The initial meeting of the University Core Curriculum Review Committee was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by Professor Christine Wiseman, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, on Tuesday, October 31, 2000 in AMU 305. Professor Wiseman welcomed the membership and explained that the meeting had been timed to allow some participation by members who would be arriving from class or departing to teach. The members introduced each other and identified their representative areas. **Members present included:** Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Rev. Philip Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Brian Unsworth, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Ken Ksobiech and Mr. James Lowrey. **Members excused included:** Dr. Ellen Eckman, Prof. Linda Laatsch and Dr. Michele Malin.

Professor Wiseman distributed a copy of the membership roster and distributed hard copies of the revised Preamble and knowledge area goals and objectives to those who had not received them by campus mail. She then introduced Dr. David Buckholdt who discussed issues and expectations with the Committee.

Dr. Buckholdt explained that the essential purpose of the Core Curriculum Review Committee was to define and describe a common core to be implemented by 2002-2003. In that regard, he hoped for something concrete from the Committee by spring 2001, at least with respect to core credits. He hoped that a formal presentation detailing Committee progress might be made to the Academic Senate at that time and suggested that Fr. Wild held that expectation as well. He also noted that a re-accreditation visit was scheduled for Marquette University in the spring 2003, and that core review and assessment was critical to that effort.

Among the specific issues raised by Committee members with Dr. Buckholdt were the following:

(a) Does this Committee maintain oversight over the core requirements adopted by the individual colleges? It was suggested that if a department or college proposes a course for consideration in the common core, the college or department must hold an interest in that area and must be prepared to sustain that course as an elective.

(b) Interdisciplinary efforts will create flexibility, but they will entail an expansion of the faculty circle beyond turf so that faculty can enrich each other from across the different colleges.
(c) Ultimately, who will ratify the enumeration of credits and the selection of courses? Will it follow a line of approval from Dr. Buckholdt, to BUS, to the Academic Senate and then to Fr. Wild?

(d) How does the Committee deal with and communicate these curricular issues that will have substantial impact upon a college, especially when there is no uniform way of deciding curricular issues within each of the colleges?

Following these discussions with Dr. Buckholdt, the Committee sought to identify process issues and concerns which must occupy its initial efforts this year. These included:

(1) qualifications and criteria for approving courses;

(2) a methodology by which to decide on the number of courses (e.g., what are we translating into numbers and what guides us; how do we present the numbers in such a way that they will make sense to faculty colleagues; what are the creative challenges in colleges that have a real credit crunch (are there new ways to think about delivering the core); and how do we delineate the balance between recognizing numeric restraints and recognizing the University’s academic and pedagogical mission);

(3) arriving at a uniform process for departments to present the Committee with materials (need for a template and a set of protocols that are workable for an organic core);

(4) rules and procedures for decision-making by the Committee with regard to a given proposal;

(5) appropriate subcommittee structure and an efficient way of dividing tasks among Committee members;

(6) interaction with the University Assessment Committee; and

(7) the authority of the Core Curriculum Review Committee vis a vis the Academic Senate.

Beyond these, the Committee focused on a number of other substantive concerns. These included the need for sequencing and ways to assure appropriate sequencing among and within the various knowledge areas; moving from a set of discursive statements to a finite number of credits, and arriving at a “sum” for all the credits comprising the core. Some members voiced other issues that would need to be addressed. Among the most critical was the need to continue faculty ownership of the core. Thus, the process must involve faculty in assuming responsibility for the core. In the future, all agreed that this Committee should not be a formality; rather, it is an important instrumentality for faculty governance in the education of Marquette undergraduates.
In closing, Committee members were advised to forward their schedules to Professor Wiseman and to advance any interest each might have in serving as chair or vice chair of the Committee. The meeting thereafter adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Assoc. Vice President for Academic Affairs
Chair pro Tem
The meeting was called to order at 10:30 A. M. by Dr. David Buckholdt, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, on Friday, December 15, 2000 in AMU 254. Members present included: Dr. Karl Byleen, Prof. Linda Laatsch, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Bob Deahl, Mr. Jim Lowrey, Dr. Shelly Malin, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki, Dr. Brian Unsworth, Dr. Tim Machan, Rev. Philip Rossi, S. J., Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, and Dr. Nancy Snow. Excused: Prof. Christine Wiseman.

Dr. Buckholdt opened the meeting by noting that no single individual had come forward to stand for election as Chair of the Core Curriculum Review Committee, but that three people had offered to share leadership responsibilities as an Executive Committee: Drs. Stephen Heinrich, Ken Ksobiech, and Nancy Snow. Some discussion of the “pros” and “cons” of this arrangement ensued, and each prospective Executive Committee member gave a brief presentation of his or her background and interest in the position. A straw vote was taken, and it was decided that an Executive Committee consisting of Dr. Snow (Chair), Dr. Heinrich, and Dr. Ksobiech would take over leadership responsibilities for the Committee. At that point, Dr. Buckholdt exited, and Dr. Snow chaired the rest of the meeting.

Dr. Snow agreed to distribute minutes of Executive Committee meetings to all members of the Committee, and to notify the Committee at the next meeting of deadlines for submitting items to be included on meeting agendas.

The Executive Committee had prepared a meeting agenda, and moved through the following agenda items:

1. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, October 31, 2000. The minutes were approved, pending two changes. First, Dr. Cheryl Maranto noted that she had been listed as excused, but was present at the meeting. Secondly, the question was raised whether the Committee could meet the expectations articulated by Dr. David Buckholdt at the meeting of October 31. It was agreed that, in the record of Dr. Buckholdt’s remarks, the word “expected” would be changed to “hoped for” in the minutes. Dr. Snow will make these changes.

2. A Division of Labor among Executive Committee members was announced and approved by the Committee: Dr. Ksobiech will serve as liaison for internal communications with Committee members; Dr. Heinrich will serve as liaison with the Assessment Committee; and Dr. Snow will be responsible for distributing meeting agendas and minutes, scheduling meetings, ensuring the provision of refreshments at meetings, chairing the meetings, and keeping the Committee on task. As previously agreed, Professor Christine Wiseman will take the minutes of meetings, which will be
distributed by e-mail by Dr. Snow. Dr. Snow took the minutes of the December 15, 2000, meeting, since Professor Wiseman was excused.

3. During the rest of the meeting, several issues of structure and process were addressed.

   A. The Executive Committee proposed having regularly scheduled bi-monthly meetings of the entire Committee. The Committee agreed to this proposal. Dr. Snow distributed scheduling grids and asked Committee members to return them to her by January 5, 2001. It was noted that the Committee might have to consider the possibility of Saturday or evening meetings.

   B. The Committee has been charged with implementing four tasks during the spring semester (see Implementation Plan, Phase 2, or “Threshold Responsibilities,” “p. 1). The Executive Committee proposed addressing these tasks via a subcommittee structure, and attempting to complete tasks (1) and (2) before spring break, which begins on March 4, 2001, then addressing tasks (3) and (4) immediately after spring break. A discussion of the “pros” and “cons” of using a subcommittee structure ensued. A number of concerns with the use of this type of structure were raised, especially regarding the completion of task (1), articulating guidelines for approval of core courses. It was stressed that the subcommittee structure might not adequately capture the need for integration of courses from various knowledge areas into a coherent core. The Committee decided that it is more appropriate for the Committee as a whole to proceed through tasks (1)-(4). Consequently, the subcommittee structure will not be used. The Committee as a whole will meet throughout the spring semester of 2001 to articulate guidelines for approval of core courses, and will also address tasks (2)-(4). The Committee as a whole agreed with Dr. Snow’s suggestion to meet during the latter part of the month of January to begin work, and agreed to have regular bimonthly meetings during the spring semester.

   C. It was suggested that the Committee needs to decide upon a decision-making process. Dr. Snow agreed that deciding upon a decision-making process for the Committee will be an agenda item for the next meeting, and asked Committee members to come prepared to discuss their ideas for how this should be done.

   D. It was also suggested that the Committee undertake a discussion of the Preamble. It was generally agreed that this should be done at some point during the Committee’s deliberations.

   E. Dr. Snow distributed a template for guidelines for approving core courses that the Executive Committee had prepared. The template includes all of the questions included under tasks (1) and (2) of the “Threshold Responsibilities,” plus the question of how many courses will be needed to satisfy core requirements in each knowledge area. Dr. Snow suggested that number (3) of the “Guidelines” listed on the template should be amended with the concluding phrase, “with accompanying rationale,” and further suggested that the guidelines approved by the Committee would be strengthened if accompanying rationales or justifications are included for each of numbers (1)-(9) on the
template. During discussion of the template, two other entries were added to the list: (10) will address the question, “Will it be possible for students to test out of core courses?,” and (11) will address the question, “How does this course tie in with other knowledge areas, and, if possible, with other courses within the knowledge areas?” It was also suggested the Committee should be mindful of what course requirements for students will look like. It was noted that there are general guidelines available from the College of Nursing that the Committee could use in its deliberations. It was also noted that such guidelines are also available from the College of Education. These materials will be given to Dr. Snow for distribution for use at the Committee’s next meeting. It was further suggested that each Committee member be responsible for bringing information to the Committee regarding the specific accreditation requirements for each College and major. Information will be needed regarding the core, the major, and cognate courses leading into the major. These materials will also be used by the Committee in its deliberations. It was suggested that this material will be important in deciding a general framework for the new core, including the total number of credits that constitute the core. The point was made that, accreditation requirements notwithstanding, there is a need to maintain the academic integrity of the core curriculum. It was suggested that the Committee also consult core curricula used at other Jesuit institutions. These curricula are available as appendices at the Core Curriculum website.

F. The question was raised whether Dr. Greg Garber, Vice-President for Financial Affairs, will be visiting the Committee. At an earlier meeting of the Core Curriculum Facilitators’ Group, Professor Wiseman had agreed to invite Dr. Garber to meet with the Review Committee. Dr. Snow said that she would inquire about the status of this visit and report back to the Committee.

G. At the end of the meeting, Dr. Snow suggested an agenda for the next meeting:

1) Discussion of Decision Procedures for the Committee.

2) Discussion of General Guidelines for Approving Core Courses (task 1 of “Threshold Responsibilities.”) This discussion will proceed using the template that was distributed to the Committee, plus the following materials: (a) general guidelines from the College of Nursing (to be distributed by Dr. Snow to Committee members prior to the January, 2001 meeting); (b) general guidelines from the College of Education (to be distributed by Dr. Snow to Committee members prior to the January, 2001 meeting); (c) models of core curricula from other Jesuit institutions (to be gotten from the web by Dr. Snow and distributed to Committee members prior to the January, 2001 meeting); (d) the Preamble to the Marquette Core; and (e) information about accreditation requirements of specific Colleges and majors, to be brought to the meeting by individual Committee members. This will include information about the core, the major, and cognate courses leading into the major.

