<u>**Committee on the Common Academic Program (CAP) Procedures**</u>
Revised 11/02/2016; CAPC approved 11/10/2016
Revised and CAPC approved 2/16/2017; APC approved 3/10/2017
CAPC approved updates 9/5/2017 to replace Student Learning Outcomes with Institutional Learning Goals

1. Administrative Structure and Scope of CAPC Authority[1]

1.1 General Administrative Structure For the Common Academic Program

The University Committee on the Common Academic Program (CAPC) was established by Senate Document DOC-10-04 on April 13, 2010. It is a standing subcommittee of the Academic Senate's Academic Policies Committee. As such, the CAPC develops its own procedures for performing its duties and such procedures are submitted to the Academic Policies Committee, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, for its approval. Its specific responsibilities and scope of authority are outlined in section 1.2 below. In summary, the CAPC reviews and approves all courses and experiences that form the components of the Common Academic Program.

In addition, DOC-10-04 required that the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Business Administration, the School of Education and Allied Professions, and the School of Engineering 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.

Finally, DOC-10-04 created the position of an Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program to facilitate, implement, and assess the Common Academic Program. 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.

1.2 Scope of CAPC Authority

The responsibilities of the University Committee on the Common Academic Program 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 judges that the proposal does not meet 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.

---

[1] The elements of this section come either directly from the University of Dayton Academic Senate Document DOC-10-04, April 13, 2010 or are derived from it.

Committee on the Common Academic Program (CAP) Procedures
Revised 11/02/2016; CAPC approved 11/10/2016
Revised and CAPC approved 2/16/2017; APC approved 3/10/2017
CAPC approved updates 9/5/2017 to replace Student Learning Outcomes with Institutional Learning Goals

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 ensure 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 of the College of Arts and Sciences, 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.

2. CAPC Membership and Voting[2]

2.1 Election of the CAPC Chair, CAPC Membership and Terms of Appointment, and Staggering of Terms

2.1.1 Election of the CAPC Chair
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.

2.1.2 CAPC Membership
The Committee on the Common Academic Program is 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 (ECAS) will appoint the members of the Committee on the Common Academic Program. Membership on the Committee must be a representative cross-section of the various components of the University.

---

[2] The elements of this section come either directly from the University of Dayton Academic Senate Document DOC-10-04, April 13, 2010 or are derived from it. Voting rights of ex-officio members were specifically clarified by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate in September 2011 with the explicit instruction that the only ex-officio CAPC members with voting rights are the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program, an Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Registrar or designee.

Committee on the Common Academic Program (CAP) Procedures
Revised 11/02/2016; CAPC approved 11/10/2016
Revised and CAPC approved 2/16/2017; APC approved 3/10/2017
CAPC approved updates 9/5/2017 to replace Student Learning Outcomes with Institutional Learning Goals

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 designee.

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 designee as an ex-officio member in addition to the ex-officio members identified above.

2.1.3 CAPC Terms of Appointment and Staggering of Terms
CAPC members (with the exception of the students and ex-officio members) 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 voting ex-officio members (Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program, an Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Registrar or designee) do not have limited terms of appointment and are permanent members.

All seven CAPC faculty members appointed for the initiation of the CAPC in the Spring of 2011 shall serve full three year terms until the Spring of 2014. Temporary replacements of CAPC faculty members shall serve during the duration of the original CAPC member's appointment until the original member returns to the CAPC or the appointment expires. Temporary replacements may finish out the term of the person they are representing. At the end of the 2014 Spring semester TWO CAPC faculty members annually must be either re-appointed or replaced by ECAS per section 2.1.2 above.

As of Fall 2016, all of the original CAPC faculty members will have rotated off of the committee.

Committee on the Common Academic Program (CAP) Procedures
Revised 11/02/2016; CAPC approved 11/10/2016
Revised and CAPC approved 2/16/2017; APC approved 3/10/2017
CAPC approved updates 9/5/2017 to replace Student Learning Outcomes with Institutional Learning Goals

CAPC faculty rotations will be determined in the Spring of the year in which a current member's term ends. The President of the Academic Senate will be notified when the CAPC member is stepping away from the committee. The appropriate committee of the Senate will identify the new member according to the requirements, so that the committee member will be available to participate in the committee deliberations at the beginning of the following Fall semester.

