Dr. Feldner then introduced the two main questions that would guide the discussion for the discussion today:

1) What ideas have you heard in this initial results that you would want us to hold on to? That is, what ideas do we want to make sure are not lost as we move forward?

2) What is missing? What ideas would you expect to see here that are not captured.

Dr. Feldner then presented an overview of the results of the first Core revision faculty survey, taken by the faculty in mid-September. (The full version of the results of this survey are available in .pdf format on the Core Revision website, as well as a PowerPoint document that summarizes the results.)

Following the presentation, the discussion moved between the two questions (What from the survey needs to be emphasized? What is missing from the results of the survey?). Points raised by the faculty in attendance included:

- Scientific competency is mentioned late in the presentation of the results of the survey but not in the results of the earlier questions. Why not? This competency should be stressed.
- Integration within the Core should not be too time-sensitive. It should focus on “base” themes that will hold up over time.
- Delivery of Core courses is as important as content.
- “Critical thinking” is too vague. The term “understanding” would be better.
- Students should get life skills from the Core, something they do not necessarily get in their majors.
- Social justice is only one aspect of Catholicism; students should receive a fuller expression of the Catholic faith.
- A capstone course is best put in the majors.
• Better to focus on big picture ideas and themes early on in the Core; bring in the experiential part toward the end.
• Jesuit education/tradition has included a focus on science.
• Critical thinking requires the ability to read and write; otherwise it is an empty concept.
• Social justice is popular, but what does it mean in practice?
• What it means to be human needs to be covered in the Core. Who are we, and what is our purpose?
• Appreciated the wide range of disciplines represented in the survey. Result was a better range of ideas than if from one’s own discipline.
• An important theme could be how we relate to ourselves, each other, and God.
• Noticed themes in the answers to the survey that included truth, dignity, meaning, and citizenship.
• Themes not as good as focusing on content. We need to be sure students have a base of knowledge.
• The Core needs to develop the essential building blocks of wisdom, wonder, and appreciation of the beauty of creation.
• Why such an aggressive timeline to complete the Core revision process?
• Aspirational institutions have discipline-focused cores; this lets students ask the questions. Thematic core is less liberalizing.
• Jesuit education assumes we can find God in all things. This requires a focus on faith, not just culture. Integration in the Core can take place around basic questions about reality.
• Core revision will work only if students buy into it. Students will sometimes react negatively initially but buy into it later.
• Undergraduates often do not appreciate a liberal arts education until years later.
• Some things that are most important about the Core cannot be easily assessed.
• With a 36 credit Core, this is only one-quarter or so of a student’s courses. The Core cannot carry the whole purpose of the university. Focus on what the Core can do, but think about how the Core relates to the rest of the curriculum including majors.
• Themes: We need to focus on “perennial” topics rather than temporary ones.
• Faculty should only teach in their areas of competency so we can respect each other’s competency.
• Think about implementation when designing the Core. Can’t box people in.
• Large classes limit how reflective a student can be. We need to move beyond presenting and receiving information in Core classes.

Core Revision College Faculty Discussion Sessions, Arts and Sciences #2, 9/30/15
Core Revision Facilitation Group member provided an overview of the Core revision process, including the Core revision process website (http://www.marquette.edu/common-studies-revision/), the Core Revision Charge document, timeline, and how of college-level discussions fit into the process.

CRFG member Dr. Sarah Feldner (College of Communication) then introduced the two main questions that would guide the discussion for the discussion today:
1) What ideas have you heard in this initial results that you would want us to hold on to? That is, what ideas do we want to make sure are not lost as we move forward?
2) What is missing? What ideas would you expect to see here that are not captured.

Dr. Feldner then presented an overview of the results of the first Core revision faculty survey, taken by the faculty in mid-September. (The full version of the results of this survey are available in .pdf format on the Core Revision website, as well as a PowerPoint document that summarizes the results.)

Following the presentation, the discussion moved between the two questions (What from the survey needs to be emphasized? What is missing from the results of the survey?). Points raised by the faculty in attendance included:
• Math not mentioned in the results from questions 1 and 2 of the survey. Why not, especially since it was an important them in question 4.
• Jesuit background and social justice: keep this focus but link it to a first-year experience.
• Students need to know why the Core is important.
• Sequencing is hard for scheduling.
• Linked courses in the Honors Program are working. Can serve as a model for the Core if there the linked courses form of integration is chosen.
• Should be fewer options for students in the Core; there should be a more common experience.
• Seniors shouldn’t be taking Core courses at the introductory level; more structure needed for how students take courses across the Core.
• There should be some kind of first-year experience. We don’t use the Core unite students across colleges, but we should.