The meeting was adjourned shortly after 12:00 P. M.

Respectfully submitted,
Nancy E. Snow
Associate Professor of Philosophy
Executive Committee, Review Committee Chair
The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m. on Friday, January 18, 2001 in Straz Hall Room 442 by Dr. Nancy Snow. **Members present included:** Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Michele Malin, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Rev. Philip Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow and Prof. Christine Wiseman. **Members Excused:** Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. Brian Unsworth and Dr. Michael Wierzbicki.

The meeting opened with a prayer delivered by Rev. Rossi from the Scottish Book of Common Order. Dr. Snow then called for additions or corrections to the minutes of the Friday, December 15, 2000 meeting and asked for approval of the revised minutes of the October 31 meeting. With respect to the December 15 minutes, Dr. Machan suggested that the last sentence in Part 3B inaccurately reflected the Committee’s determination to work within the time constraints proposed by Dr. Buckholdt for the spring semester 2001, noting that the Implementation Plan had called for an additional six months over and above the time suggested by Dr. Buckholdt. Prof. Wiseman responded that Dr. Buckholdt was not as concerned with deadlines in a particular area as he was that the Committee demonstrate some overall progress in a report that could be made to the Academic Senate this spring. A consensus formed to simply drop the first part of the last sentence, re-working the sentence to reflect that the Committee had agreed to bimonthly meetings. The new sentence would simply read: “The Committee as a whole agreed with Dr. Snow’s suggestion to meet during the latter part of the month of January to begin work, and agreed to have regular bimonthly meetings during the spring semester.” Dr. Snow would amend the minutes to incorporate that change. Dr. Deahl then moved to approve the December 15 minutes, as amended, and to approve the October 31 minutes. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ksobiech and passed unanimously. [Reporter’s Note: Revised minutes for December 15, 2000, conforming to the amendment, were distributed by Dr. Snow via e-mail dated January 18, 2001].

**Item A. Chair’s Report.**

1. **Meeting Schedule.** Attending to the schedule of meetings earlier distributed by Dr. Snow, the Committee determined to employ two options and to invoke those options alternatively, meeting sometimes on Wednesday evenings and sometimes on Saturday mornings. Thus, the Committee arrived at a final schedule of meetings for the spring semester 2001. Professor Wiseman agreed to investigate the availability of the Conference Room (Room 107) in O’Hara Hall for each of the meetings. As newly devised, the meeting schedule is as follows:

   - Saturday, February 3, 2001  9:00-11:00 a.m.
   - Wednesday, February 14, 2001  7:15-9:15 p.m.
   - Wednesday, February 28, 2001  7:15-9:15 p.m.
   - Saturday, March 17, 2001  9:00-11:00 a.m.
   - Wednesday, March 28, 2001  7:15-9:15 p.m.
   - Saturday, April 21, 2001  9:00-11:00 a.m.
   - Wednesday, May 2, 2001  7:15-9:15 p.m.

   [Reporter’s Note: Professor Wiseman has now confirmed the availability of O’Hara Hall, Room 107, for each of those meetings and has secured a key for that purpose].

2. **Placing Items on the Meeting Agenda.** The Committee accepted Dr. Snow’s proposal for 24-hour notice in order to place items on the agenda for any particular meeting. Thus, agenda items must be submitted to Dr. Snow not later than 24 hours before the particular meeting. Committee members also understood that, on occasion, there might be a need to prioritize items, which could result in postponing certain items (submitted in timely fashion) to a later date.

   In terms of specific items, Mr. Greg Garber, Vice President for Finance, had earlier agreed to meet with the
Committee regarding the University cost-study and its impact on core curricular resources. Committee members agreed to pursue the meeting and offered two dates for consideration by Mr. Garber: February 3 and February 14. Fr. Rossi suggested that it was important for the Committee to have a conversation with Mr. Garber about the principles by which financial decisions regarding the core are made rather than simply being informed about how these financial decisions are made. Other members suggested that it was important to be informed about the process but also to communicate with Mr. Garber about the governing principles so that he might fully inform the Committee of any options for funding the core. Committee members decided that Professor Wiseman should communicate an invitation to Mr. Garber, suggesting to him the purpose for his visit, as defined above. They further offered that the duration of the meeting should remain open, suggesting that he plan on an hour but retain the option to stay longer. Beyond an invitation to Mr. Garber, the Committee determined to invite Dr. Jerry Viscione, Executive Vice President, at a later date since members thought that Dr. Viscione had overriding responsibility for making any final financial decisions. In that regard, it might be important that Mr. Garber understand and ally himself with the work of this Committee. [Reporter’s Note: Mr. Garber has agreed to appear at the February 14 meeting].

3. Dissemination of Minutes. Committee members informed that several colleges were reviewing the curricula in their majors such that it might be profitable to establish lines of communication with those constituencies. As one member noted, it is important to convey reliable and accurate information to the faculty in order to avoid the surprise factor and protect the work of the Committee from rumor and innuendo. In that regard, Dr. Naylor suggested that it was particularly important to share the minutes as between the University Assessment Committee and the Core Curriculum Review Committee and to provide detailed minutes to the Deans. Others suggested posting minutes on the web but not until the Committee had approved them. Concluding the discussion, the Committee agreed that, after approval, it would post suitably constructed minutes on the web so as to evidence the transparency of its process while sometimes maintaining confidentiality with respect to substantive discussions. It would also send copies of these minutes to the various college Deans. Dr. Eckman added that it was important as well to hear regular updates from members of the various college curriculum committees.

Item B. Decision-Making Procedures.

The Committee discussed several options for arriving at decisions with respect to the issues that surfaced before it. Dr. Snow proposed that, when possible, consensus afforded the greatest strength in the decision-making process. She also proposed that a vote be taken when consensus could not be reached. Several members then questioned whether time limits should affect the deliberations needed to reach consensus, advising that such limits might not be appropriate. Others suggested that consensus sometimes worked to suppress opposing viewpoints, defeating the purpose of divergent representation. They also suggested that voting conveys the relative strength of any given position taken by the Committee more clearly than consensus. After considerable discussion, the Committee resolved to utilize a mix of decision-making processes, voting on programmatic and legislative issues and acting by consensus with respect to others.

Item C. Guidelines for Approving Core Courses.

Dr. Snow directed the Committee’s attention to the various submissions from members of the Committee who offered templates for qualifying core courses from within their own departments or colleges. Specifically, these included submissions from the Department of English and the College of Nursing (copies distributed to each Committee member in advance of the meeting are attached to these Minutes). At the suggestion of Dr. Deahl, Drs. Machan and Malin explained their submissions to the Committee by walking them through the process in each of their respective units. In particular, Dr. Malin explained that Nursing has a defined set of terminal objectives, level objectives and curricular themes. Each of the Nursing faculty commit to assessing whether students meet a given set of objectives within their courses, but the objectives are externally driven, to some extent. Nursing faculty organize and submit materials (as well as syllabi) that demonstrate this commitment by following the template offered by Dr. Malin. She then advised that after the faculty member systematically reviews her own course, a college committee reviews the assessment materials and offers feedback to the faculty member.

Dr. Machan offered a similar explanation with respect to the sophomore literature courses, suggesting that it
was the responsibility of this Committee to arrive at a similar process and identify core courses from this process. Rather than allowing departments or colleges to devise the objectives, however, he suggested that the objectives have already been devised by the faculty focus groups which arrived at a given set of objectives in each of the knowledge areas. Furthermore, where the English faculty now devise their own survey assessment and evaluative tools, the University Assessment Committee would devise the assessment and evaluative tools for each of the knowledge areas. Thus, it remains for this Committee to identify the courses that meet the objectives in the knowledge areas, define how many objectives should be met in any one particular course and define the number of courses that must be taken in a given knowledge area. Fr. Rossi offered that the Committee also must sequence the objectives. Dr. Naylor and Professor Wiseman then suggested that in order to determine how many courses might be needed in one knowledge area or how many objectives could be covered in one course, the Committee should design a grid of objectives for each of the knowledge areas and then submit these to the different departments now charged with teaching responsibilities in the core to see which courses (and how many) address the various learning objectives. Dr. Malin noted, however, that some knowledge areas correspond with identifiable departments and some do not, suggesting that these grids should be sent to all departments across the University to seek their input as well.

At the conclusion of these discussions, Dr. Pustejovsky offered to devise a template that identifies objectives in the different knowledge areas and then structure a grid to link the various courses with the knowledge areas. Drs. Naylor and Laatsch offered to form a subcommittee to work with him on this project in advance of the next meeting. Left unresolved were questions about whether this document would be given to each department or whether the Committee would work with a single department (or a set of objectives in a single knowledge area) as a pilot study for feasibility purposes.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Reporter
Core Curriculum Review Committee
The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. on Saturday, February 3, 2001 in O’Hara Hall Room 107 by Dr. Nancy Snow. **Members Present:** Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Michele Malin, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Rev. Philip Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki and Prof. Christine Wiseman. **Members Excused:** Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Cheryl Maranto and Dr. Brian Unsworth.

The meeting opened with a prayer delivered by Fr. Rossi. Dr. Snow then called for additions or corrections to the minutes of the January 18, 2001 meeting. With respect to those minutes, the members suggested corrections to the second-last paragraph on page 3. In particular, Fr. Rossi suggested substituting the word “sequence” for “order the objectives.” Dr. Machan then noted that the words “on that basis” should be removed from the sentence defining the work of this Committee, and that the term “identify” should be substituted for the word “name,” such that the sentence should read: “Thus, it remains for this Committee to identify the courses that meet the objectives in the knowledge areas, define how many objectives should be met in any one particular course, and define the number of courses that must be taken in a given knowledge area.” As rewritten, he suggested that the statement provides perhaps the clearest indication of the Committee’s work. Dr. Eckman moved to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Dr. Pustejovsky and approved unanimously.

**Item A. Chair’s Report; Distribution of Minutes.** In accord with the scheme approved at its January 18 meeting, the Committee agreed to distribute to the Deans of the schools and colleges, and otherwise have the approved minutes of the meetings that occurred on October 31, 2000, December 15, 2000 and January 18, 2001 posted on the University website. The Committee also agreed to distribute its minutes to the members of the University Assessment Committee. Dr. Snow then announced that she had attended the February 2 meeting of the University Assessment Committee at the invitation of Prof. Wiseman to obtain a better sense of the issues facing that Committee and to better understand how the work of that Committee might inform the work of the Core Curriculum Review Committee. She announced that the Assessment Committee had determined to publish its minutes to the Chair of the Committee on Faculty, the Deans of all the undergraduate schools and colleges, and the Chairs in the College of Arts & Sciences. She then inquired whether the CCRC might adopt a similar approach.