2.2 Voting Rights, Quorum, and Voting Procedures

2.2.1 Voting Rights
The following CAPC members have voting rights of one vote per representative, 12 votes total:

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. The Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program, an Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; and the Registrar or designee.
5. No other CAPC members, as provided in section 2.1.2, have any voting rights.

2.2.2 Quorum
A quorum shall be constituted when there is one more than half of the voting members present.

2.2.3 Voting Procedures
Decisions of the CAPC will be by majority vote of those present, provided a quorum (one more than half of the voting members) is present. Voting will be open unless a committee member requests a secret ballot; Votes cast will be "Yes", "No", or "Abstain." Decisions of the CAPC will be communicated to the proposing faculty, chairpersons, deans, and appropriate others in writing after the CAPC decision as provided in section 4 of its Procedures.

3. CAPC Meeting Schedules
Timelines will be set each semester according to the needs of the CAPC and approved by the APC.

4. Procedures for Processing CAP Course Proposals
To expedite the preparation of documents and to ensure that the documents receive timely and full consideration, the Common Academic Program Committee (CAPC) establishes the following procedures. Courses must be approved by the CAPC before they can be listed in the Class Schedule

Committee on the Common Academic Program (CAP) Procedures
Revised 11/02/2016; CAPC approved 11/10/2016
Revised and CAPC approved 2/16/2017; APC approved 3/10/2017
CAPC approved updates 9/5/2017 to replace Student Learning Outcomes with Institutional Learning Goals

as approved for the Common Academic Program. The procedures that follow may be revised periodically and as needed as a result of the technical limits or technicalities of the Online Course Proposal system and as a result of the full implementation of CAP including its assessment.

4.1 Course Proposal Form
All course proposals must use the Course Proposal Form found directly at:
> http://nextcatalog.udayton.edu/courseadmin/

Separate proposals must be submitted for each course NUMBER, NOT each SECTION. All proposals for new CAP courses, submission of existing courses for CAP approval, or changes in course number, Catalog description, credit hours, etc. for courses must use this form.

4.2 Prior Approvals
Course proposals must be approved by the appropriate department(s) and academic unit(s) (i.e., College of Arts and Sciences, School of Business Administration, School of Engineering, School of Education and Allied Professions) prior to submission to the CAPC.

4.3 Consultations
Consultations are defined as seeking the advice and expert opinion from departments, programs, and units that may affect or be affected by the course proposal or whose input may strengthen the course.

> *PRINCIPLES:*
>
> *A—Consultations and the results of the consultations are used by the CAPC in its evaluation of the proposals and are therefore an important element in the course proposal approval process.*
>
> *B—If the CAPC feels that there has not been sufficient or broad enough consultation the CAPC will return the proposal for additional consultation.*

4.4 Notification of Submitted Proposals and CAPC Meetings
Any written comments concerning the proposal must be submitted at least seven (7) days prior to the committee meeting. Departments or faculty submitting a proposal are welcome to attend and serve as a resource at the meeting at which the course is considered. All who wish to speak to the CAPC about a particular proposal are welcome to do so. Communications concerning a CAP course proposal should be addressed to the chairperson of the CAPC and to the Assistant Provost for CAP if it cannot be done within the Online Course Approval system directly. The CAPC reserves the right to solicit additional comments about CAP course proposals from interested parties.

> *PROCEDURE:*
>
> *A—Sufficient notification to all departments and units affected by a course proposal must occur prior to CAPC meetings and at a minimum the Deans of all units receive notification of a course proposal at least two weeks in advance of a CAPC meeting wherein the proposal will be discussed. Only the course proposals will be distributed and shall exclude any remarks or notations.*

Committee on the Common Academic Program (CAP) Procedures
Revised 11/02/2016; CAPC approved 11/10/2016
Revised and CAPC approved 2/16/2017; APC approved 3/10/2017
CAPC approved updates 9/5/2017 to replace Student Learning Outcomes with Institutional Learning Goals

> *B—All faculty will receive an email listing course proposals (with the ability to review complete proposals) at least two weeks in advance of the CAPC meeting where the proposal will be discussed. Only the course proposals will be distributed and shall exclude any remarks or notations.*

4.5 Committee Voting Rules
Decisions of the CAPC will be by majority vote of those voting members present, provided a quorum (one more than half of the voting members) is present. See section 2.2.3 of these Procedures.