• How do we, as teachers, connect across disciplines and do we reward or punish students who bring in ideas from their other Core courses into our course?

• Need to focus not just on curriculum but also on pedagogy. This needs to be part of the review of the Core. Small courses will make the Core more appealing to students and make the delivery of the course material more effective.

• Core should be competency-based rather than discipline-based.

• What are the financial and other constraints on the changes to the Core?

• Easier if we limit the new Core to existing Core courses, but this will not really be a change.

• There are practical benefits to revising the Core in terms of making Marquette more attractive. The Core offers a “curricular location for distinctiveness,” but we don’t take advantage of this at present.

• Students need to understand the value of Core courses and should be able to explain this to others.

• Parents want students to get their major training, but in a setting in which ethics and service to others are central.

• How do we change the Core when departments are currently staffed to deliver the existing Core?

• Are we analyzing what students take in the current Core? Are the early courses they take in the Core offering opportunities for making connections?

• Need to emphasize excellence. Guarantee an experience of excellence.

• There should be a common first-year experience involving regular faculty teaching courses of 20 or fewer students.

• What happens in the first two years? We want them to move beyond courses and narrow topics to a broader way of understanding the world.

**CRFG: Discussion of Survey 1 Outcomes with Business School**

- The answers to question one weren’t very interesting. Work needs to be done to make them more compelling.

- A question was raised about the actual data from the survey. What were the actual numbers of responses to each of the most popular answers?
- There was a brief question and answer about what other institutions are doing? What are some of the themes and frameworks at other institutions?

- There was a comment confirming the desire to have a distinctive, Jesuit core, and wanting to be the “best” Jesuit core.

- One person commented on the lack of depth in the current core and that we can be good by going deep in one or more areas.

- Phil Gardner’s work from Michigan State was mentioned. What makes students employable and what skills employers are looking for was mentioned.

- One person commented that, when thinking about careers, students need to think beyond majors and think in a more interdisciplinary way. We need to help facilitate their reflections on their career paths.

- Questions were raised about faculty survey and the potential for bias in response rate. There was a worry about the “wolves running the hen-house.”

- Someone commented that we should look at other sources as well, including the scarborough report, the Huron report and other external reviews.

**Communication Listening Session (10/2)**

- Question: when will there be criteria or course proposals? (wanting to understand the process)

- There is a disconnect between broad characteristics and themes. The themes get at topic areas. Need to to think about which of two lists will drive the conversation. Latter is territoriality – need to focus on the broader picture

- Need a core that is not a checklist and cannot just be a core to support a grad program. If there is pragmatic question about grad programs, need to think about student needs and learning

- Need a balance between some really different courses and things that are more traditional and meets the needs that are more pragmatic.

- Need a stronger global awareness; students need to complete an outcome by a class – need to try to be more flexible about the courses on the list or something that can be taken abroad that may fulfill the outcome. We need to figure out a way that encourages students to have community experiences here or abroad
• Need to think about thematics before we dump it, for example rhetoric, argument etc. rhetoric has more than writing. There are ways to be more creative ways to break down the silos with different kinds of arguments – allow or multidisciplinary approaches

• Logistical things – the scales didn’t allow you to spread out as much – somewhat agree and agree = moving forward doesn’t really give a clear picture

• Integration – unclear what it means; my sense of core it is base that this should be an early on process and then let the majors take hold after that foundation has been laid. I feel like the core should be in first two years and then be done

• Something that builds on first year experience/ some sort of community building that would be important

• I would endorse the first year experience; can have undergrads be tutor – it works

• What is surprising that there is nothing surprising – seems like there is no idea here. If students were only to take the core, would that be an meaningful experience educationally?

• Think about students existentially – seeing where they are developmentally and how they are putting themselves together as adults and professional.

• Didn’t see writing on there is that part of communication – but seems to be important creativity and creative thinking and problem solving. I think critical thinking can mean something different people ore support about first year experience – broad and open and it challenged both students and faculty; it can be really rewarding to think big picture. Challenge students to think about our world outside the disciplines; do it in a way that mashes all things together

• If you think about paths into traditional ways of knowing/disciplines. I wouldn’t give up on wonder/curiosity. If core is place where they learn to ask good question – that could be an outcome – you can see if they can ask good questions. Rather than see it as a death march that they slog through –build on human regular curiosity

• Hard to equate learning outcomes with what we are talking about – at one moment we may want to do the aspirational and the larger outcomes without shutting down with outcomes with starts to limit it.
• Not so much on foundations because it gets to what disciplines are foundational. Instead to think about how students learn to see the world in a particular way – you are in a point where people are understanding how you see the world. How do you describe the space in which all of us work. Thinking then about classes like Theology and then would that lead us to the kinds of the classes that we are currently teaching.