Incident to this discussion, Dr. Deahl noted that the deans found these minutes particularly helpful, and Dr. Machan suggested that it was important for the CCRC as well as the Assessment Committee to distribute its minutes to these constituencies. Thus, the CCRC agreed by consensus to publish its minutes to the Deans of the undergraduate schools and colleges, the Chair of COF, and the Chairs of departments that teach undergraduate courses, and to post such minutes on the website. Drs. Malin and Pustejovsky then noted that, since some colleges do not organize by department, it was important to include the associate dean or chair of undergraduate curricula in that distribution scheme. At their request, Dr. Snow agreed to publish the CCRC minutes to Dr. Mary Pat Kunert (Chair of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee in Nursing) and Dr. Kathleen Karrer (Chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee in Arts & Sciences).

**Item B. Procedural Issues.**

1. **Operational Norms.** Dr. Shelly Malin expressed the view that her experience on committees and in work groups benefited proportionately from their ability to decide operational norms at the outset. The nature of the presiding norms could be left to the group. However, she suggested that it was important to reserve some time at the end of a meeting to reflect about group progress at the meeting: to decide what went well and what did not. She thought it particularly critical to this group, comprised of representatives from diverse departments and colleges, that its members strive to understand the perspectives and the language used by each when articulating a view or position. Other members agreed, and several suggested the following operational norms:
(a) (Dr. Deahl) members should agree to push for clarity of expression, when necessary, since Committee members each represent diverse areas;

(b) (Dr. Malin) it is imperative that Committee members engage in skillful discussion: members should advocate their positions but also inquire when matters are unclear;

(c) (Dr. Eckman) the members should use each other’s given names in discussions. [Reporter’s Note: Dr. Pustejovsky agreed to provide name cards for each member to be set out at the meetings];

(d) (Dr. Snow) members should avoid sidebar conversations since those detracted from meaningful discussion;

(e) (Consensus) the chair would reserve five or ten minutes at the end of each meeting to reflect upon progress at the meeting.

2. Voting by Proxy. Fr. Rossi inquired whether, on those occasions when a formal vote was taken, the Committee would adopt a procedure for voting by proxy or would simply base its vote upon the number of members present at the meeting. Prof. Wiseman suggested that proxy votes were appropriate since Academic Affairs had arrived at both the number of Committee members and their representation by design, in order to achieve some balance between the various departments in Arts & Sciences and the remaining undergraduate schools and colleges. Fr. Rossi then suggested that if the CCRC were inclined to allow formal vote by proxy, there were a number of means by which to do so: (a) employ a “second meeting” rule so that all members would have notice that discussions would take place at one meeting with a formal vote to follow at the next; (b) allow a representative to designate an alternate from his or her department or college to appear and vote on such matters, trusting in the prudential judgment of that colleague; (c) instruct that alternate to appear and vote in a specific manner, or (d) designate another member of the CCRC to cast an absentee ballot for the Committee member who could not be present for the vote. Prof. Wiseman suggested that allowing the full panoply of options was too cumbersome a process. She also suggested that vesting complete discretion in a department colleague who had not been present for discussions and could not contextualize the vote would not be prudent.

Following these discussions, Committee members generally favored a “two-meeting” rule. The first meeting would alert members to the need for a critical vote at the following meeting. Dr. Byleen added that the minutes of the initial meeting should therefore reflect substantive Committee deliberations, particularly when the members disagreed about an issue. Dr. Malin noted that such a process had worked well in the College of Nursing, and Dr. Laatsch added that the process would also allow members time to address the issue with other faculty in their departments or colleges. Notwithstanding this accord, Fr. Rossi also wanted the option of designating another member of the Committee to cast the vote for him at the second meeting should he be absent. Dr. Naylor responded that the Committee’s chair should be informed of a proxy vote in advance of the meeting. The Committee therefore adopted the following procedure by consensus:

(a) the Committee would follow a “second-meeting” rule whereby critical issues would be noticed at one meeting and voted on at the next;

(b) a formal motion regarding the critical issue would be made, seconded, and discussed at the first meeting such that the minutes could reflect the full deliberations;

(c) a vote on the critical issue would be taken at the second meeting;

(d) a Committee member could vote at the second meeting or designate a proxy for that vote from among the Committee membership, but if a proxy were designated, the chair would receive notice of such proxy at least 24 hours before the second meeting.

Item C. Visit by Mr. Greg Garber. Committee members discussed the nature and extent of the February 14 meeting with Mr. Greg Garber, Vice President for Finance. All agreed that Mr. Garber had performed significant service to the University, providing order and “a human face” to the financial process. Several suggested that the February 14 meeting should provide an opportunity for Mr. Garber to describe the current cost-study model, to hear the members’ concerns about the impact of this model on the success of core curricular reform, and to explore other models that might better serve the core. To this end, Dr. Snow and Prof. Wiseman would meet with Mr. Garber before the meeting, suggesting that he read the report of the Core Curriculum Review Steering Committee, if he had not already done so. The members
generally agreed that Mr. Garber might help in developing a new model to finance the core that was less dependent upon student enrollment. Mr. Garber could provide significant leadership for this effort. In terms of priorities, Dr. Heinrich expressed the majority view that it would be important to have Mr. Garber first offer an “operational introduction” so that all members could understand the cost-study model and its impact on the core; he opined that there was a general lack of information within the Committee about the prevailing financial model for the University. He suggested that it was also important to provide a time for questions, perhaps scheduling a second meeting with Mr. Garber if necessary.

**Item D. Framework for Evaluating Core Courses.** Dr. Nancy Snow informed the Committee that the final item on the agenda had been modified in order to consider the role of technology within the qualification of core courses. She suggested that the role of technology could be profitably folded into the discussion of some issues raised by the “Framing Document” submitted by Drs. Pustejovsky, Naylor and Laatsch. She and Prof. Wiseman also reported that the University Assessment Committee was working on an assessment template to pilot in Philosophy, and that these efforts would fit nicely into the CCRC Framework. She advised that the CCRC should consider assessment when they contemplate a model for the qualification of core courses.

Committee members then entertained some discussion of the role of assessment within the qualification of core courses. Several members of the Committee were already engaged in the process of assessment within their own colleges and programs. Dr. Malin offered that faculty eventually will appreciate that assessment is integral to the course, not merely something extra. However, all faculty will require some time to accommodate this new mode of thinking, i.e., moving from grade-based assessment to narrative-based assessment. She offered that faculty can do both, but they must be tutored in the process. Dr. Deahl also suggested that the CCRC must be careful to identify what can be measured, and Dr. Pustejovsky offered that there is a difference between program assessment and assessment of individual student learning. The latter is critical to our efforts, and program assessment will follow from the former.

Dr. Snow then turned to the Framework template and thanked the subcommittee members for their impressive efforts. [A copy of the template is attached to the original of these Minutes]. Dr. Pustejovsky explained the structure of the Framework document, offering that page 1, Part I focused on course objectives, content and pedagogy. Page 1, Part II focused on the context of the course for students, asking that the faculty describe connections and coherence with other core knowledge areas. Page 1, Part III then sought information on the administration of the course, including who would provide instruction and what resources were allocated. Each of the three Parts was organized in terms of working assumptions, nature of inquiry and objectives. Dr. Pustejovsky suggested that the Framework itself derived from earlier Committee submissions in Nursing, Engineering and English. Turning to page 2, he added that the document included a sample questionnaire to be completed by any faculty member proposing a core course. That form sought a listing of the relevant objectives, asked whether those objectives were met in the course, and then asked the faculty member to briefly describe how the course addressed the particular learning objective.

Returning to page 1, Part I, Dr. Wierzbicki questioned whether the course syllabus would be the only evidence sought from faculty to demonstrate that certain objectives were targeted for student learning in the course. Dr. Malin responded that other evidence would be appropriate and could include papers, final exams, presentations, etc. However, it would be important to convey to faculty that such documentation was being sought in order to gauge the measure of student learning and not a measure of teaching effectiveness.

The Committee agreed that the Framework was impressive and helpful, providing a context for future discussions. As a preliminary matter, Dr. Deahl noted that page 2, Question 3 (“How will students demonstrate that they have met the course objectives?”) was critical to assessment and might require greater direction. With regard to page 2, Question 5 (“How will instruction and content situate this knowledge area with respect to others in the core, and to the core as a whole?”), Dr. Pustejovsky remarked that faculty had been asked to discuss what it is they do to make a course a core course and then had been asked what they could say about the core as a whole at the A & S Conversations on Learning. Question 5 attempted to do the same thing: to inform faculty that the CCRC expects them to fit the course into the core and be aware of
how that course integrates the core. Fr. Rossi suggested that the question was important because integration of the core for students will only succeed if faculty themselves model the interaction. Others agreed that it was important for faculty to discuss an integrated core with each other and to articulate that rationale to students. Such discussions would be critical to faculty who must advise students and critical to the determination of when to waive core requirements for transfer students.

With respect to page 1, Part III, it was important to identify who would provide instruction in order to insure that the course would be “adequately supported with qualified staff.” Dr. Machan noted that the appointed phrase should be placed within the third column opposite “Who will provide instruction?” since that would be the object of the Committee’s inquiry. Dr. Eckman remarked that it would be important that core courses do not depend upon one faculty member, although others disagreed. Courses might be dropped from the core depending upon the prevalence of other core courses in the knowledge area or depending upon student enrollment.

As an aid to further discussion, Dr. Malin offered to complete the sample template, responding to the fourteen questions using one of the courses she now teaches. She will present the completed sample for discussion at the February 28 meeting. The Committee then agreed to rejoin its discussion on the template on February 14, following its meeting with Mr. Garber, or at the meeting on February 28. Prof. Wiseman also requested that the materials on Information Literacy Competency Standards, distributed at the meeting by Mr. Lowrey, be placed on the agenda for either of those meetings, consistent with the Committee’s determination to consider the role of technology within the qualification of core courses.

Item E. Meeting Review. Consistent with the norms earlier suggested, Committee members determined to review their progress at the meeting ten minutes before adjournment. Dr. Malin suggested that the meeting could close in one of two ways: (1) by asking each Committee member to voice an opinion in turn or (2) by inviting contributions from any interested member. The latter process was invoked de facto.