4.6 Actions on Course Proposals
Once a course proposal has been submitted to the CAPC for consideration the following actions determining the disposition of the proposal can occur:

1. **Proposal is withdrawn from consideration.**
   DESCRIPTION:
   A. The proposal author and/or unit where the proposal originates take this action.
   B. Withdrawal may occur up to the moment the CAPC is to vote on the proposal.
   C. A proposal that is withdrawn may be resubmitted at a later date.
   WORKFLOW:
   A. Assistant Provost performs rollback in CIM to unit from which the proposal originated.
   B. Once the proposal is at the unit level, the unit and proposer decide how to proceed.

2. **Proposal is approved with no changes.**
   DESCRIPTION:
   A. This action is taken by the CAPC.
   B. By taking this action the CAPC communicates that the proposed course satisfies the criteria for all of the proposed CAP components and University of Dayton Institutional Learning Goals.
   WORKFLOW:
   A. Assistant Provost approves the course in CIM, at which time the course is submitted to the Registrar for addition to the Catalog. Course proposal process is complete.
   B. Disposition of the course proposal is designated as "Approved" and will be communicated to the University by the Assistant Provost via posting on the CAP website.

3. **Proposal is approved pending required minor changes.**
   DESCRIPTION:
   A. This action is taken by the CAPC.
   B. This action should not be taken if required revisions indicate a change in course design.
   C. By taking this action, the CAPC communicates its decision that the course satisfies the criteria for all of the proposed CAP components and the proposed University of Dayton Institutional Learning Goals. Since changes are minor, the two-week notification for a follow up CAPC approval meeting is not necessary.

Committee on the Common Academic Program (CAP) Procedures
Revised 11/02/2016; CAPC approved 11/10/2016
Revised and CAPC approved 2/16/2017; APC approved 3/10/2017
CAPC approved updates 9/5/2017 to replace Student Learning Outcomes with Institutional Learning Goals

D. However, by taking this action rather than action 2, the CAPC communicates that the written proposal requires minor changes before final approval. These minor changes could be the correction of omissions, the correction of typographical errors, or clarifications of the manner in which the course will satisfy the criteria for the proposed CAP components and/or the proposed University of Dayton Institutional Learning Goals.

WORKFLOW:

A. The nature of the required minor changes is clearly described to the proposer who will complete revisions and resubmit to the CAPC.

B. Assistant Provost performs rollback in CIM to unit from which the proposal originated.

C. Once the proposal is at the unit level, the unit decides how and by whom the edits are made and approved so it is resubmitted to CAPC for final review and approval of the minor edits.

D. Once approved by the originating unit and sent to the CAPC, the Assistant Provost reviews the edits to determine accuracy of the agreed CAPC/proposer minor edits and reports to the CAPC with recommendation for approval.

E. Assistant Provost approves the course in CIM, at which time the course is submitted to the Registrar for addition to the Catalog. Course proposal process is complete.

F. Disposition of the course proposal is designated as "Approved" and will be communicated to the University by the Assistant Provost via posting on the CAP website.

4. **Proposal is not approved.**

DESCRIPTION:

A. This action is taken by the CAPC.

B. By taking this action, the CAPC communicates its decision that the course, as designed, does not clearly satisfy the criteria for at least one of the proposed CAP components or the proposed University of Dayton Institutional Learning Goals, or that the proposal is incomplete.

WORKFLOW:

A. Assistant Provost performs rollback in CIM to unit from which the proposal originated.

B. Once the proposal is at the unit level, the unit and proposer decide how to proceed.

C. Disposition of the course proposal is designated as "Not Approved" and will be communicated to the University by the Assistant Provost via posting on the CAP website.

