.

  iv. *Debate and dialogue of a socially significant issue*
    - The final assignment will involve two major events: (1) Students, working in pairs, will debate a controversial and significant topic. This debate will involve opening with a persuasive case, cross-examining the other side, and closing with arguments that bolster their side and demonstrate weakness in opposition arguments. (2) The members of class will follow the debate with a dialogue, facilitated by the instructor, in which they use a dialogic mode of communication to come to a greater
understanding of the issue, very likely new and unforeseen perspectives and understanding, and possibly (but not necessarily) common agreement on aspects of the issue.

- This final assignment requires that students do significant research, develop arguments, and analyze their opposition. It requires a greater level of confidence in speaking than what students are used to, due to the strong interrogation their arguments will be subjected to. Then, switching over to dialogue on the topic requires students to model different communication behaviors. Whereas debate requires vigorous and unwavering support of one stance along with listening only to expose weakness, dialogue requires listening to understand and an attempt to draw conclusions that are neither prejudged nor restricted to the options people initially considered.

- In this unit of the class, students would compare and contrast the modes of communication. Debate can strongly support a person’s stance and perhaps defeat an opponent. These are vital skills for supporting strong ideas or defending against unfounded ideology, and can sometimes be necessary when exerting leadership. However, debate traditionally obviates optimal solutions to problems, often harms relationships, and can frustrate those whose voices are shut down.

- Rationale for this material: Ultimately, both dialogue and debate skills have their place, and they need not be separate events--an interaction can blend both modes of communication to maximum effect. Exposure to both can give students the understanding of how and why to use each one and the skills to do so. The ability to use both effectively gives students both an ethical basis for communication and a very powerful ability.

- Topics for the final assignment will meet established criteria, most important, social and practical significance.

**Course instruction**

At present, almost all modules are taught by unranked faculty (full- and part-time instructors, and TAs). Instructors for the proposed new course would include a mix of ranked and unranked faculty. Although many instructors and TAs would teach the class after receiving appropriate training, the department would also expect that all ranked faculty who have expertise in this area would also teach sections. Faculty with traditional communication theory in their graduate training would be able to do so, whereas faculty whose background is exclusively in media or public relations may not be suited to teach the course. This change in instruction will move the university’s goal of moving more ranked faculty into general education courses.
Outcomes

Fit of the course with current trends in higher education
A new AAC&U report on essential learning outcomes opens by noting that the report “examines a set of outcomes that are highly prized both by the academy and by employers, which include critical thinking, quantitative literacy, communication skills, ethical reasoning, and civic engagement” (“Outcomes,” n.d., p. 1, emphasis added).

The course we propose provides foundations in all of those areas except quantitative literacy, and offers students important gains in ability to present and critique ideas effectively and in ability to work well with others.

HIR learning outcomes addressed
Although our thinking on this proposal focused primarily on diversity, community, and critical evaluation of our times, the proposed course also contributes to all seven student learning outcomes (SLOs). This connection with all of the outcomes is not surprising, given how strongly HIR relies on appropriate and effective communication to function properly.

For purposes of mapping SLOs, it may be most appropriate to list this course only with the outcomes it most strongly develops. In that regard, we would rank community as the most significant, diversity second, and critical evaluation of our times third. (All HIR quotes in this section are from p. 8.)

1. Scholarship
   - HIR stipulates that scholarship learning outcomes require that students’ work is “intended for public presentation and defense.” This is clear for departments like Chemistry, which require a public defense of the senior project. The public speaking fundamentals and the ability to articulate and defend a position are necessary for UD’s students meeting the criteria set out in the scholarship SLO.

2. Faith traditions
   - Our committee was initially reluctant to link the proposed oral communication course to faith traditions because, unless a speaking assignment topic involves a faith-related issue, the class does not address issues of a spiritual nature. However, the faith traditions outcome requires students “to participate intelligently and respectfully in dialogue with other traditions.” The ability to engage in conversation across positions of difference requires students to have the dialogue theory and skills provided in this class. So, this class provides knowledge and skill essential to meeting this outcome.

3. Diversity
   - The diversity SLO mandates that students understand and appreciate diverse others, with the understanding that this knowledge will lead to better interaction. One of the most important skills in encountering diverse others is the ability to engage in conversation that advances understanding. Such conversation requires the skills of dialogue and sensitivity to the audience in any conversation. Thus, the knowledge and skills covered in the proposed oral communication class are essential if UD students are to appreciate and respond appropriately to diversity.

4. Community
   - Community exists only through communication. If communication were to be completely eliminated, that community would cease to exist (Tinder, 1980). So, the
means by which we communicate with each other are essential in defining the nature of that community.
- As with diversity, then “values and skills necessary for learning, living, and working in communities of support and challenge” require dialogue to enact. The same is true of “resolving conflicts peacefully, and promoting reconciliation” and “respectful collaboration with persons from diverse backgrounds and perspectives.”

5. Practical wisdom
- Practical wisdom requires that “students will be able to define and diagnose symptoms, relationships, and problems clearly and intelligently, construct and evaluate possible solutions, thoughtfully select and implement solutions, and critically reflect on the process in light of actual consequences.” Although these processes may not always require oral communication, it is most often through interchanges with others that we engage in developing understanding, creating and evaluating solutions, implementing those solutions, and critically evaluating them. Through both dialogue and debate, these processes are worked out by individuals and groups as they seek to address human needs. So, oral communication is not an essential element in all manifestations of practical wisdom, but it is prevalent in much of it. And, wisdom that is never shared with or tested through conversation with others is probably better described as “impractical wisdom.” It is through social application that wisdom becomes practical.

6. Critical evaluation of our times
- The final debate and dialogue project will be an exercise in critical evaluation of our times. This SLO requires that students “evaluate critically and imaginatively” the challenges of their times, and that is exactly what they will do with their final project for the class.

7. Vocation
- There is only a weak link between the proposed foundational course and vocation. This SLO requires that “all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to articulate reflectively the purposes of their life and proposed work through the language of vocation.” The proposed oral communication course will help students articulate their ideas more clearly, but it is not designed to help them do so in the language of their vocation.
- The second part of our proposal could offer stronger support for this SLO, since it would help departments enhance oral communication within their major.