Committee members concluded that the meeting had been productive. Prof. Wiseman questioned the members’ reaction to the topic of assessment in conjunction with their work. Committee members responded that the discussion was useful; they would inform her if the discussion ranged too far afield. Committee members felt that it was important to be informed about assessment but they did not want to become sidetracked by considering specific issues more germane to the work of the University Assessment Committee. Dr. Byleen also suggested that the time might be nearing for a joint meeting of the two committees. Other members felt it was helpful to hear from Dr. Deahl and Prof. Wiseman about administrative concerns. With regard to other issues, the members felt: (1) Room 107 provided a good environment for discussion; (2) parking near O’Hara Hall would be important at night [Professor Wiseman will arrange]; (3) it was important that the meetings begin and end on time. Members commended Dr. Snow on her leadership and viewed the Committee’s work as an important step in bringing a stronger voice to faculty governance.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Reporter
Core Curriculum Review Committee
The meeting was called to order at 7:15 p.m. on Wednesday, February 14, 2001 in O’Hara Hall Room 107 by Dr. Nancy Snow. **Members Present:** Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Michele Malin, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Rev. Philip Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki and Prof. Christine Wiseman. **Members Excused:** Dr. Linda Laatsch and Dr. Brian Unsworth. **Guest:** Mr. Greg Garber, Vice President for Finance.

The meeting opened with a prayer delivered by Fr. Rossi from the Scottish Book of Common Order. As an abbreviated **Chair’s Report,** Dr. Snow announced that approved minutes of the meetings of October 31, 2000, December 15, 2000, and January 18, 2001, have been sent to the Deans of all undergraduate colleges, the chairs and program coordinators of all undergraduate departments, the chair of the Committee on Faculty, and the chairs of the curriculum development committees of the College of Nursing and the College of Arts & Sciences. They also have been posted on the University web site.

**Greg Garber Visit.** Consistent with the Committee invitation, extended after the February 3 meeting, Dr. Snow introduced Mr. Greg Garber, Vice President for Finance. He sought to describe the current cost-study model, to hear the members’ concerns about the impact of this model on the success of core curricular reform, and to explore other models that might better serve the core. Mr. Garber began with an “operational introduction” in order to provide a context for continuing discussions. He distributed a set of documents that provided a snapshot of the financial situation facing the University. These documents had been earlier shared at a Board of Trustees presentation. He explained that although investment losses had been reduced since 1996 and the endowment had grown from $152M to $259M in the current year, the University remains “under-resourced.” For example, the endowment is half the size it should be. Furthermore, although the University has achieved a balanced budget and redistributed some costs, there is a need to increase reserve dollars for the future. This step will be difficult given the high demands of labor and related costs. At present, the University has identified some $355M in capital needs for renovation and update of current structures. Although a small dent is made each year, the University has limited its capital spending to cash flow. The University also saved part of its surplus last year, but that step was more symbolic than effective.

Turning to the chart marking the University’s consolidated operating activities, Mr. Garber explained that 51% of the University’s revenues derive from tuition. However, since the institution is labor-intensive, 61% of its costs are occupied by labor. Furthermore, depreciation has gone up by 3% since 1996 because the assets acquired by the University in technology are consumed faster than others. From these charts, Mr. Garber identified a number of challenges facing the University. First and foremost, although there is no financial crisis at present, one could develop. He described the University’s financial status as “living hand to mouth.” Thus, as chief financial officer, Mr. Garber has sought to be proactive rather than reactive. Secondly, the University has been placed in a “negative unrestricted cash position” by the number of restricted and temporarily restricted accounts. In short, the University has no unrestricted cash. In some cases, he has discovered that the University’s restricted accounts are not legally restricted but historically restricted. In that regard, some of the accounts left untouched are actually designed for the very purpose for which the University is now spending its tuition dollars. Thus, he is reviewing all such accounts. Thirdly, the University’s revenue stream has fallen significantly short of resource demands. Last year alone, there was a $7M gap between revenues and operating expenses. As a result, the University removed any flexibility from the operating budgets to cover the deficit. This year, his office is attempting to build more flexibility into those budgets, but the process moves slowly. For the most part, the savings created by the Renewal Task Force have been absorbed by current operations.

Within the context of this background, Mr. Garber addressed the cost studies. He remarked that the cost studies are a management tool. They take the revenue stream of the University and match the costs incurred to generate those revenues, and they represent the current thinking of University administrators. He described the process of distributing resources among the components or departments in the University...
as follows. The University takes the net tuition of each student (less funded and unfunded discounts) and
distributes 15% of those monies to the Department in which the particular student has declared a major.
This is known as a “Finder’s Fee”. The percentage itself is arbitrary, decided by a group of deans and other
administrators, and it is allocated by student. The remaining 85% is assigned to the components, depending
on where the student actually takes his or her courses. Mr. Garber explained that although this process is
new, it will occur annually. The goal is to project the future. Moreover, each college has a target; if the
college does better than anticipated, it receives greater spending authority for the next year.

The University also assigns costs as against these revenues. The costs principally take the form of
direct costs (operating budget), costs of occupancy (total depreciation of the University spread among the
departments based upon the square footage they occupy, including administrative areas and classrooms)
and indirect costs (University overhead). He suggested that the indirect costs are measured by a percentage
of revenue but they should not exceed 35% of total revenues. It is expected that other areas of the
University that represent “overhead” will exercise fiscal restraint to keep those costs down.

Following these introductory explanations, Mr. Garber fielded questions from the Committee
members. A number of members suggested that if revenue follows individual students, the process itself,
particularly as applied to the core, could breed turf battles because the departments generate revenues from
students who take courses within those departments. Mr. Garber remarked, however, that he was open to
other methods for financing the core so long as equity was maintained. He also noted that the cost studies
should not be viewed as a barrier to core curricular reform. For example, the Committee might consider
setting core courses aside as a separate entity (like a department) by segregating revenues derived from
core courses and the costs for teaching those courses. He cautioned, however, that the process was a “zero
sum game” unless Academic Affairs could raise separate monies to finance the core. Thus, the revenues of
some departments would have to be shared. He also advised members that he would need to understand
what core inter-disciplinary courses would look like to arrive at a plan. In that regard, he advised members
that departmental budgets were largely based on history, augmented by certain added increments. He
suggested the need to move away from such budgets toward more responsibility-based budgeting. Without
a specific plan for re-allocation of resources, however, it would be difficult to finance new initiatives.

Some members responded that department chairs might need to make decisions in derogation of
the interests of their own departments, but Mr. Garber suggested that it was better for deans and department
chairs to make such decisions than financial administrators. He therefore suggested that the members of
this Committee must decide the operative criteria. The members then proffered suggestions such as
different multipliers for core courses (so that they might not be rewarded as much as other courses). Others
suggested financing the core by removing a small percentage across the board from the operating budget of
each undergraduate college and creating a fund for the core in which the relevant departments might
equitably participate. Long term, however, it will be necessary for the University to increase its revenues
for this purpose.

Dr. Snow and the members of the Committee thanked Mr. Garber for spending two full hours on
these matters. The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Reporter
Core Curriculum Review Committee
The meeting was called to order at 7:20 p.m. on Wednesday, February 28, 2001 in O’Hara Hall Room 107 by Dr. Nancy Snow. **Members Present:** Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Michele Malin, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Rev. Philip Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Brian Unsworth, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki and Prof. Christine Wiseman. **Members Excused:** Dr. Robert Deahl and Dr. Stephen Heinrich.

I. Minutes. The meeting opened with a prayer delivered by Fr. Philip Rossi. The minutes of the February 3 meeting were unanimously approved without amendment on motion of Dr. Ksobiech, as seconded by Dr. Laatsch. With respect to the minutes of February 14, 2001, Fr. Rossi noted that his prayer was taken from the *Scottish Book of Common Order*. At Dr. Machan’s suggestion, the Committee also acted by consensus to remove the following sentences from the concluding paragraph on page 2: “Whatever plan is chosen will create ripples within the colleges. Nevertheless, these adjustments will be necessary if a core curriculum is truly valued in the University’s mission of delivering a Jesuit education.” Dr. Machan offered that these sentences publicly portended a course of action which the Committee had not yet fully discussed or determined to adopt. As such, the effect of any Committee deliberations upon the current core is unknown and should not be implied. Dr. Maranto moved to adopt the February 14 minutes, as amended. That motion was seconded by Dr. Ksobiech and passed unanimously.

II. Chair’s Report. Dr. Snow reported that, at the request of Dr. Maranto, the CCRC’s approved minutes are now being sent electronically to Dr. Joseph Daniels, Chair of the Curriculum Review Committee in the College of Business Administration, as well as to others noted in the February 3 minutes. She also directed members of the CCRC to the minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting of February 21, 2001. Noting a change in the mention of one matter suggested by Professor Wiseman, those minutes are incorporated herein as follows:

**Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting of February 21, 2001.** The Committee met from 12-1:30 p.m. to discuss how best to proceed at this point. Professor Christine Wiseman was invited to give input from Academic Affairs. She reported that Dr. Buckholdt has stated that finding a way to finance the University core curriculum, at least while it is in its “start up” phase, will now be a main concern of Academic Affairs. The Committee decided that the groundwork has been laid for consideration of proposals for courses to qualify as University core courses. Completion of the template is the last remaining work to be done, and this can be undertaken at the February 28 meeting. Input from the faculty is now required for decisions concerning which courses should qualify as core courses, and how many courses should comprise the core. The Committee discussed a timeframe for soliciting proposals, and decided to request proposals within the few days following the February 28 meeting. A reasonable deadline for proposals is approximately one month after the call, April 9, 2001. Given that most departments participated in formulating learning objectives for the knowledge areas, one month should be sufficient time for proposals to be formulated.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nancy E. Snow, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Philosophy
Chair, Core Curriculum Review Committee

III. Publishing the Call for Core Courses.

A. Cover Letter. As noted in the above minutes, the Executive Committee proposed publishing a call to all University colleges, departments and units for courses that might qualify as core courses. It
suggested publishing the call shortly after the February 28 meeting and establishing a reasonable time frame within which those units could respond. The call for courses would include a cover letter from the Committee, accompanied by the revised template, which would incorporate an area for “Assessment.” Dr. Snow suggested that the goal would be to have some courses approved by the end of the spring semester. Moreover, since faculty would be in process of submission between the end of February and the beginning of April, she proposed canceling the meetings now scheduled for March 17 and March 28, holding an additional meeting on April 16.

Several faculty agreed with the proposal but suggested modifications. Among them, Dr. Machan added that the cover letter should contextualize the process within the CCRC. In particular, the letter should indicate that the CCRC is examining extant courses to assess how well they meet objectives, but the actual core has not yet been determined. He also offered that, to the extent a de facto core can be measured by Dan Gemoll’s numbers or Appendix 6 of the original Steering Committee report, those statistics offer a baseline comparison as the Committee moves forward.