D. A proposal that is not approved may be resubmitted at a later date.

Committee on the Common Academic Program (CAP) Procedures
Revised 11/02/2016; CAPC approved 11/10/2016
Revised and CAPC approved 2/16/2017; APC approved 3/10/2017
CAPC approved updates 9/5/2017 to replace Student Learning Outcomes with Institutional Learning Goals

4.7 Communication of Action on Course Proposal

Actions (Approval, Approval Pending Required Minor Revisions, Disapproval, No Action) of the CAPC will be communicated in writing by the Assistant Provost for CAP within one week of the decision. The notifications will follow the same workflow process established by the unit in CIM.

4.8 Periodic Course Review

In order for a course to continue to satisfy one or more components of the Common Academic Program, the department that submitted the original course proposal must, at least once every four years, submit information that demonstrates that the course continues to meet the CAP requirements for those components and the University of Dayton Institutional Learning Goals for which it was approved. The initial review must take place within four years from the time the course is first listed in the Catalog as a CAP-approved course. Subsequent reviews must take place within four years from the last time that the course was re-approved. Six months before the end of such a four-year time period the department that submitted the original course proposal will be notified of the need to have the course reviewed. Following the guidelines provided by the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate, the Humanities Commons will be reviewed in the same manner as originally approved for the Common Academic Program – as a program and not as individual courses.

4.8.1 Departmental Process

As a result of the review process the department will do one of the following:

A. Respond to the following questions through CIM:

1. What specific course learning objectives or experiences are linked to the UD institutional learning goals (*Habits of Inquiry and Reflection*)?
2. What criteria are/will be used to judge the student evidence for each specific course learning objective? (You may attach an assessment rubric or list of criteria.)
3. What evidence (e.g., student artifact or performance) is/will be used to demonstrate level of achievement for each course learning objective?
4. What were the results of your student assessment for each course learning objective?
5. If you have decided this course should address different CAP components from when it was originally approved, what changes are you proposing and why?
6. If you have decided this course should address different UD institutional learning goals (HIR) from when it was originally approved, what changes are you proposing and why?

B. Request that the course be removed from the list of approved CAP courses.

If a department chooses option A), the CAP course will be reviewed by the CAPC to determine if it continues to satisfy the CAP components and University of Dayton Institutional Learning Goals for which it was originally approved. If a department chooses option B), a plan should be developed to phase the course out in order to cause

Committee on the Common Academic Program (CAP) Procedures
Revised 11/02/2016; CAPC approved 11/10/2016
Revised and CAPC approved 2/16/2017; APC approved 3/10/2017
CAPC approved updates 9/5/2017 to replace Student Learning Outcomes with Institutional Learning Goals

minimal disruption in the courses of study of students likely to take the course. This plan should be developed by the department offering the course in coordination with all academic units. While the review of a CAP course must occur at least once every four years, the department may choose to take action B) at any time.

4.8.2 CAPC Process

A. During the review process, the CAPC will verify that the Course Learning Objectives adequately support the CAP Component(s) and University of Dayton Institutional Learning Goals for which the course was (or is being) approved.

B. If a course has no current assessment plan employed *and* does not provide a plan for assessment of the University of Dayton Institutional Learning Goals, it will not be re-approved for CAP.

C. *A conditional re-approval would be applicable for courses that provide a description of an assessment plan, but have no current assessment process or data.* Conditional re-approval would mean that the course is re-approved for two years, during which time the assessment process would be used. In the next review period (after the two years), information resulting from this process would be provided. *A maximum of one conditional re-approval is allowed for each course.*

D. If a course is offered less than once a year, an explanation as to the plan for assessment of student learning can be deferred for two years. After receiving notification of the need to have the course reviewed, the department should submit a request for the two-year deferral for courses in this category. *A maximum of one deferral is allowed for each course.*

4.9 Actions on Courses Submitted for Re-approval

Once a course has been submitted to the CAPC for review, the following actions determining the disposition of the course proposal can occur:

1. **Course is re-approved with no changes.**
   DESCRIPTION:
   A. This action is taken by the CAPC.
   B. By taking this action the CAPC communicates that the course continues to satisfy the criteria for all of the proposed CAP components and University of Dayton Institutional Learning Goals.
   WORKFLOW:
   A. Assistant Provost re-approves the course in CIM, at which time the course proposal is submitted to the Registrar for continued inclusion in the Catalog. Course re-approval process is complete.
   B. Disposition of the course proposal is designated as "Approved" and will be communicated to the University by the Assistant Provost via posting on the CAP website, which will be amended to include the most recent course approval date.