1In fact, Tinder (a professor of Political Science) actually takes his argument further to suggest that communication isn’t just a necessary condition for community, but rather, communication is community. Tinder says, “It [community] is real only while communication is being carried on; once communication ceases, then community is no longer a present reality. Community is inherently unfinished. It is not the product of the activity, but the activity itself” (1980, p. 81).
Sequencing of the course

Our charge was to design a course for all students in their first year. However, our interviewees offered relevant information from which we offer a recommendation. Many units suggested the first or second year was the best time for an oral communication class because students were still taking their required non-major courses. Also, several people mentioned the knowledge and skills from the oral communication class should benefit students in their other classes at UD, so they really need to get that class in early. Some units, though, indicated that scheduling flexibility will be needed in the CAP, or it will disrupt sequences of courses their students must take in the first year. This need was particularly important in the natural sciences.

We recommend that although the foundational course in oral communication should be taken by most students in the first or second year, flexibility should built into the program to allow students to take the class at a different time. For example, spring of the junior year is the optimal timing for Chemistry students. During that semester, all their students observe seniors’ research presentations, and they must give their own presentations in the following spring. So, the course would be timed ideally to integrate with their oral communication assignments--critically analyzing the speakers they hear that semester and preparing for their forthcoming speaking assignment. Furthermore, taking the class in the first two years presents scheduling problems for Chemistry students, who must fit in required introductory science courses.
II. SUPPORTING ORAL COMMUNICATION IN THE DEPARTMENTS

At present, the Department of Communication does not have resources to support instructional development outside the department. Thus, supporting oral communication across other departments will require new resources, and the degree of support is a function of the degree of resource allocation. In that vein, we propose several options that vary in resource use.

The ideas proposed below all allow students who have already had a foundational course to further develop their oral communication through additional practice and support. These proposals could not replace a foundational course. Without essential knowledge and skills from a foundational course taught by experts in the field of communication, students cannot effectively meet basic oral communication needs in other classes scattered across the university.

**Fewest resources: Periodic seminars**

With a relatively small allocation of resources, the Department of Communication could offer periodic seminars for interested faculty across campus on use of oral communication in classroom learning. These seminars could take place as part of the Faculty Exchange Series, or perhaps in some other context. However, these seminars would be brief, limited in scope, and infrequently offered.

With an increase in resource allocation, such seminars could be enhanced by bringing in external consultants who have special expertise in oral communication across the curriculum.

**Moderate resources: Speech lab or LTC presence**

The OCWG’s preferred option is to provide both student and faculty support through the creation of a speech lab or through a full- or part-time staff position in the LTC. The option would require allocation of space for tutoring students (videotaping equipment would be needed), a small annual budget for instructional materials, and hiring of a faculty/staff member with graduate education in oral communication.

This person would be able to offer assistance to students who need guidance or practice in any aspect of oral assignments in classes across the university. Perhaps more important, this person would also work with faculty in designing oral communication assignments for classes that would help them develop the skills necessary in using oral communication as it would be used in different professions, and work with the instructors on how to grade such oral performance and offer helpful feedback. The person could also meet with classes as they prepared for or delivered oral presentations.

This type of resource could help students and faculty not only with public speaking assignments, but also with other important forms of oral communication used in classes and industry, such as working effectively in teams (e.g., organizing and leading group discussion, effectively making decisions in groups) and interpersonal skills (e.g., nonverbal sensitivity, interviewing effectively, listening, self-presentation, conflict management).

**Greatest resources: Oral communication intensive classes**

The option that would require most resources, but would also offer the greatest pay-off, would be to develop criteria for classes that would be “oral communication intensive.” Such courses could be optional (perhaps accumulation of several courses could lead to designation on the student’s transcript), or students could be required to take 1-2 oral communication intensive
courses in their major. Doing a combination of a foundational course from the Department of Communication followed by oral communication intensive courses that met established criteria and were instructed by specially trained faculty would assure that UD’s students graduated with better abilities to speak in workplace and civic duties than students from other universities.

Preparing faculty across the university to use oral communication in ways that significantly enhance students’ ability to speak in their major’s career fields would require the development of criteria for such classes, extensive training for faculty across the university (likely annual workshops of several days held during the fall or winter break), incentives to faculty for participating in the program, a committee that would review syllabi to certify that the course and instructor were suitable for designation, and the hiring of a faculty member (possibly at a senior level) with expertise in communication and instruction who would be primarily responsible for overseeing the program.

Such a plan would require significant resources and broad support across campus. We have not had the opportunity to see whether there would be widespread faculty support for such a plan, so we cannot say whether that condition would be met. But, successfully carrying out such a plan could transform the university in a very positive way.
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Charge for the CAP Social Science Working Group
On September 4, 2009, Pat Donnelly delivered the following charge to the CAP-Social Sciences Working Group:

1. Select a chair from among the working group members and devise a procedural plan for the Working Group. The Working Group Chair will meet every three weeks with the Coordinating and Writing Task Force.

2. Familiarize itself with the opening sections of the *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection* document, particularly the seven student learning outcomes that are now at the heart of the University’s assessment plan; the CAP draft proposal; and the Coordinating and Writing Task Force’s summary of the comments on the CAP Draft Proposal, and CAP Work Plan.

3. Develop the Social Science component for the CAP by:
   a) establishing criteria for a CAP Social Science component that incorporate the appropriate student learning outcomes and disciplinary objectives;
   b) determining whether this component should be a single course offered by faculty from all the social science disciplines or whether it would be more appropriate to offer a single course in each of the social science disciplines that would share a significant common element across all sections of the course. This common element might involve common topics, common readings, common lectures or panels representing each of the social science disciplines, or common assignments. In addition to the focus on content, this group should attend to the pedagogy necessary to accomplish the tasks—critical readings and writing and ability to integrate knowledge;
   c) proposing a corresponding course or courses that meet the criteria.

   In completing its assignment, the Working Group should:
   • consult regularly and substantively with their colleagues in the departments they represent;
   • develop a proposal for an intended audience of first- or second-year students;
   • develop a proposal that will address as many of the seven HIR outcomes as are appropriate to the content and focus of the social sciences, including those on diversity and critical evaluation of our times;
   • consult with Drs. Jack Ling, Executive Director for Diversity and Inclusion, in developing strategies relating to the diversity student learning outcome;

   This proposal should be submitted to the Coordinating and Writing Task Force by December 15, 2009.