Fr. Rossi cautioned that it was important to frame the call in such a way that the Committee did not receive a mere “repackaging” of what is already there. Thus, he suggested that it might be necessary to determine first whether the proposed template could effectively identify core courses. In that regard, it might be important to offer a “provisional template” and run a pilot study since the Committee might need practice in evaluating core courses under the template. He agreed that the cover letter should indicate to faculty that the Committee was moving forward in its deliberations by seeking this additional information, with opportunity for feedback between the Committee and the Departments, thereby continuing its efforts to encourage a participatory process.

The Committee then followed with a discussion of how and to whom the call should issue. Dr. Wierzbicki suggested that the memo should be sent to chairs, who would be asked for a sample of courses that might be submitted. He cautioned that there were still questions about how many objectives should or could be met in any one course. Thus, the Committee should form some idea about the number of courses needed in any given knowledge area. Others commented that some departments could have a dozen courses that might qualify as core courses, and it would be unreasonable to ask them to complete the template for all such courses in five weeks. Dr. Machan added that the template could provide important information in two respects: (1) it would give the Committee an opportunity to make some progress in qualifying core courses, and (2) it would give the Committee a sense of how many courses might be needed to satisfy the learning objectives in any given knowledge area. He also reminded the Committee that the creation of a new course was the responsibility of the department, but the certification of those courses within the core would be the responsibility of this Committee. Dr. Byleen then suggested that the Committee should invite each department, college or school to propose up to three courses which would best meet the learning objectives in any of the nine knowledge areas. The Committee agreed to this framework, and Dr. Snow invited Committee members to e-mail her with the specific names of recipients beyond those mentioned above.

Dr. Malin added that the Committee should insure that the course template is easy to use, noting that it took her 2-3 hours to complete the template. She asked that the Committee include a set of analysis questions regarding the template and that the cover letter reference the membership roster if respondents have any questions about the template. Finally, she suggested that the template be particularized to each knowledge area and then placed on the web site with links to the various knowledge areas and the committee membership. In response to other concerns, Dr. Laatch proposed that the cover letter suggest an initial deadline for submissions, to be followed by others. Dr. Unsworth noted that the template could spur discussion of other related issues. For example, the Biology department might wish to devise and offer new, more exciting courses that would meet the science and nature objectives. However, staffing issues would preclude that ability. Other members suggested that Dr. Unsworth had offered a salient reason for graduated submission deadlines. The Committee then agreed that it would propose Wednesday, April 11 as the initial deadline and that it would meet on Monday, April 16 from 9:00 a.m. until noon in order to consider the first wave of core proposals. Until then, it would cancel the March 17 and March 28 meetings. Dr. Snow would investigate whether Cudahy Hall, Room 143 was available for the April 16 meeting.
B. The Template. With that, the Committee turned to Dr. Shelly Malin’s completed template for Health 025 (Culture and Health), submitted in response to the Diverse Cultures objectives. (A copy of her template is attached to the original of these minutes). Noting again that it took her 2-3 hours to complete the template, Dr. Malin observed that it was fairly straight-forward. She also thought that it was sometimes tricky to respond to the objectives since they were written at different levels: some were very general and some very specific. She suggested there would probably be significant feedback on that front. She also surmised that a single course might not satisfy all learning objectives in any given case, but that learning objectives might be sequenced if more than one course was required in a given knowledge area.

In terms of the Committee’s review process, she and Dr. Naylor suggested that the Committee should consider asking the instructor or department chair to consult about a particular course, but that someone other than the instructor should make the presentation to the Committee. Their explanation should be so sufficient that people who are not conversant in the field would understand the proposal. Dr. Malin also suggested that the Committee might request syllabi or assignment guidelines for any given course. In terms of assessment, it would only be necessary for this Committee to judge that there are appropriate ways of meeting or measuring the learning objectives; the Committee could not assess the veracity of those measures. Dr. Malin and others expressed greatest concern over Question No. 5: “How will instruction and content situate this knowledge area with respect to others in the core, and to the core as a whole?” Committee members debated whether to exclude this question entirely or include it in some other form. The members agreed that it was important to encourage respondents to examine objectives in other knowledge areas and determined that Dr. Snow should recraft the question to ask: “How do the learning objectives satisfied in this course overlap or interconnect with learning objectives in other knowledge areas and the Preamble?” The Committee also agreed to omit Question No. 10, asking whether “any special facilities and/or technology are a critical part of the course.” Members agreed that information literacy was important to the core but would determine its impact at a later date.

Following this discussion, Dr. Malin agreed that the completed template on Health 025 should be placed on the web as a model. Dr. Snow then agreed to devise a cover letter for distribution to Committee members in advance of any distribution among the faculty. She announced that the Committee would next meet on April 16, and the Committee moved to its closure program.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Reporter
Core Curriculum Review Committee
The meeting was called to order at 7:20 p.m. on Wednesday, May 2, 2001 in Cudahy Hall Room 143 by Dr. Nancy Snow. **Members Present:** Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Michele Malin, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Rev. Philip Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki and Prof. Christine Wiseman.

Dr. Nancy Snow opened the meeting by asking Fr. Rossi to offer a prayer. Fr. Rossi responded with a reading from Chapter 6 of the Book of Solomon. After concluding the prayer, he noted that this function might be better served as a shared responsibility among members of the Committee. Dr. Snow noted his observation and suggested that she would invite others to offer an opening prayer at future meetings.

Dr. John Pustejovsky then announced that he had been invited that afternoon by Dr. Phillip Naylor to attend the last World Civilization lecture in the Varsity Theatre, which would also mark the end of academic lectures in that building. Dr. Pustejovsky noted that only four faculty had taught in that building, all of whom had won University awards for teaching excellence. He congratulated Dr. Naylor on the conclusion of a fine tradition and noted that, just as the University was moving in a new direction with respect to this tradition, it was also moving in a new direction with respect to the core of common studies.

**I. Minutes.** Dr. Snow remarked that two sets of minutes were pending for Committee approval. The first was the set of minutes for the *April 16* meeting. With respect to these minutes, Dr. Machan observed that no agreement regarding the “prima facie” standard proposed by Professor Wiseman had been reached. He therefore suggested deleting the last two sentences in the first full paragraph under subsection V. He also noted that the standard for determining the sufficiency of any supporting evidence should be placed on the agenda for specific debate since this matter also called into question the sufficiency of the template, for which the Committee had sought specific feedback. Fr. Rossi then suggested that the paragraph covering Theology 157 be amended, such that the second sentence of the paragraph would read as follows: “The Theology Department submitted this course because it believed that Theo 157 and other third-level courses were necessary to integrate the learning objectives of Theo 001 and the second-level Theology courses.” There being no further corrections to the minutes, Dr. Ken Ksobiech moved to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Dr. John Pustejovsky and passed unanimously. Dr. Snow advised that the minutes of April 16 would be redacted before being placed on the web in view of their sensitive nature.

With respect to the minutes of *April 21*, Committee members suggested the following: (1) that the wording in Section V concerning “The Core Curriculum,” be amended to substitute the word “specific” for the word “finite” on both occasions of its use; (2) that a parenthetical sentence be inserted in the same section suggesting that, “Dr. Naylor objected and would have favored postponing the discussion;” (3) that the third last sentence in the section on page 5 of the minutes be removed entirely and the preceding sentence amended to read, “. . .that Fr. Rossi had submitted several memos regarding the integrative nature of the core,” and (4) that the first full paragraph on page 4 of the minutes be amended to read as follows:

“In an effort to initiate discussions on the size of the core, Dr. Stephen Heinrich stated that the College of Engineering now required 30-32 credits in what might be considered ‘core’ credits outside the areas of study in their majors. He suggested that while the College probably could withstand a core of 35 or 36 credits and still graduate its students in four years, it would be extremely problematic if the core courses exceeded 36 credits. Other College representatives communicated their threshold requirements as well. Dr. Laatsch indicated that her College could accept a common core of 36 credits if core requirements in Mathematical Reasoning and Science and Nature could be filled by courses in the major. Dr. Cheryl Maranto likewise responded that since the College of Business currently is considering a core of 39 credits, they could readily
accept a core of 36. Dr. Eckman noted that since students taught by the School of Education were actually enrolled in the College of Arts & Sciences and the College of Communication, those cores would apply to Education students.

There being no further amendments to the April 21 minutes, Dr. John Pustejovsky moved to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ellen Eckman and passed unanimously.

II. Chair’s Report. Dr. Snow indicated that, along with Professor Wiseman, she and Dr. Ksobiech had appeared before the Board of Trustees to provide a history of the core process, the specifics of core curricular progress, and insights on the process gleaned from the various departments and colleges. The Board’s comments indicated that it was pleased with the Committee’s progress thus far and supportive of its efforts. Of particular note, Fr. Toppel raised issues regarding the place of justice in the Marquette core of common studies. The parties discussed some ideas regarding courses and strategies, which Dr. Snow would pursue with the Committee at a future meeting.

Dr. Snow then noted that she had been invited to a University Town Hall meeting to discuss progress on the core. That meeting would replace the Academic Senate and would occur on May 16 from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. She also reported that the Committee’s determination to hold an all-University core curricular conference in the fall had received the unanimous support of interested deans and Dr. David Buckholdt. In that regard, Drs. Malin, Maranto and Pustejovsky volunteered to coordinate the event, and other members were invited to participate. Fr. Rossi cautioned that planning for the conference should include the option for continued follow-up, noting that the fall effort should not culminate in a one-shot event. Dr. Maranto suggested that it might be wise to host a more limited event each semester. Finally, Dr. Snow reported that the Office of Communication would delay any on-going call for core courses in News and Views until that issue was decided, instead publishing a progress report on the call.

II. The Continued Process. Having concluded her report, the Chair inquired about issuing a general call for core courses and the possibility of subcommittee meetings over the course of the summer. Fr. Rossi offered that any questions about the sufficiency of supporting evidence to qualify core courses should be settled before issuing a general call for core courses. He also suggested that the Committee should reflect on its process thus far, taking care to observe the larger objectives of the core as enunciated in the Preamble and to focus on the issue of sequencing, beyond integration of core courses. He noted that it makes a difference whether the students taught are lower or upper division students. Dr. Machan then cautioned about issuing a general call for additional courses at this time, echoing Fr. Rossi’s concern that the Committee should take time to reflect on the process and agree on standards, lest the momentum of moving ahead substitute for a process that has been carefully deliberated.