Committee on the Common Academic Program (CAP) Procedures
Revised 11/02/2016; CAPC approved 11/10/2016
Revised and CAPC approved 2/16/2017; APC approved 3/10/2017
CAPC approved updates 9/5/2017 to replace Student Learning Outcomes with Institutional Learning Goals

2. **Course is re-approved pending required minor changes.**
   DESCRIPTION:
   A. This action is taken by the CAPC.
   B. This action should not be taken if required revisions indicate a change in course design.
   C. By taking this action, the CAPC communicates its decision that the course continues to satisfy the criteria for all of the proposed CAP components and University of Dayton Institutional Learning Goals. Since changes are minor, the two-week notification for a follow up CAPC approval meeting is not necessary.
   D. However, by taking this action rather than action 1, the CAPC communicates that the written proposal requires minor changes before final re-approval. These minor changes could be the correction of omissions, the correction of typographical errors, or clarifications of the manner in which the course will satisfy the criteria for the proposed CAP components and/or the proposed University of Dayton Institutional Learning Goals.
   WORKFLOW:
   A. The nature of the required minor changes is clearly described to the proposer who will complete revisions and resubmit to the CAPC.
   B. Assistant Provost performs rollback in CIM to unit from which the course proposal originated.
   C. Once the proposal is at the unit level, the unit decides how and by whom the edits are made and approved so it is resubmitted to CAPC for final review and approval of the minor edits.
   D. Once approved by the originating unit and sent to the CAPC, the Assistant Provost reviews the edits to determine accuracy of the agreed CAPC/proposer minor edits and reports to the CAPC with recommendation for re-approval.
   E. Assistant Provost re-approves the course in CIM, at which time the course proposal is submitted to the Registrar for continued inclusion in the Catalog. Course re-approval process is complete.
   F. Disposition of the course proposal is designated as "Approved" and will be communicated to the University by the Assistant Provost via posting on the CAP website, which will be amended to include the most recent course approval date.

3. **Course is re-approved pending major changes.**
   DESCRIPTION:
   A. This action is taken by the CAPC at the request of the unit and the proposer.
   B. This action should be taken if required revisions indicate a change in course design, CAP components, and/or University of Dayton Institutional Learning Goals.
   C. By taking this action, the CAPC communicates its decision that the course will satisfy the criteria for all of the proposed CAP components and University of Dayton Institutional Learning Goals.
   D. By taking this action, the CAPC communicates that the requested revisions are acceptable and the written proposal requires substantial changes before final re-

Committee on the Common Academic Program (CAP) Procedures
Revised 11/02/2016; CAPC approved 11/10/2016
Revised and CAPC approved 2/16/2017; APC approved 3/10/2017
CAPC approved updates 9/5/2017 to replace Student Learning Outcomes with Institutional Learning Goals

approval. These changes could be the addition or removal of CAP components and/or University of Dayton Institutional Learning Goals, or a substantial change in the course content.

WORKFLOW:

A. The nature of the required major changes is clearly described to the proposer who will typically complete revisions and resubmit to the CAPC.

B. Assistant Provost performs rollback in CIM to unit from which the course proposal originated.

C. Once the proposal is at the unit level, the unit decides how and by whom the edits are made and approved so it is resubmitted to CAPC for final review and approval of the edits.

D. Once approved by the originating unit and sent to the CAPC, the Assistant Provost reviews the edits to determine accuracy of the agreed CAPC/proposer edits and reports to the CAPC with recommendation for re-approval.

E. Assistant Provost re-approves the course in CIM, at which time the course proposal is submitted to the Registrar for continued inclusion in the Catalog. Course re-approval process is complete.

F. Disposition of the course proposal is designated as "Approved" and will be communicated to the University by the Assistant Provost via posting on the CAP website, which will be amended to include the most recent course approval date.