4. Identify the resources and faculty development needed to deliver these courses, as well as a suggested assessment plan for this component of the CAP, and submit it to the Coordinating and Writing Task Force by February 1, 2010.

Criteria for the Social Science Component Common Academic Program
One of the primary aspects of the charge to the CAP-SSWG is “establishing criteria for a CAP Social Science component that incorporate the appropriate student learning outcomes and disciplinary objectives.”

1. **Scholarship:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity through the production of a body of artistic, scholarly or community-based work intended for public presentation and defense.

2. **Faith traditions:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to engage in intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical inquiry regarding major faith traditions. Students will be familiar with the basic theological understandings and central texts that shape Catholic beliefs and teachings, practices, and spiritualities. Students’ abilities should be developed sufficiently to allow them to examine deeply their own faith commitments and also to participate intelligently and respectfully in dialogue with other traditions.

3. **Diversity:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical understanding of the cultures, histories, times, and places of multiple others, as marked by class, race, gender, ethnicity, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, and other manifestations of difference. Students’ understanding will reflect scholarly inquiry, experiential immersion, and disciplined reflection.

4. **Community:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate understanding of and practice in the values and skills necessary for learning, living, and working in communities of support and challenge. These values and skills include accepting difference, resolving conflicts peacefully, and promoting reconciliation; they encompass productive, discerning, creative, and respectful collaboration with persons from diverse backgrounds and perspectives for the common purpose of learning, service, and leadership that aim at just social transformation. Students will demonstrate these values and skills on campus and in the Dayton region as part of their preparation for global citizenship.

5. **Practical wisdom:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate practical wisdom in addressing real human problems and deep human needs, drawing upon advanced knowledge, values, and skills in their chosen profession or major course of study. Starting with a conception of human flourishing, students will be able to define and diagnose symptoms, relationships, and problems clearly and intelligently, construct and evaluate possible solutions, thoughtfully select and implement solutions, and critically reflect on the process in light of actual consequences.

6. **Critical evaluation of our times:** Through multidisciplinary study, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate habits of inquiry and reflection, informed by familiarity with Catholic Social Teaching, that equip them to evaluate critically and imaginatively the ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, and ecological challenges of their times in light of the past.
7. **Vocation**: Using appropriate scholarly and communal resources, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to articulate reflectively the purposes of their life and proposed work through the language of vocation. In collaboration with the university community, students’ developing vocational plans will exhibit appreciation of the fullness of human life, including its intellectual, ethical, spiritual, aesthetic, social, emotional, and bodily dimensions, and will examine both the interdependence of self and community and the responsibility to live in service of others.

**Pertinent HIR Outcomes**

In both HIR and the original CAP proposal, it was suggested that the CAP Social Science component would build on the student learning outcomes introduced to students in the first year courses. The original CAP proposal suggested that the Social Science Course should address Scholarship, Diversity, Community and Critical Evaluation of Our Times. Practical Wisdom also seemed to be a relevant Student Learning Outcome, particularly when one considers the applied social sciences that are an important aspect of the social sciences.

In the charge to the SSWG, the CAP Coordinating Writing Group identified diversity and the critical evaluation of our times as student learning outcomes that are relevant to the social sciences and to which it should address its attention.

**Specific Development Criteria for the Social Science Courses in the Common Academic Program**

Below we specify criteria for social science courses in the common academic program. Students should be able to:

1) Critically examine a human issue or problem from at least three social science disciplinary perspectives. [HIR Outcome 1 and 6]

2) Describe social science methods and social theory as applied by the social sciences to the humanly constructed world, distinguishing between the inductive and deductive approaches to addressing social science research questions. [HIR Outcome 1]

3) Find and identify arguments in empirical research literature and/or data in the social sciences. [HIR Outcome 1]
4) Describe an aspect of human diversity with regard to the selected issue or problem by incorporating concepts addressing difference and positionality to understand the complexity and contradictions of selected issues or problems. [HIR Outcome 3]

5) Engage in and reflect upon one experience outside the classroom that exposes students to an aspect of human diversity. [HIR Outcome 3]

6) Explore how the social sciences lay an intellectual foundation for understanding community life, through critical readings and reflection on the selected issue or problem. [HIR Outcome 4]

7) Critically evaluate through a writing assignment or other intellectual product the selected issue or problem based on social science literature. [HIR Outcome 1 and 6] [This is strongly dependent upon class size and therefore has resource implications, which the committee will address as the process of CAP develops.]

8) Analyze and demonstrate factors that contribute to and create barriers for human flourishing with regard to the selected issue or problem. [HIR Outcome 1, 4, 5, and 6]
Review of Current General Education Program in the Sciences

The current general education program in the social sciences is defined as follows in the August, 2009 University of Dayton Bulletin:

Social Sciences: Educated members of society need to understand the dynamics through which people relate to each other as individuals, in groups, and as producers and consumers of goods and services. Effective relationships sustain us as members of families, professions, nations, and the global community. Students, therefore, must take at least one course in the social sciences.

Although this is the only University-wide requirement, some units and majors are exposed to the social sciences in a much higher level than this minimum requirement of the University General Education Program. However, given the restrictions in a number of programs, many students only meet the minimum social science expectation. There is a long list of social science courses approved for general education. Many of these courses are approved through the cluster structure of upper-level general education courses. Since the assumption for general education courses is that they could not have a prerequisite, so all students could take them, many students take an upper-level social science course without being exposed to an introductory level course. Faculty in the social sciences see this situation as problematic, both logistically and because of its limited purview. It sends the wrong message to students about the importance of the social sciences in understanding and addressing current problems facing human beings.

Summary: Key Strengths and Weaknesses of the Current General Education System

Below we identify several key areas of strength and weakness in the current Social Science program in the general education system. The strengths should be preserved as we seek to remedy the weaknesses in this revision to the common academic program in the social sciences.

Strengths

Among the key strengths of the existing system are:

- Flexibility

Exposure of students to social science thinking with regard to some issue or problem.

Weaknesses or Deficiencies

Areas of weakness, deficiency or concern in the current system include:

- Many students take an upper-level course without having a foundation or broad understanding of the breadth of the social sciences. Instructors then have to do remedial work with such students to bring them up to speed. This does a disservice to majors, who have to “wait” for others to catch up, and it does a disservice to non-majors by creating a very partial view of the social sciences based on the one course they may take.