Dr. Eckman responded that the Committee has utilized a reasoned process, but noted that it is an evolving process. Dr. Eckman then inquired whether some sequencing was already occurring in the de facto existing core, and whether only certain courses should be sequenced. Dr. Maranto responded that attention should be paid to integration of core courses but observed that many of the larger issues of Jesuit pedagogy centered on delivering the core. She added that there should be some dialogue between instructors about how the knowledge areas are integrated, including delivery, methods and sequencing. However, the qualification of core courses might still proceed apace. She noted that it was important for faculty to view each other’s syllabi; integration would not occur until that exchange becomes more common. She offered that it might be important to widen the membership of the various subcommittees now operating in each of the knowledge areas. Dr. Malin agreed, noting that once a course is qualified as a core course, there are added responsibilities for each instructor, which should be addressed. Dr. Malin added that the Committee and the instructors would need to know more about how students learn before the Committee could adopt overriding principles governing sequencing.

Dr. Snow then commented that the Preamble should be revised or refined in terms of what is learned by the Committee. She also inquired whether the qualification of core courses was permanent or provisional. Dr. Heinrich added that the Committee needed a common procedure for feedback on the various templates already submitted. He emphasized that the template currently in use was very effective
for some purposes. Dr. Snow agreed, noting that the template offers a good, basic tool that probably needs to be adjusted. She suggested that enough information could be gleaned from the templates to know that some courses clearly qualify and some do not.

Dr. Ksobiech observed that the Committee had identified a combination of topics that might be considered over the summer. In particular, he and Dr. Pustejovsky noted that much could be learned by studying the templates already submitted. Members suggested that it might be important to invite the University Registrar, Mr. Tony Tortorella, to discuss with the Committee how much sequencing already occurs. Dr. Pustejovsky noted that some intentional sequencing clearly occurs; however, the intent now implemented is not the instructional intent behind the core. Dr. Heinrich offered that instructors or departments might be asked to pay particular attention to the integration and assessment questions on the template. Fr. Rossi added that the template could also ask instructors about the role justice plays in each of their courses. Dr. Snow, cautioned, however, that faculty time is jealously guarded and that efforts to coordinate these knowledge areas across departments should be rewarded, particularly in the promotion and tenure process. Dr. Maranto offered that the Committee could also utilize a “carrot and stick” approach: if instructors or departments fail to do certain things, their courses will not be included in the core. Dr. Wierzbicki cautioned, however, that it might be impractical to require extensive assurances of commonality in the core. The Committee might use the influence of department chairs to cajole faculty into reworking their syllabi but it would be difficult to torpedo an entire course because of what occurs in one section.

Professor Wiseman questioned the Committee about what was meant by integration of core courses with the larger purposes of the Preamble. Dr. Maranto offered that the larger purpose of integration was to help students build a mental map or world view that was informed by Jesuit education. Professor Wiseman then suggested that the Committee consider identifying non-curricular core experiences, such as those contemplated by the Core Steering Committee in its original report when it described the core as a composite of courses and experiences. In particular, she noted that justice should be experience-based rather than course-based. Mr. Lowrey agreed, noting that much of what we do as a University is reflected in the volunteer and service traditions of our students rather than in specific course work. Fr. Rossi then noted that efforts to frame these core experiences could be the subject of extramural funding.

Dr. Deahl commented that these discussions are integral to the process of core reform, noting that Marquette University is not a small liberal arts college but a University facing many challenges. It would be important to move the core process in stages. Where the Committee has obtained feedback, it could revise the template and in doing incorporate other critical questions. He suggested it was important to move forward and identify areas of further conversation. Dr. Naylor responded that the need for summer meetings required a decision. The Committee agreed, therefore, to schedule up to four meetings this summer at the discretion of the Chair. Those members who were available would attend the meetings. Dr. Deahl suggested that the minutes reflect a list of key items or issues. The Executive Committee then would derive a plan for dealing with these outstanding issues over the course of the summer. The Committee agreed that the following outstanding issues should be addressed:

- refined template and evidentiary standards governing learning objectives
- duration of any course approval
- feedback procedures for pending template submissions
- general guidelines for template submissions
- integration and sequencing
- number of credits in the common core
- fall conference
V. Concluding Business. The Committee determined that it would conclude its meetings for this academic year on Thursday, May 17 from 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. in CU 143 (if available). Dr. Snow then directed each Committee member to e-mail their summer schedules so that dates could be announced for the summer meetings. Dr. Snow further advised that the Committee would resume its discussion of the specific number of credits within the common core at the May 17 meeting. The meeting then closed with a roundtable discussion of progress and adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Reporter
Core Curriculum Review Committee
The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. on Thursday, May 17, 2001 in Cudahy Hall Room 143 by Dr. Nancy Snow.  

**Members Present:** Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Michele Malin, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Rev. Philip Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki and Prof. Christine Wiseman.  

**Members Absent or Excused:** Dr. Phillip Naylor.

Dr. Nancy Snow opened the meeting by offering a reflection from Fr. Peter-Hans Kolvenbach’s address on the “Service of Faith and the Promotion of Justice in American Jesuit Higher Education.” In particular, she focused on the concluding paragraphs of the address, noting that Fr. Kolvenbach had identified an agenda for Jesuit education during the next decade of the 21st century. She also suggested that the Committee might want to offer a study session on this message at its fall conference. Dr. Snow then welcomed Dr. James Courtright, Professor of Biology, who would replace Dr. Brian Unsworth on the Committee as a College of Arts & Sciences representative from the Sciences.

**I. Minutes.** Dr. Snow directed the Committee’s attention to the May 2 minutes and asked for additions or corrections. In that regard, all revisions were directed at Part III, “The Continued Process.” In particular, members noted that students should be differentiated as upper or lower division, rather than upper or lower class. Paragraph 2 of the same section should read “course” instead of “core,” and the first full paragraph on page 3 should replace “Dr. Pustejovsky added” with “It was suggested.” Moreover, the middle two sentences were amended to read: “Dr Heinrich offered that instructors or departments might be asked to pay particular attention to the integration and assessment questions on the template. Fr. Rossi added that the template could also ask instructors about the role justice plays in each of their courses.” There being no further additions or corrections, Dr. Robert Deahl moved to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Dr. John Pustejovsky and passed unanimously.

**II. Chair’s Report.** By way of written agenda, Dr. Snow offered a summary of the Committee’s progress thus far, commenting on the issues covered at each of the meetings from December 15, 2000 through May 2, 2001. She also reported that Drs. Virginia Chappell and Robert Masson from the Assessment Committee had volunteered to help plan the fall core curricular conference. She then noted that a component of the University’s core initiative was under serious consideration for inclusion in a grant proposal submitted to the Eli Lilly Foundation. Since Fr. Rossi was a member of Marquette’s coordinating team, he was asked to offer relevant comment.

Fr. Rossi reported that the Lilly Foundation had invited fifty religiously-affiliated schools to submit a proposal on the theological foundations of vocation. Each was offered a $50,000 planning grant to enable them to submit proposals that might generate up to $2 million over a five-year period. As the recipient of a planning grant, Marquette University has begun a process to develop programs consistent with this initiative. Fr. Rossi explained that the Lilly Foundation was interested in developing future generations of church leaders and therefore sought to encourage undergraduate students to pursue this leadership as part of their life’s work. Thus, the Lilly initiative is intended to affect the student body at large, both in the classroom and in other areas of campus life. Although this initiative creates opportunities for course development, Fr. Rossi was unsure whether those courses could be directly related to the core of common studies. However, it was possible that some of the courses generated for the Lilly grant could also qualify as core courses. In that regard, he suggested that the coordinating team might host a workshop to which instructors could be invited in order to reflect on the process and develop course proposals.

When Professor Wiseman asked whether the grant might be applied to develop concepts of justice within the core, Fr. Rossi replied that the Church’s concept of vocation had shifted since Vatican II to include everyone within the faith community. However, the Lilly Foundation did not have a strong sense of that shift or how that shift might encompass justice issues. Nevertheless, since the Lilly Foundation also sought to respect the distinctive religious traditions of the institutions involved, it could be argued that...
Catholic Jesuit institutions might implicate a need for justice as a distinctive element within their proposals. Dr. Snow then indicated that the Executive Committee wished to pursue these conversations with the coordinating team to investigate whether the Lilly Foundation might fund such a core proposal. By consensus, the Committee authorized the Executive Committee to pursue such conversations.

Dr. Snow next addressed the e-mail messages from Dr. David Buckholdt and Dean Madeline Wake regarding timelines for revising any college core curricula. In particular, members questioned whether Dr. Buckholdt’s suggestion of a November 1, 2001 deadline for the colleges shortened the original time frame within which this Committee sought to define the larger core of common studies, upon which each college was expected to rely in defining its own core. Professor Wiseman suggested that Dr. Buckholdt had intended merely to remind the colleges about their need to build upon the core of common studies in sufficient time to meet publication deadlines for the admissions materials. However, she did not perceive that he had intended to circumscribe the work of this Committee. Dr. Snow suggested that the Committee should resolve this issue in its discussions with Dr. Buckholdt, who was scheduled to meet with the Committee on May 25.

Finally, Dr. Snow reported that the executive Committee had met on Wednesday, May 16, 2001 and discussed three issues as follows: (1) it endorsed Dr. Snow’s suggestion to invite Dr. Stephanie Quade, who is also a member of the Lilly grant coordinating team, to join the Core Curriculum Review Committee as a representative from Student Affairs; (2) it determined to seek the support of the CCRC in pursuing further conversations about inclusion of core curricular initiatives in the Lilly grant proposal, and (3) it determined to open the discussion of number of credits in the common core by soliciting general comments from the members, following Robert’s Rules of Order with respect to any motions that might arise.

III. Number of Credits in the University Core of Common Studies.

As a prelude to continuing discussion on the number of credits within the proposed core of common studies, Mr. James Lowrey placed on a board the initial proposal, as reflected in the April 21 minutes. That proposal consisted of the following:

**Theology and Philosophy**
- Theology (6)
- Human Nature & Ethics (6)

**Humanities**
- Literature/Performing Arts (3)
- Foreign Languages/Diverse Cultures (3)
- Histories of Cultures & Societies (3)
- Rhetoric (6)

**Sciences**
- Mathematical Reasoning (3)
- Science & Nature (3)
- Individual & Social Behavior (3)

Total: 36 credits

Fr. Rossi began the discussion by asking how the core of common studies would be communicated to the undergraduate schools and colleges. He was concerned about the context within which the numbers would be communicated and stressed that it would be important to identify a pedagogical rationale for both the number of credits and the allocation of credits among the different knowledge areas. He noted that the Committee itself had not entertained that discussion and cautioned that to publish the numbers without such a rationale might discourage the individual colleges from building upon the common core. Dr. Deahl agreed with Fr. Rossi, noting that it would be important to “put language around this determination.” He commented that it would be unwise to repeat the work of the Core Curriculum Steering Committee, but added that it would be important to convey substance in a pedagogically sound manner. He further
suggested that a subgroup of the CCRC should present the Committee’s determination to the Dean’s Council as well. Dr. Wierzbicki and Dr. Laatsch likewise agreed with Fr. Rossi, but suggested that appropriate language had likely been developed in the several iterations of the Preamble. Dr. Wierzbicki noted that the purpose of Marquette’s core of common studies should be to ensure that students graduate with some basic skills, both quantitative and rhetorical, and to expose students to content areas and modes of thought. However, he cautioned that proficiency in content areas should be left to the majors. Professor Wiseman agreed, noting that the individual cores developed by the colleges were intended to be supplementary and to develop proficiency in areas consistent with their own mission.