Education Listening Session

Question about faculty who teach only graduate courses being excluded. Number of people who want to participate and have good information, but were not on the first survey.

The idea of a Milwaukee semester (in the model of DePaul) – riding transit, going to arts, and introduction to pedagogy of the institution

Importance of social engagement and connecting curriculum of core to real life in Milwaukee; get outside of the classroom

Connections between heads, heart and hands – with VP for Student Affairs, great opportunity to find someone who is committed to this. Good moment to make connections to co-curricular

In Student Affairs, there is a focus on learning outcomes in out of classroom situation; allows to have seamless outcomes; this will allow us to play off the fact that we have a strong residential campus in an urban setting. That environment for our students – how does that integrate?

A lot of the priorities early on were contextual and interdisciplinary and then the themes suggest we are not capable of doing this. This is hard because we do not seem to think in this way and we will have to work on this is we are going to make this happen.

What themes? Suggestion of problem based themes – real world problems for students to solve

Challenge – should we be thinking about fact that students meet core requirements early in their curriculum? Does that dictate what we are able to do?

Ignatian pedagogy is important – needs to be seen as more as faculty training and this needs to involve the learner and her development as a reflective process

In thinking of the problem centered, there is an opportunity to think about the climate study – to think about respect and civility for the others – and have students to think about as co-creator of climate. Have them create rather than respond.

Nothing is mentioned about direction or purpose – could be tied to clear career goal – struck by the fact that is does not come up that something developmental / sense of purpose is not here. It does not have to be career centered but this can be helpful.
Broader than vocational outcomes – there are bigger questions – what does it mean to be a human? What does it mean to be just? Students do not know how to think in those ways? This can be an invitation for the students to know.

The big questions that we want students to think about – we think students need to leave a university with a recognition of the steps that they are going to take – career paths aren’t straight – so we need to make it okay for students to follow different paths – need to think about tension between getting a job and we sit an institution of a liberal arts focus and not clear how that fits. But still at the core need to think about big questions

Ethics for the profession – while not quite missing but need to gear ethics to how are you going to behave as a professional

When you say career focus and liberal arts – really good research that there are really good outcomes that can be integrated. Purpose for why you are doing something that can be put into tangible outcomes

Don’t want to lose the focus on philosophical thinking – from a disciplinary perspective and to get a sense of history – remember Marquette used to require 15 of philosophy and 12 of theology and it was training in a way of thinking that is remembered as critical to students. Not to say go back to 15 credits, but need to think about philosophical thinking – there are a lot of fuzzy thinkers. We need to not lose the ability to think in this philosophical thinking

When you put better citizens in your strategic plan need to think what is that – people have talked about how you would define citizenships – will need to define it – just, community, ethical – people have very different ideas about what that is.

Struck in results that the spiritual piece was de-emphasized. Surprising that it wasn’t there

Need to think about what really sets us apart as a university, as Catholic, as Jesuit Catholic – if something comes out of this that helps us decide what a core is and it will make us smarter as a university – not necessarily competitive – but was is our ethos

This is our time to think about our climate survey – when we focus on faith we have to remember that there are many faiths and we want to be seen as more inclusive – more inquisitive and respecting of race and gender

Surprised that leadership and being a change agent – creating difference is not there

Marquette grads talk consistently that they felt really prepared to step into roles and lead things

Need to understand how change works and knowing how to interpret that in particular way
10/16/15 Notes from Meeting with Engineering

Marquette University

John Su did a 5 minute introduction with the slide deck.

Comments:

One thing missing is that there isn’t an outcome for putting what a student learns into practice.

One person commented that it is hard to fit the curricula of professional schools into the core. We need to fit the core into those curricula.

Problem solving was missing from the learning objectives, but may be hidden in the critical thinking answers. Also, applying what students learn to problem solving was missing.

One comment was about the breadth and depth requirement before the current core. Will a tiered framework offer more depth and be closer to the old system?

Social justice is lower on the themes (question 3) than it was on the answer to question 2. There was a little discussion about that. Also, one perception is that it is an A&S core. How do we make it more of a university core, instead of an A&S requirement.