- Students often are not exposed to social sciences until later in their college career.
Conceptual Model for the Common Academic Program in the Social Sciences

The CAP-Social Sciences Working Group has outlined two general ways in which the social sciences can meet the charge given to them by the CAP writing group. Each addresses the concerns identified in our current general education approach to social sciences and meets the spirit of CAP. The first model is more bold and rethinks the way in which we have delivered social sciences to the broad population of students. Although not unanimous, there is significant support for the first model in the CAP-Social Sciences Working Group. We think it would be exciting for students and faculty. It would show students how the disciplinary boundaries become muddy, when researchers approach a problem. This first model, however, would require the most resources in both faculty development and faculty lines to develop and deliver. It would also potentially have a greater impact on how it fit into degree requirements in the College and Schools. The second model is less ambitious and would less boldly meet the charge. It too would require faculty development and an infusion of faculty lines, but maybe less so. We will take up these issues next semester. If we had to rank the two models, the Social Science Working Group would say reach for Model 1 and have Model 2 as an alternative, if Model 1 seems unrealistic. Although the Working Group is not unanimous on this view, it is the majority sentiment. Below we lay out two paths that emerged from our weekly discussions. The changes proposed will require that the social sciences work more collaboratively in providing some breadth and commonality for all students at the University of Dayton. This will provide a better understanding and foundation in the social sciences than is currently offered in our general education program.

Comprehensive Social Science Course employing an Integrative Theme

All Basic CAP social science sections would be offered under a common number. This idea would have faculty design courses around the student learning outcomes defined above, using a faculty generated theme that illustrates how the social sciences add to our understanding of the human condition. The theme would be proposed by faculty from the social science disciplines with the objective of providing an integrative understanding of how the social sciences address specific issues or problems. To ensure that the proposed course satisfies the learning outcomes and basic integrative requirements, each faculty proposal would be reviewed and approved by a Social Science CAP oversight committee. A qualifying course could be taught by a single faculty or team-taught sections could be proposed. Faculty teaching these integrative courses would be expected to rely upon readings from three social sciences that addressed the selected theme. The student would gain an understanding of the methodologies used by the social sciences and how each contributes to the understanding of the proposed theme. This proposal is modeled after ENG200, which is currently being piloted by the English Department to meet CAP expectations.
Strengths:

- Instructors can propose themes that draw on their expertise and interests. Many faculty read beyond their specific disciplines as it pertains to their research and areas of interest.
- Provides a fully integrated experience for students early in their academic experience.
- Builds on the foundation in student learning laid in the Humanities Base in the first year.
- Provides flexibility to integrate with LLCs or other aspects of CAP.
- Promotes interaction and collaboration among faculty in the social sciences.

Concerns:

- Whether CAP will make the required resources available to teach smaller sections.
- Faculty must draw on literature and information outside of their specific disciplines.
- Will require time to develop and ramp up for this new course.
- Diverts resources from delivery of upper-level courses to foundational, developmental stages.
- Adjuncts would not be an effective way to deliver this course, since it would be a relatively unique approach to delivering social science content. This approach would require full-time instructors for the development and delivery of the courses.

Existing Introductory Courses with Common Component

This option retains the basic structure of existing introductory courses. However a significant common, integrative component would be developed in each introductory course section to meet the specific student learning outcomes defined above. The common component could consist of a minor topic or sub-theme that could be covered along with the typical range of introductory material. The sub-theme would serve as a vehicle for integrating perspectives from the other social sciences. There are a variety of ways that the integration could be enhanced both, in class or through extracurricular events, such as panel discussions and guest lecturers. Although the implementation of a common element will have to be developed and articulated as we think through this alternative, as a starting point the SSWG believes a 75% disciplinary—25% common, integrative element is a good starting point to begin thinking about how this option would look in practice.

Strengths:

- Introduces social science integration relatively early in the undergraduate curriculum.
- Provides an in-depth introduction to a social science as part of a student’s CAP experience.
- Instructor teaches in area of expertise.
- Conveys an understanding of how the other social sciences are applied from primarily a disciplinary perspective.
- Promotes interaction and collaboration among faculty in the social sciences.

Concerns:

- Requires extensive departmental and faculty coordination.
• Requires coordination of extracurricular activities if they are a primary means of exposing students to other social science approaches.
• May be repetitive if student takes more than one introductory social science course, which they must do for the BA requirements.
• Integrative component will reduce time devoted to customary introductory material and may undermine the depth required by a traditional, disciplinary introductory course.
• Will require redesign and restructuring of all introductory courses to meet the integration and common element goals.
• A risk that the integration and commonality may be lost over time in favor of meeting the disciplinary demands of introductory courses.
• Challenge for administering and monitoring the common element as it exists in departmental, disciplinary courses.
BACKGROUND

- HIR enumerated seven learning outcomes for general education at the University of Dayton.
- April 2010 University of Dayton’s Academic Senate passed the Common Academic Program (CAP). CAP affirms the seven HIR learning outcomes and provides a basic architecture for CAP components, including the CAP Social Science course.
- Social science chairs and Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program attended EDI to develop learning outcomes, assessment measures, an organizational structure, an action plan, and timetables to implement a two-year pilot phase for the CAP-SS course before full implementation in Fall 2014.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND GOALS