Dr. Machan then offered that there was long-standing differentiation between core requirements and general education requirements. He offered that a core emerged from certain institutional principles such that its graduates could be uniquely identified as having emerged from that institution. Thus, to the extent Dr. Wierzbicki’s concept prevailed, it more properly described general education requirements. Dr. Machan also offered that, given Marquette’s configuration as a university comprised of many different colleges, it might not be possible to do more than implement general education requirements rather than a proposed core of common studies.

At Dr. Snow’s suggestion, copies of Professor Wiseman’s document entitled, “Formatting the Core,” which described the process thus far, was distributed to each Committee member. The Committee then discussed to what extent the individual colleges could be expected to build upon the common core, given the restraints in some majors. Dr. Snow summarized that the number thirty-six represented the upper limit in terms of credits allocable to the core of common studies, given the needs of the individual colleges. Members commented that although a number greater than thirty-six might be optimal, that number could be unworkable given enrollment needs in the various colleges, which must compete for students with other academic institutions. Members concluded that though it might be “distasteful” to arrive at a specific number of credits for the core of common studies, the individual schools and colleges could not decide their own cores without that number. Committee members then discussed the fact that core objectives might be met by mandating core “experiences” without increasing the number of credits. These might involve capstone courses, senior papers, service learning requirements, or seminars. Each college might be expected to work this experience into its own core requirements.

Concluding this discussion, Dr. Ken Ksobiech moved that the Committee adopt a thirty-six hour core of common studies, in the configuration noted above, for Marquette University. The motion was seconded by Dr. John Pustejovsky. Dr. Pustejovsky then offered a historical explanation for the present dilemma, noting that the ratio offered the single method for informing higher education for 350 years, until the majors were introduced. At that point, the majors considered themselves the single organizational method for informing higher education. Dr. Pustejovsky suggested that only flexibility would allow these competing organizational methods to co-exist.

During discussion on the motion, Fr. Rossi indicated that he would likely vote against the motion because the Committee still had not articulated a rationale with respect to the principles that would inform the formation of the core. He was reluctant to support a motion on a number at this time if that number were not connected with some explicit form of justification. Others agreed that a dialogue about formative principles was necessary among the faculty, but that such a dialogue would not occur until the Committee first published a number for the core of common studies. Dr. Snow responded that she never anticipated publishing a set of numbers without accompanying rationale. She then asked for volunteers to create a subcommittee that might fashion a rationale for the number and allocation of credit hours. Volunteer members included Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Fr. Phil Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow and Professor Christine Wiseman. They agreed to meet and devise a rationale in advance of the May 25 meeting. Dr. Pustejovsky volunteered to forward the various versions of the Preamble to each volunteer by electronic mail. Dr. Wierzbicki also asked each college representative on the Committee to organize a list of cognates that students must take to fulfill their core requirements. Each agreed to do so for the May 25 meeting.

V. Concluding Business. Dr. Snow advised that the agenda for May 25 would include further discussion and a vote on the pending motion, in accord with the Committee’s two-meeting rule. She then
clarified the proxy rule for Committee members. She also urged Committee members to review the core templates since she anticipated additional motions on May 25 to approve various course submissions. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Reporter
Core Curriculum Review Committee
The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. on Friday, May 25, 2001 in Cudahy Hall Room 143 by Dr. Nancy Snow. Members Present: Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Rev. Philip Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki and Prof. Christine Wiseman. Members Absent or Excused: Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Stephen Heinrich and Dr. Michele Malin.

Dr. Robert Deahl opened the meeting by offering a reflection that invoked the principles of wisdom. Dr. Snow then welcomed Dr. Stephanie Quade, who joined the Committee as a nonvoting representative from the Office of Student Affairs.

I. Appearance by Dr. David Buckholdt. Dr. Snow introduced Dr. David Buckholdt, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Institutional Planning, who was invited to speak with the Committee about issues surrounding development of the core of common studies. Dr. Buckholdt announced that he was pleased with the work of the Committee and appreciated the members’ extraordinary commitment of time to the efforts of core reform. Dr. Buckholdt suggested that Fr. Wild and the Board of Trustees were also pleased. In particular, he noted that Fr. Toppel (Trustee emeritus) had returned for a presentation on the core delivered to the Trustees by Dr. Snow, Dr. Ksobiech and Professor Wiseman. Fr. Toppel had been skeptical that the work of core revision would progress but was “pleased to be wrong.” Dr. Buckholdt reported that all parties anticipated successful implementation of the new core.

Dr. Buckholdt also noted that his e-mail message to deans and directors had contained an error. He expected that core revisions would be implemented during the fall of 2003, not 2002 as earlier reported. He suggested that it was most important to have a plan of core studies for North Central and to display a process that permitted faculty governance and faculty control. He remarked that North Central and other professional accrediting agencies increasingly look to the core of common studies to integrate university mission. His attention now would be directed at the efforts of individual colleges to implement their own supplemental cores. He and Fr. Wild would be scrutinizing this effort to ensure that the individual schools and colleges enacted rigorous cores in all cases rather than “slipping to the lowest common denominator.”

Dr. Buckholdt remarked that pending administrative issues included enrollment and marketing to incoming students. In that regard, he sought a core curriculum that was a “signature piece for Marquette University” – a significant statement about the value of a Marquette education. He therefore asked the Committee to be mindful of that goal, even though it was not the Committee’s focus. He explained that neither the faculty nor the Board of Trustees considered the “old core” a work of proudful accomplishment in the sense that each knew or acknowledged its importance. In closing, he considered the Committee’s work in defining the core of common studies by a new paradigm (knowledge areas) to be a “giant first step.”

Dr. Deahl remarked that collaborative conversations had emerged from the work of core reform. He hoped that the Center for Teaching and Learning would play a significant role in advancing and continuing these conversations. Dr. Buckholdt acknowledged that his vision for the center included a place to strengthen interdisciplinary discussions and discussions regarding the vocation of teaching, although he cautioned that some viewed the center’s function more narrowly, to advance the work of technology and teaching.

Fr. Rossi acknowledged that the core of common studies should ideally represent a signature piece but expressed concern that the process might not yield that refinement. Dr. Buckholdt responded that the new core structure held far more potential for interdisciplinary work; in that way it represented something distinctive and unique. He also noted that the proposed core was much more definitive, even within the courses themselves, since instructors could now define a set of learning objectives for courses in the same knowledge areas. He added that there existed a potential for connectedness and progression that did not exist in what purported to be the old core. In response to additional questions from Committee members, Dr. Buckholdt noted that administrators held no resistance to these changes in format. He observed that the
an academic theme predominating university education today assumes that majors are the only way to organize post-secondary education. Not enough thought has been given to the fact that most students will not earn advanced degrees. He offered that the “touchstone” must be the focus on students and what they will need, rather than the needs of the particular discipline. He noted that any disagreements regarding core issues would be resolved in the Office of Academic Affairs in conversations between him and the various deans. However, there are no immediate controversies since the schools and colleges are only beginning their efforts at integrating a common core.

Dr. Naylor then asked whether the University would provide the resources necessary to foster cross-disciplinary development of courses. Dr. Buckholdt responded that a strong core would require financial support from the University. He would seek to budget separately for the core and for those who administer and teach in the core, perhaps according these faculty some special status or some special consideration during promotion and tenure. Though he disfavored the “scholarship of teaching” as a concept, he thought to provide special consideration for instructors who approach teaching in a passioned way. He acknowledged, however, that the most troublesome cross-disciplinary development issue would be the methodology of the cost-studies, since that methodology does not encourage interdisciplinary work among faculty. He suggested further that there must be some interplay between enrollment and the operating budget. Finally, Dr. Buckholdt acknowledged that core experiences were as necessary to the core of common studies as core courses; all of these are necessary to show parents that a Marquette education is worth the cost of tuition. However, Dr. Buckholdt rejected the suggestion that a member of the CCRC or the assessment committee should hold membership simultaneously on the marketing task force since he did not want the task force to become unduly large. Concluding the discussion with members of the CCRC, Dr. Buckholdt departed the committee meeting at 9:50 a.m.

II. Minutes. Dr. Snow directed the Committee’s attention to the unapproved minutes of May 17, 2001 and asked for additions or corrections. The members suggested the following: (1) Dr. James Courtright would replace Dr. Brian Unsworth as the “College of Arts & Sciences representative from the Sciences;” (2) the Lilly Foundation grant would total $2 million over the next five years; (3) Dr. Machan’s concluding thoughts in the last sentence of the first full paragraph on page 3 of the minutes should read: “it might not be possible to do more than implement general education requirements rather than a core of common studies;” and (4) the second sentence in the second full paragraph on page 3 should be removed entirely. There being no further additions or corrections, Dr. Linda Laatsch moved to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ellen Eckman and passed unanimously.

III. Chair’s Report. After welcoming Dr. Quade once again, Dr. Snow noted that she would be meeting with Fr. Timothy Lannon, S.J., Vice President for University Advancement, that afternoon from 4:00-5:00 p.m. She proposed to discuss grant opportunities for the core curricular initiative. She reported as well that she had contacted Dr. Susan Mountin, Acting Director of University Ministry and another member of the Lilly Foundation grant coordinating team, to convey the Committee’s support of ongoing conversations regarding the interplay between core curricular revision and the grant proposal.