One person commented that there were no learning objectives on knowledge of business, business acumen, and skills in business. This is something alumni tell engineering faculty is missing from their curricula a lot.

One person wanted to make a distinction between math, science, and technology. There are different learning pedagogies and different classifications within those areas.

Credit hours of other units like the Diederich College of Communication are decreasing to 120 credits or so. What is the impact of that on core discussions? There was some discussion on that.

One person commented that we need to get over the concept that core has to equate with credits and content in individual courses.

One person commented that ethics can be taught in a domain-specific manner. There was discussion about the merits of theoretical and domain-specific ethics.

One person expressed a desire to have an assessable and assessed core. Also, this person commented that it is difficult to talk about learning outcomes without learning objectives. There was a lot of discussion about this.

Other people commented that maybe we should take a step back and ask what the purpose of our core is. John Su answered this question in many ways. There is a directive from the Provost and President about the general vision, but that they didn’t want to be prescriptive. The
process is set up for faculty to drive both what the outcomes and objectives are through this process.

One person asked if external stakeholders like employers are being asked to review learning outcomes.

One person commented that the core needs to be taught by the diverse areas within a university—philosophy taught by philosophers, math taught by mathematicians, etc.

There was another comment about having both theoretical ethics and applied ethics in the core.

One person commented that the current core that the person interpreted as being introductory and distributional is worse than the framework that preceded it, i.e. theo/phil and humanities social sciences electives.

One person commented about the feedback from employers. They like that Marquette engineers are well-rounded. They thought that students are not strong in written and oral communications skills and business acumen.

Core Revision Facilitation Group (CRFG) & College of Health Science (CHS) Meeting

-Minutes
  - Lars Olson introduced the revision process & PowerPoint; Sarah Feldner led group discussion of survey data & learning outcomes

-Guiding Questions to Keep In Mind
  1) What’s important to hold onto from the survey results?
  2) What’s missing in the data?

-Survey results were discussed

-Open Discussion
  1) What’s important to hold onto from the survey results?
     - Cross-disciplinary (inter-disciplinary) themes are important
       - Ex. food insecurity, sustainability, health disparities
     - Application of learning is vital ⇒ common theme in the data that service learning was important

*Would it be possible to link 1-2 “Major” classes back to a “core theme“?
- Better citizens!
- How to survive in the world → what does “prepared” look like?
- Capstone idea is important for synthesis & REFLECTION
  Ex. various ideas could be applied to social justice / community engagement
- Communication skills (writing, public speaking, etc.)
- Be mindful of Core flexibility & scalability (please remember transfer students & majors with large numbers of students)
- Link college/major course into the Core → vital to get students to engage other disciplines (including those discipline students)
- Core courses should be delivered without a “memorization-focus”, better to have student reflection/application
- Meaningful ethics instruction / application, vital to all disciplines
- Incentivize instructors to teach courses that would be interdisciplinary (ex. History of Medicine); vital that the class would be structured more than just “health history”
- Important to have CHS students know more than just medicine

2) What’s missing in the data?
   - Nothing specific addressed → clarification of next steps (ex. learning outcomes & framework/model discussion) ensued

Meeting concluded at 12:55PM

Respectfully submitted by Robert Paxton

**Nursing Listening Session**

Noted the idea that a lot of the ideas that emerged from the survey were already in part of the college curriculum

Like the idea of the first year experience – it would be nice to embed the Marquette experience

The third question is disturbing because it looks like people’s worldview of the curriculum is that is gen ed – we don’t want it to be gen ed. Have some challenges for what we think we mean when we look at core

Missing from this is leadership – we want people out there making a difference and changing the world

Concerns that there is the process – should there be more listening sessions
Integrating what are the most effective approaches – would like to look at evidence to determine what works – seem like there are some answers about what is more effective that should be a part of this.

There seems to be an underlying theme of not everyone buying into the mission of the university – need to be mindful of the fact that faculty do not buy into the vision

Service-learning seems to be important and should be retained as a focus

Interdisciplinary and interprofessional thinking connections to be a part of the world – how increasingly in programs this is an accreditation requirement.

Core is very discipline specific – so the core happens over there – this is something that I’d like to see come forward – so not simply that English course – but need to think of a course that all people will take

Madison did a story of gen ed graduates and how many were required; not only is it required of students in the professions but in the other disciplines it could be important to do the professional to think of the marketable – and this needs to be considered as we build the core