The following CAP-SS learning outcomes, assessment outputs and criteria were developed, drawing from the CAP Social Science Working Group Report and the CAP Senate document. It should be noted that the CAP-SS learning outcomes reflect developmental expectations appropriate for the sophomore year.
Table 1: Mapping CAP Learning Outcomes to CAP-SS Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAP Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>CAP-SS Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Assessment Output</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship: All undergraduates will develop advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity through the production of a body of artistic, scholarly or community-based work intended for public presentation and defense.</td>
<td>1) Students will demonstrate the ability to locate primary source, peer-reviewed social science literature using library and electronic sources.</td>
<td>1) Skill evaluation: Work product that evidences ability to locate primary source, peer-reviewed social science literature using library and electronic sources.</td>
<td>1) Rubric Criteria: Absent, Superficial, Developing, Proficient, Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Students will demonstrate the ability to utilize primary source, peer-reviewed social science research for academic inquiry.</td>
<td>2) Knowledge Evaluation: Work product that evidences ability to utilize primary source, peer-reviewed social science research for academic inquiry.</td>
<td>2) Rubric Criteria: Absent, Superficial, Developing, Proficient, Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Evaluation of the Times: Through multidisciplinary study, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate habits of inquiry and reflection, informed by familiarity with Catholic Social Teaching, that equip them to evaluate critically and imaginatively the ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, and ecological challenges of their times in light of the past.</td>
<td>3) Students will demonstrate knowledge of social science methods of inquiry.(^1)</td>
<td>3) Knowledge Evaluation: Work product that demonstrates knowledge of social science methods of inquiry.</td>
<td>3) Rubric Criteria: Absent, Superficial, Developing, Proficient, Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Students will demonstrate knowledge of how various social theories facilitate the critical and imaginative evaluation of the ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, or ecological challenges of the times.</td>
<td>4) Knowledge evaluation: Work product that employs social theory to critically and imaginatively evaluate ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, or ecological challenges of the times.</td>
<td>4) Rubric Criteria: Absent, Superficial, Developing, Proficient, Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity: All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical understanding of the cultures, histories, times, and places of multiple others, as marked by class, race, gender, ethnicity, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, and other manifestations of difference. Students’ understanding will reflect scholarly inquiry, experiential immersion, and disciplined reflection.</td>
<td>5) Demonstrate knowledge of how context, difference, and/or positionality shape social issues.</td>
<td>5) Knowledge evaluation: Work product that addresses how context, difference, and/or positionality shape social issues.</td>
<td>5) Rubric Criteria: Absent, Superficial, Developing, Proficient, Exemplary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Topics could include types of knowledge, hypotheses, laws, theories, paradigms, types of reasoning, causal analysis, research strategies, techniques for data analysis, use of internet for social science research, and ethical considerations in social science research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Strategies/Responses</th>
<th>Opportunities for Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Resistance to CAP-SS course requirements.                             | • Informational sessions where concerns/apprehensions are acknowledged; move to action.  
• Start with capable and enthusiastic group of faculty for pilots and early adopters.  
• Faculty development programs key.  
• Focus on what’s best for students.                                      | • CAP-SS Coordinator  
• LTC  
• Resource library                                                          |
| • Resistance to assessment.                                             | • Focus on “how do we know students know/do X?”  
• Underscore that assessment doesn’t focus on individual faculty performance.  
• Have CAP-SS faculty play integral role in assessing their classes.  
• Faculty development programs key.                                      | • CAP-SS Coordinator  
• LTC                                                                         |
| • Hesitancy about contributing to general education.                    | • Faculty development programs are key.  
• Underscore link between CAP-SS course theme and faculty research.  
• Offer incentives for constructing pilots.                               | • CAP-SS Coordinator  
• Provost Office/Dean’s Office                                               |
| • Apprehension about interdisciplinarity, social theory, social methods, developmental, learning-centered elements of course.  | • Faculty development programs are key.  
• Cross-disciplinary meetings.  
• Generate database of social science faculty areas of expertise.           | • CAP-SS Coordinator  
• CAP-SS resource library                                                   |
| • Faculty may dilute interdisciplinary course components due to lack of knowledge outside home discipline. | • Ask CAP-SS faculty to articulate plan for learning about integration in pilot and formal course proposals.                                                                                                      |                                                                                               |
| • Resources for new hires.                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | • Provost support for new full-time faculty lines.                                         |
| • Resources for CAP-SS pilot grants.                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | • Provost/LTC support for faculty development.                                               |
| • Innovative nature of course presents new demands on faculty.          | • Acknowledge innovative elements; discuss as growth opportunities.  
• Underscore potential link between CAP-SS theme and faculty member’s research. |                                                                                               |
| • Standard readings on social science methods/social theories,          | • Communicate that faculty aren’t expected to be pedagogically prepared to cover social science methods/social theories exhaustively. Just those relevant to course theme.  
• Faculty development important.                                          | • CAP-SS Coordinator  
• LTC  
• Resource library                                                          |
• Course development takes time.
• Stipends proposed for CAP-SS pilots will provide necessary time.
• Delicately remind faculty that new course development is regular expectation.

• How will CAP-SS courses count during pilot phase? Once CAP implemented?
• Social science chairs include recommendation in EDI report; will discuss issue at fall retreats to solicit faculty input.

• Social Science chairs have made suggestions re CAP Competency Committee forms
• Professional development workshops

COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

• Please see timeline and action plan for communication strategies.

TEAM ACTIONS AND TIMELINE

GOAL: Following the Humanities Commons timeline, this action plan puts processes in place where two years of pilot courses will run and be assessed before CAP-SS is fully implemented in Fall 2014. The timetable is designed to leave adequate room for informational sessions, promoting the pilot opportunity, recruiting two cohorts of pilot faculty, and analyzing assessment data.

• Summer 2011
  o Consult with Dean’s Office about course numbering for CAP-SS pilots.
  o Consult with Dean’s Office about EDI Report.

• Fall 2011
  o Preliminary discussion of CAP-SS at department retreats – Social Science Chairs
  o Conduct CAP—SS informational sessions – CAS Dean/Social Science Chairs
  o Advertise RFP for 1st cohort of CAP-SS pilots – CAS Dean
  o Advertise/Appoint CAP-SS Coordinator – Provost Office/CAS Dean
  o Appoint CAP-SS Steering Committee – CAS Dean

• Spring 2012
  o Begin to assemble electronic and print resource library - CAP-SS Coordinator
  o Conduct CAP-SS informational sessions – CAP-SS Coordinator
  o Conduct faculty develop workshops on learning-focused education, development-driven curriculum, teaching interdisciplinarity, social methods, social theories. – CAP-SS Coordinator / LTC
  o CAP-SS pilot applications due – Jan. 17
  o 1st cohort CAP-SS pilots selected by Jan. 26 – Don Pair and CAP-SS Coordinator
• Late Spring/Early Summer 2012
  o CAP-SS workshop for 1st cohort CAP-SS pilot faculty – CAP-SS Coordinator