4. **Course is conditionally re-approved for two years pending required changes.**
   DESCRIPTION:

   A. This action is taken by the CAPC.

   B. A conditional re-approval would be applicable for courses that provide a description of an assessment plan, but have no current assessment process or data. During the two-year re-approval, the assessment process would be used. In the next review period (after the two years), information resulting from this process would be provided. *A maximum of one conditional re-approval is allowed for each course.*

   C. This action should not be taken if a course does not have a current assessment plan and does not provide a plan for assessment of the University of Dayton Institutional Learning Goals. In those cases, the course will not be re-approved for CAP (see item 4.9.5 below).

   D. By taking this action, the CAPC communicates its decision that the department has two years to implement the assessment plan for the course.

   WORKFLOW:

   A. Assistant Provost re-approves the course in CIM, at which time the course proposal is submitted to the Registrar for continued inclusion in the Catalog. Course re-approval process is complete.

   B. Disposition of the course proposal is designated as "Approved" and will be communicated to the University by the Assistant Provost via posting on the CAP website, which will be amended to include the most recent course approval date.

Committee on the Common Academic Program (CAP) Procedures
Revised 11/02/2016; CAPC approved 11/10/2016
Revised and CAPC approved 2/16/2017; APC approved 3/10/2017
CAPC approved updates 9/5/2017 to replace Student Learning Outcomes with Institutional Learning Goals

5. **Course is not re-approved.**
   DESCRIPTION:
   A. This action is taken by the CAPC.
   B. By taking this action, the CAPC communicates its decision that the course, as designed, does not clearly satisfy the criteria for at least one of the proposed CAP components or the proposed University of Dayton Institutional Learning Goals.
   C. This action will be taken if a course has no current assessment plan *and* does not provide a plan for assessment of the University of Dayton Institutional Learning Goals.
   WORKFLOW:
   A. Assistant Provost performs rollback in CIM to unit from which the course originated.
   B. Once the course is at the unit level, the unit and proposer decide how to proceed.
   C. A course that is not re-approved may be resubmitted at a later date.

   4.10 Communication of Action on Course Reviews
   Actions (Re-approval, Re-approval Pending Required Minor Changes, Re-approval Pending Major Changes, Conditional Re-approval, Disapproval, No Action) of the CAPC will be communicated in writing by the Assistant Provost for CAP within one week of the decision. The notifications will follow the same workflow process established by the unit in CIM.

   4.11 Monitoring of Course Offerings
   The Assistant Provost for CAP and the Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) will monitor the number of CAP courses offered to ensure that sufficient courses are available to meet student needs.

5. **Documentation and Depository of Records**
   The CAPC will maintain accurate minutes for each of its meetings and those approved minutes will be maintained by the Office of the Provost. In addition, those minutes will be submitted to the Academic Policies Committee on a monthly basis.

   The CAPC will instruct the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program to identify and promulgate, at least once a semester, a list of courses or experiences that have been approved for the Common Academic Program.

   The CAPC will keep an electronic file of documents for approved courses in the CAP under the auspices of the Office of the Provost. In addition, the CAPC will provide PDF document files for approved courses to the University Archivist at the University Libraries, who will maintain at least two copies of the PDF versions of the approved courses –- one in the original PDF format and one archival PDF. Finally, the CAPC, in consultation with the University Archivist, will determine the best method for keeping the electronic records so that those records can be accessed easily and in the long duration of time.

Committee on the Common Academic Program (CAP) Procedures
Revised 11/02/2016; CAPC approved 11/10/2016
Revised and CAPC approved 2/16/2017; APC approved 3/10/2017
CAPC approved updates 9/5/2017 to replace Student Learning Outcomes with Institutional Learning Goals

6. **Procedures for Periodic Review of the Common Academic Program**
    With the assistance of the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program and the Associate Dean, the CAPC will 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. In addition, 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 Common Academic Program must be reviewed after 2 years after the initiation of the CAP in 2013 and then every 5 years after (first review in the Fall of 2015, then every 5 years after). The procedures for review will be developed by the CAPC in consultation with Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program, the University Assessment Committee, the Academic Policies Committee and the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

7. **Procedure for Amending the CAPC Procedures**
    If the majority of CAPC voting members wish to amend substantive elements in these Procedures they may do so at any time. Such amendments to the Procedures must be submitted to the Academic Policies Committee, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, for its approval.