• Fall 2012
  o 1st cohort CAP-SS pilots run
  o Advertise 2nd cohort CAP-SS pilots- CAP-SS Coordinator
  o Conduct faculty develop workshops on learning-focused education, development-driven curriculum, teaching interdisciplinarity, social methods, social theories. – CAP-SS Coordinator / LTC

• Spring 2013
  o 1st cohort CAP-SS pilot faculty present experiences to social science faculty
  o Recruit 2nd cohort CAP-SS pilots (Should include new CAP-related hires.) – CAP-SS Coordinator
  o Assessment/retooling 1st cohort CAP-SS pilots – CAP-SS Coordinator, Provost’s Office, pilot faculty
  o Conduct faculty develop workshops on learning-focused education, development-driven curriculum, teaching interdisciplinarity, social methods, social theories. – CAP-SS Coordinator / LTC

• Spring/Early Summer 2013
  o CAP-SS workshop for 1st and 2nd cohort CAP-SS pilot faculty – CAP-SS Coordinator

• Fall 2013
  o Humanities Commons fully implemented Fall 2013
  o 1st cohort CAP-SS run second iteration
  o 2nd cohort CAP-SS run first time (including new CAP-related hires)
  o Conduct faculty develop workshops on learning-focused education, development-driven curriculum, teaching interdisciplinarity, social methods, social theories. – CAP-SS Coordinator / LTC

• Spring 2014
  o Assessment/retooling 1st and 2nd cohort CAP-SS pilots - CAP-SS Coordinator, Provost’s Office, pilot faculty

• Fall 2014
  o Social Science fully implemented Fall 2014 – 30 sections

• Spring 2015
  o 30 sections

• Fall 2015
  o 30 sections

• Spring 2016
EVIDENCE OF SUCCESS

A number of measures and milestones will evidence a successful rollout. They include the following:

1) CAP-SS Coordinator is appointed by end of fall 2011 semester.
2) Adoption of assessment rubric that follows.
3) Faculty excited about pilot opportunities.
4) Generation of 10 pilot courses during each pilot year.
5) Assessment data from two pilots show learning outcomes being met.
6) Adoption of CAP course approval form in CAP Competency Committee. The proposed criteria for the CAP-SS course are listed below.

Senate Document Doc-10-04 established the Social Science course of the Common Academic Program. The goal of the course is to address the HIR learning objectives of scholarship, critical evaluation of our times and diversity of the human world through an interdisciplinary social science course. Doc-10-04 established the following criteria for the CAP-SS:

- Each section will be constructed around a theme or issue related to human flourishing.
- Each section will use social theory and social science methods to develop the course theme or issue.
- Each section will utilize at least three social sciences disciplinary perspectives with no more than two perspectives coming from Sociology, Anthropology, Social Work and Criminal Justice.

In order to meet the learning goals, the following learning outcomes have been developed for the CAP-SS:

1. Students will demonstrate ability to locate primary source, peer reviewed social science research using library and electronic sources. (Scholarship)
2. Students will demonstrate ability to utilize primary source, peer reviewed social science research. (Scholarship)
3. Students will demonstrate knowledge of social science methods of inquiry. (Critical evaluation)
4. Students will demonstrate knowledge of how various social theories facilitate the critical and imaginative evaluation of the ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, or ecological challenges of the times. (Critical evaluation)

5. Students will demonstrate knowledge of how context, difference, and/or positionality shape social issues. (Diversity)

In order to assess whether the learning objectives have been met, an assessment rubric has been developed (Appendix 1).

Faculty are encouraged to include high impact practices in the development of these sections. Such activities could include:

- Service learning and community-based learning
- Collaborative assignments and projects
- Self-reflection and reflection papers
- Writing intensive activities

Curricular Transition Recommendations

- Pilot Phase (Fall 2012 – Spring 2014)
  - Recommendation: CAP-SS pilots listed as 200-level course
  - If 200-level not possible, then ASI 345 or selected topics course
  - Informal advising will encourage sophomores across social sciences to enroll in pilots.
  - For BA students, CAP-SS pilot course will count as fourth social science course.
  - For non-BA students, CAP-SS pilot course will count as social science elective.

- After CAP Implementation (Fall 2014 -)
  - For BA students, CAP-SS course will not count toward major requirements.

Notes and Recommendations

- Don Pair and CAP-SS Coordinator will evaluate applications for pilot courses.
- CAP-SS Review Committee should be composed of CAP-SS Coordinator and one faculty member from each social science department, appointed by chair. Committee members will serve two-year, renewable terms.
- CAP-SS Steering Committee will review pilot syllabi and help CAP-SS Coordinator with assessment.
- Social science chairs encourage CAP-SS Coordinator and Review Committee to develop course evaluation tool and give it to potential applicants in advance of application deadline.
- Social science chairs invite CAP-SS Coordinator to consider teaching a pilot.
- Pilots run in fall semester only, leaving CAP-SS Coordinator and participating faculty time to review assessment data and make necessary alterations to courses during the spring semesters.
- Social science chairs anticipate generating a total of 10 pilots each year, across the social sciences.
- The pilot application deadline is intended to provide faculty and chairs enough time to prepare the fall composite.
- 1st cohort participants are expected to teach their pilots twice, fall 2012 and fall 2013 semesters.
- Following the Humanities Commons, faculty selected to teach CAP-SS pilots will receive $2500.
- Faculty selected to teach CAP-SS pilots are expected to develop, teach, and assess the course.
- CAP-SS pilot courses will not automatically be accepted for CAP-SS.
- Social science departments will encourage sophomores to enroll in pilots to mimic future student population.
- CAP-SS course will not count toward the major. Rather, social science chairs recommend that during pilot phase and after implementation, CAP-SS course count for BA students as the 4th social science class and for non-BA students will count as a social science elective.

Remaining Questions/Tasks

- Social science chairs develop plan regarding August department retreats.
- Develop position description for CAP-SS Coordinator
- Describe task of CAP-SS Review Committee
- How do we get CAP-SS course coded/numbered during pilot phase? Is there a quick way to get a 200-level course listed?
- Who puts into place guidelines for how CAP-SS course will count during pilot phase and after CAP is implemented?
- How can CAP-SS build upon Humanities Commons? Social science chairs need to meet with Humanities Commons Coordinator and relevant humanities chairs.
- Talk with Don Pair about funding for pilots.
- Talk with Bill Trollinger re RFP format.

RESOURCES & SUPPORTING MATERIALS

Appendix 1: Evaluation Rubric for CAP-SS Learning Outcomes
### Appendix 1: Evaluation Rubric for CAP-SS Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Student Output</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Students will demonstrate ability to locate scholarly science literature using library and electronic sources.</td>
<td>Work product that evidences ability to locate scholarly social science literature using library and electronic sources.</td>
<td>Able to find appropriate scholarly social science literature using library and electronic sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unable to find appropriate scholarly social science literature using library and electronic sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Students will demonstrate ability to utilize primary peer reviewed social science research.</td>
<td>2) Work product that evidences ability to use primary peer reviewed social science research.</td>
<td>Clear and integrated conclusions drawn from appropriate primary sources.</td>
<td>Clear and detailed conclusions drawn from appropriate primary sources.</td>
<td>General and broad conclusions drawn from appropriate primary sources.</td>
<td>Superficial conclusions drawn from appropriate primary sources.</td>
<td>Incorrect conclusions drawn from appropriate primary sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Students will demonstrate knowledge of social science methods of inquiry</td>
<td>3) Work product that demonstrates knowledge of social science methods of inquiry.</td>
<td>Clear explanation of choice of social science methods of inquiry as applied to the course theme.</td>
<td>Clear and detailed description of social science methods of inquiry as applied to the course theme.</td>
<td>General and broad description of social science methods of inquiry as applied to the course theme.</td>
<td>Superficial application of social science methods of inquiry as applied to the course theme.</td>
<td>Incorrect application of social science methods of inquiry as applied to the course theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Students will demonstrate knowledge of how various social theories facilitate the critical and imaginative evaluation of the ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, or ecological challenges of the times</td>
<td>4) Work product that employs social theory to critically and imaginatively evaluate ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, or ecological challenges of the times.</td>
<td>Clear critique of the application of social theory to the evaluation of an aspect of the course theme.</td>
<td>Clear and detailed application of social theory to the evaluation of an aspect of the course theme.</td>
<td>General and broad application of social theory to the evaluation of an aspect of the course theme.</td>
<td>Superficial application of social theory to the evaluation of an aspect of the course theme.</td>
<td>Incorrect application of social theory to the evaluation of an aspect of the course theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Demonstrate knowledge of how context, difference, and/or positionality shape social issues.</td>
<td>5) Work product that addresses how context, differences, and/or positionality shape social issues.</td>
<td>Clear critique of arguments regarding how context, differences, and/or positionality shape social issues related to the course theme.</td>
<td>Clear and detailed arguments regarding how context, differences, and/or positionality shape social issues related to the course theme.</td>
<td>General and broad arguments regarding how context, differences, and/or positionality shape social issues related to the course theme.</td>
<td>Superficial arguments regarding how context, differences, and/or positionality shape social issues related to the course theme.</td>
<td>Incorrect arguments regarding how context, differences, and/or positionality shape social issues related to the course theme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charge to 1st-Year Humanities Working Group

Chair:
Don Pair, Associate Dean for Integrated Learning and Curriculum

Members:
Julius Amin (chair, HST)
Maura Donahue (director, Program for Christian Leadership)
Myrna Gabbe (PHL)
Sheila Hughes (chair, ENG)
John Inglis/Bill Richards (chair, PHL)
Patricia Johnson (Alumni Chair in the Humanities, PHL)
Caroline Merithew/Laura Hume (HST)
Don Pair (Associate Dean for Integrated Learning and Curriculum)
Lori Phillips-Young (Writing Program Coordinator, ENG)
Anthony Smith (REL)
Susan Trollinger (ENG)
Cari Wallace (Director of New Student Programs, Student Development)
Sandra Yocum (chair, REL)

1. The Working Group Chair will meet every three weeks with the Coordinating and Writing Task Force.

2. Familiarize itself with the opening sections of the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection document, particularly the seven student learning outcomes that are now at the heart of the University’s assessment plan; the CAP Draft Proposal; and the Coordinating and Writing Task Force’s summary of the comments on the CAP Draft Proposal, and CAP Work Plan.

3. Develop the Humanities component for the CAP by:

a) establishing criteria for the Humanities component that incorporate the appropriate student learning outcomes and disciplinary objectives;

b) proposing first-year CAP introductory courses in ENG, HST, PHL & REL that create a foundation for student success in the rest of the Common Academic Program and their majors and that satisfy the criteria.

In completing its assignment, the Working Group should:

- consult regularly and substantively with their colleagues in the department they represent;
work with Drs. Jack Ling (Executive Director for Diversity and Inclusion) and Maura Donahue (Director of the Program for Christian Leadership) to develop strategies related to the diversity and vocation student learning outcomes;

explore and identify a common element to link at least two of these four Humanities courses together, either through common learning outcomes, common themes, common fundamental or orienting questions, or common readings or lectures. The common themes or fundamental questions may include, but are not limited to, those of the current General Education Program. In developing these courses, the working group should take into consideration, but not be limited by, existing or developing programs such as the Core Program and LLCs. In addition to the focus on content, this group should attend to the pedagogy necessary to accomplish the tasks—critical reading and writing and ability to integrate knowledge.

This proposal should be submitted to the Coordinating and Writing Task Force by December 15, 2009.

4. Identify the resources and faculty development needed to deliver these courses, as well as a suggested assessment plan for this component of the CAP, and submit it to the Coordinating and Writing Task Force by February 1, 2010.

Process and Progress to Date

Following their initial meeting, the CAP Humanities Working Group developed the following steps to guide their process and related discussions. The progress made towards completing these steps is indicated by the italicized text after each of the steps. These statements are based on the approved minutes from the regularly scheduled meetings.

1. Members will familiarize themselves with existing documents related to the existing HB program and review the feedback and survey results from the 2009 Humanities Base Workshop. Examine the AAC documents creating the existing HST 103, PHL 103, REL 103, and ENG 102/114 courses and review what learning outcomes were stated for each of the courses that comprise the HB.

   Committee members reviewed the May 2009 Humanities Base Workshop Questionnaire and Response document. The existing ENG, HST, PHL, and REL Humanities Base documents were located, reviewed by each dept, and shared with the entire CAP – Humanities Working Group.

2. Members will review the existing goals of the HB and consider these in the context of the seven student learning outcomes. Do these goals promote in obvious ways the new UD-HIR learning outcomes?

   Each department mapped the HIR SLOs on to the goals and course content of the existing HB courses and shared the resulting departmental document with the entire CAP – Humanities Working Group. After extensive conversation through both the QuickPlace site and in scheduled meetings, the WG
concluded that the present HB courses do promote the HIR SLOs. The departmental-level SLO mapping can be found on the WG QuickPlace.

3. If not, develop a limited number of specific new student learning outcomes. These would be action-oriented subsets of the existing HIR learning outcomes.

*Given the results of the HIR SLO mapping analysis described in step two, the committee chose to focus their attention on identifying ways that the existing courses could be better connected to the HIR SLOs.*

4. Establish criteria for the Humanities component that incorporate these appropriate student learning outcomes and disciplinary objectives.

*In lieu of establishing new criteria, the committee agreed that their main priority should be to develop new connections between all four of the existing HB courses.*

5. Propose first-year CAP introductory courses in English, History, Philosophy, and Religion that create a foundation for student success in the rest of the CAP and their majors and that satisfy the requirement that all seven student learning outcomes will be introduced to all first-year students and that the diversity outcome and other discipline-appropriate outcomes be developed.

*Using the results of the departmental mapping exercises and subsequent committee conversations, the WG then focused on summarizing their ideas for the HB and has begun work on developing common elements to link all four of the existing HB courses. These elements include retaining the existing four course structure and central question of “What does it mean to be human?”, continuing to include common texts within disciplines, and re-energizing the use of the existing or possibly new themes. Next steps in this process will include the identification and development of these connections as well as construction of a new framework for assessment of this component of the CAP.*
Habits of Inquiry and Reflection: Core student learning outcomes for the Common Academic Program

1. **Scholarship:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity through the production of a body of artistic, scholarly or community-based work intended for public presentation and defense.

2. **Faith traditions:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to engage in intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical inquiry regarding major faith traditions. Students will be familiar with the basic theological understandings and central texts that shape Catholic beliefs and teachings, practices, and spiritualities. Students’ abilities should be developed sufficiently to allow them to examine deeply their own faith commitments and also to participate intelligently and respectfully in dialogue with other traditions.

3. **Diversity:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical understanding of the cultures, histories, times, and places of multiple others, as marked by class, race, gender, ethnicity, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, and other manifestations of difference. Students’ understanding will reflect scholarly inquiry, experiential immersion, and disciplined reflection.

4. **Community:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate understanding of and practice in the values and skills necessary for learning, living, and working in communities of support and challenge. These values and skills include accepting difference, resolving conflicts peacefully, and promoting reconciliation; they encompass productive, discerning, creative, and respectful collaboration with persons from diverse backgrounds and perspectives for the common purpose of learning, service, and leadership that aim at just social transformation. Students will demonstrate these values and skills on campus and in the Dayton region as part of their preparation for global citizenship.

5. **Practical wisdom:** All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate practical wisdom in addressing real human problems and deep human needs, drawing upon advanced knowledge, values, and skills in their chosen profession or major course of study. Starting with a conception of human flourishing, students will be able to define and diagnose symptoms, relationships, and problems clearly and intelligently, construct and evaluate possible solutions, thoughtfully select and implement solutions, and critically reflect on the process in light of actual consequences.

6. **Critical evaluation of our times:** Through multidisciplinary study, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate habits of inquiry and reflection, informed by familiarity with Catholic Social Teaching, that equip them to evaluate critically and imaginatively the ethical, historical, social, political, technological, economic, and ecological challenges of their times in light of the past.

7. **Vocation:** Using appropriate scholarly and communal resources, all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate ability to articulate reflectively the
purposes of their life and proposed work through the language of vocation. In collaboration with the university community, students’ developing vocational plans will exhibit appreciation of the fullness of human life, including its intellectual, ethical, spiritual, aesthetic, social, emotional, and bodily dimensions, and will examine both the interdependence of self and community and the responsibility to live in service of others.

Humanities Commons Student Learning Goals

In each of these courses students will

1. read a variety of primary texts closely and critically (including self-critically).
   Aligned with HIR #1.

2. analyze, in writing, a variety of texts contributing to larger historical conversations, debates, and traditions and as resources for understanding and appreciating the complexities of human identity, dignity, and experience.
   Aligned with HIR ##1, 5.

3. develop an understanding of their place in community, country, and world in relationship to multiple others, with particular attention to differences—such as class, gender, and race—upon which social inequalities are constructed and maintained.
   Aligned with HIR ##1, 3, 4.

4. engage central concepts of Catholic intellectual tradition as they contribute to humanistic inquiry and reflection in the relevant academic discipline (English, History, Philosophy, or Religious Studies).
   Aligned with HIR ##1, 2, 6.

5. examine the question of what it means to be human from a disciplinary perspective, and in the process make connections among disciplines and develop an appreciation for the ways in which learning is a process of integrating knowledge.
   Aligned with HIR ##1, 6.

6. understand and practice academic honesty as foundational to the making and sharing of knowledge in a community of learners that is both local and global.
   Aligned with HIR ##1, 4.
CAP COURSE APPROVAL

ELECTRONIC COURSE PROPOSAL FORM
Below you will find the link to access the Course Proposal form.

You can log in using your Novell username and password. This is live data. Anything that you change will go through the designated appropriate workflow process.

**PLEASE NOTE:**
1. You should open this link in **Internet Explorer 7** (or higher) or **Firefox**. It will not work in Chrome.
2. There is not a PDF print button. You can use the toolbar in Firefox (File --> Print Preview-->Print)

[Link to Electronic Course Proposal Form]

CAP COURSE REVIEW GUIDELINES

The CAP Committee (CAPC) has developed CAP Course Review Guidelines as a summary of the CAP components created by the CAP Senate document (visit CAP 101 to access this document). These guidelines are a reference tool for the CAPC and may be used as part of the CAPC review process for the approval of CAP courses. We are sharing this resource as a tool for those faculty developing CAP courses.

[Link to access the CAP Course Review Guidelines resource]

Please note that this resource is an evolving, working document and will be updated from time to time so be sure to check for the latest revision before using it to evaluate your developing CAP courses.