IV. Vote on Pending Motion Regarding Total Credits in the Core of Common Studies. In accord with the notice provided by the agenda, Dr. Snow announced that she would entertain thirty minutes of additional discussion on the motion regarding the total number of credits in the core of common studies, as made at the May 17 meeting. That time could be enlarged in the event of a new or pressing need to continue the discussion. Dr. Snow also announced that she had received proxy votes from Drs. Jim Courtright, Steve Heinrich, Shelly Malin and Mike Wierzbicki. However, since Dr. Wierzbicki was in fact present at the meeting, she would discard his proxy in favor of his immediate vote. She then referred the members to the allocation of credits, as described by the May 17 minutes. That allocation is repeated below:

Theology and Philosophy
Theology (6)
Human Nature & Ethics (6)
Various members voiced support or opposition to the motion. Among those opposed, members noted that the allocation noted above did not sufficiently constitute a “signature piece” marking the identity of a Marquette education. In particular, Dr. Machan noted his concern that the above did not represent the best way for Marquette to identify its educational mission. He was unsure about the kind of education defined by a core structured in this fashion and would welcome the opportunity to do something more. Dr. Laatsch responded that the proposed core did offer something more, defining knowledge areas and learning objectives that were consistent with the Mission of the University and the Preamble to the Core of Common Studies. Fr. Rossi then renewed his objection, remarking that the motion was premature since it was unaccompanied by a supporting rationale. He failed to discern from the proposed core a pedagogy of persons as opposed to a pedagogy of knowledge areas. Dr. Snow responded that she sought to keep the question of number of credits separate from the unifying language. Dr. Deahl remarked that he trusted that appropriate language would be fashioned to explain the rationale and supported a vote on the numbers since there was enough connection to the Preamble to support the structure. Others agreed that issues such as structure and sequencing would not go forward unless the number of credits was first decided.

Dr. Naylor added that his remarks suggesting that he could “live with the structure” did not convey his support for the structure. In fact, he wished to see more humanities included in the proposed core which, in his view, de-emphasized the liberal arts. Others responded that it was not a question of credit numbers but the quality of core courses that would impress the students. Furthermore, the mission of Marquette University was not accomplished entirely by the core. Dr. Laatsch noted that much of the Jesuit tradition replicates itself in the major courses and how they are taught. Dr. Eckman offered that the proposed core placed an exciting emphasis on the humanities and liberal arts. She noted that almost thirty credits were devoted to the arts and the humanities and remarked that the Committee could only be limited by its inability to move forward. By which would stymie the supplemental efforts of the individual schools and colleges. Dr. Maranto added that faculty would not devote further time and effort to interdisciplinary courses until the numbers were in place. Dr. Snow also reminded Committee members that they had been presented with other opportunities to make alternative motions, but none had surfaced. She then asked Professor Wiseman to repeat the motion from the May 17 minutes and called the question. That motion was stated as follows: That the Committee adopt a thirty-six hour core of common studies, in the configuration noted above, for Marquette University. The members signaled their vote by raising their hands. There were nine votes in favor of the motion and three opposed. Dr. Snow then announced that the three absent Committee members had each registered a proxy vote in favor of the motion. Thus, the motion passed with 12 members in favor and 3 opposed. There were no abstentions.

V. Continuing Business. Dr. Snow returned to the agenda, noting that the Committee would continue its review of course submissions and determine the applicable standard upon which its review would be based. Because of the advancing hour, she proposed to withhold further consideration of the templates and course submissions until the May 31 meeting and move immediately to a discussion of the appropriate standard of review. However, Dr. Machan noted that the templates had generated massive amounts of information which could not properly be considered in a 15-minute review by the Committee. He cautioned that the templates should be revised or that the Committee should use a different process of review. Professor Wiseman offered that there were two issues pending before the Committee: (1) the standard of review and (2) the process of review. She explained that, however titled, the Committee had
engaged a standard of review which simply involved analyzing whether the instructor had presented “some evidence upon which the Committee could conclude that the particular learning objective was addressed in the course.” Dr. Wierzbicki offered that he had been very impressed with the English Department’s organization and presentation of materials for the literature courses, suggesting that the department chairs could play a crucial role in advising individual instructors about the need to address learning objectives in their courses and their syllabi. He suggested that the fall conference could provide an opportunity to gather the chairs for that purpose. Dr. Maranto added that on-going oversight by the department was critical; core instructors could be provided with a copy of a completed template so they understood the Committee’s expectations. Dr. Snow then closed the meeting by suggesting that Committee members should re-read the templates for discussion about procedures and standards at the May 31 meeting. She also advised that the number of credits and configuration for the core of common studies would be public knowledge once the minutes were approved and published.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Reporter
Core Curriculum Review Committee
Core Curriculum Review Committee
Approved Minutes
May 31, 2001

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. on Thursday, May 31, 2001 in Straz Hall Room 456 by Dr. Nancy Snow. **Members Present:** Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki and Prof. Christine Wiseman. **Members Excused:** Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Stephen Heinrich and Dr. Michele Malin, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, and Rev. Philip Rossi.

Dr. Linda Laatsch opened the meeting by offering a prayer from the works of John Oliver Nelson, as modified by her daughter, who also serves as a pastor at Eddystone United Methodist Church in Pennsylvania.

**I. Minutes.** The Committee addressed the minutes of May 25, 2001. Dr. Snow noted that the curricular grant, formerly denominated the “Lilly Foundation Grant” in prior minutes of the Core Curriculum Review Committee (CCRC), is properly termed the “Lilly Endowment Project.” By incorporation in these minutes, the Committee intends that its prior minutes be revised to reflect that change. Beyond that, Dr. Linda Laatsch suggested that the three proxy votes should not be designated by name since the other votes were recorded anonymously. The Committee therefore determined to revise the third last sentence of the second full paragraph on page 3 to read: “Dr. Snow then announced that the three absent Committee members had each registered a proxy vote in favor of the motion.” There being no further additions or corrections, Dr. Ken Ksobiech moved to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Dr. John Pustejovsky and passed unanimously.

**II. Chair’s Report.** Dr. Snow reported that the subcommittee planning the fall core curriculum conference had met since May 25 and had devised a full agenda that potentially included a speaker from Notre Dame. She suggested that the more immediate issue was finding a suitable date for the conference. Consulting with Committee members by hand vote, Dr. Snow concluded that neither August 21 nor August 23-24 were suitable. Instead, Committee members preferred a Saturday conference with some sessions offered simultaneously. Members also suggested that the conference might occur later during the fall semester but noted that the sooner the date was published the better.

Dr. Snow also reported that she had met with Fr. Tim Lannon, Vice President for University Advancement, Barb Armstrong, Director of Foundations, Dr. Susan Mountin, Acting Director of University Ministry, and Laura Abing, the Lilly Endowment grant writer, regarding grant opportunities for the core curricular initiative. She noted that discussions with each were positive but cautioned that any proposal submitted as part of the Lilly Endowment Project would require a specific process for evaluating core curricular submissions. Thus, it would be necessary for this Committee to identify that process and include that process in any proposal. She also noted that any course which qualified as a core course would require additional submission to a separate committee formed to decide how the grant would be funded. As a result, these courses would require approval by the CCRC and the grant funding committee. She emphasized that it would be advantageous to have representation from the CCRC on that grant committee. Dr. Snow suggested it would be most opportune if this Committee identified and articulated its process by June 14, at which time its summer meetings would conclude.

**III. Template Revision.** Turning to additional items on the agenda, Dr. Snow inquired of Committee members whether they thought the template for proposing core courses needed significant revision or something less. Committee members concluded that the template did not require significant revision but did require some adjustment, consistent with the feedback sought and obtained from the faculty who responded to the initial call for core submissions. In addition, Dr. Eckman suggested that the Committee itself had thought to include questions on justice and technology. Dr. Quade added that since
core submissions might also qualify for Lilly Endowment funding, it might be wise to include a question appropriate for that purpose. Dr. Snow then constituted a subcommittee to fashion revisions to the template over the course of the summer. Members would include Dr. Shelly Malin, Dr. John Pustejovsky and Dr. Nancy Snow. This same subcommittee might fashion a checklist for use as a cover sheet to accompany the Committee’s recommendation on each core submission. The checklist could be fashioned from Dr. Pustejovsky’s “Framework for Evaluating Courses Proposed for the Marquette University Core of Common Studies,” revised on January 26, 2001. Looking to that document, he suggested three common points from which to begin: (1) an initial level of review to ascertain whether course objectives were clear; (2) analysis of whether course objectives described student activity or instructor activity, and (3) analysis of whether the department’s responses were coherent with the specific knowledge area objectives. Dr. Ksobiech also suggested that each department henceforth should accompany the particular core submission with a transmittal memo by which the chair indicates the department’s willingness to support the course.

IV. Standards for Template Review. At its May 25 meeting, Professor Wiseman had proposed that the Committee follow a prima facie standard of review, defined as “some evidence upon which the Committee could conclude that the learning objectives are addressed in the course.” Committee members discussed whether and how this standard could be implemented, noting that it might be premature to adopt any standard before analyzing the templates for strengths or deficiencies. Others noted that it would be important to develop a rubric, identifying how many or which objectives constitute the minimum threshold in any given knowledge area. Dr. Wierzbicki and Professor Wiseman suggested that it might be important to review the templates and note what evidence convinces the Committee and what evidence does not before articulating and publishing a standard. Dr. Wierzbicki added that this process would generate consistency when the Committee ultimately votes on core submissions. He suggested, however, that the Committee could adopt a working standard, subject to revision as the Committee undertakes its review. Dr. Machan observed that no matter what standard or review the Committee applied, the review of template materials should consume more than fifteen minutes. Others noted, however, that departmental submissions (e.g., English literature) tended to be very strong in articulating rationale and methodology for addressing learning objectives in the appropriate knowledge area since these reflected collaborative discussion among all affected instructors. In these situations, much of the preliminary investigative work has been done by the department, necessitating only expedited review by the Committee. Consequently, the work of this Committee might not be as intense.

Concluding its discussion of this issue, Committee members determined that they were not satisfied with “some evidence” as the appropriate standard. Instead, Dr. Snow proposed a working standard of review as follows: “clear evidence upon which the Committee could conclude that the learning objectives are addressed in the course.” This standard would be supplemented with appropriate guidelines, as derived from subcommittee review of the templates.

V. Necessity of a Cover Sheet (Checklist) Regarding Standards. Dr. Ksobiech suggested that it might be particularly useful to develop a cover sheet for those courses whose templates were deficient, providing a checklist of any deficiencies. Dr. Laatsch added that such a checklist would be important as well for those courses that qualified as core courses since records should be kept of supporting documents in all core courses. The Committee therefore decided to include a cover sheet or checklist for each course submission, to which supporting documents would be attached. The Committee or Academic Affairs could then maintain a file containing each of these courses. Dr. Eckman noted that these “template files” would provide instructive examples to both department chairs and faculty. She added that the process of completing templates would be most meaningful if undertaken by departments. Even where courses were not approved, department faculty would know what each was doing in any proposed core course.

VI. Process for Review of Core Submissions. Committee members discussed various models for review of core course submissions, ranging from review of grant proposals to review of dossiers for promotion and tenure. Process distinctions were noted, however, since the Committee in this case would consider a number of proposals, the majority of which were likely to be successful. Dr. Wierzbicki
suggested that it was not practical for the Committee as a whole to consider each submission initially. Instead, the Committee should trust to the judgment of the subcommittees and their expertise, invoking additional resources from the department where necessary. Whatever its process, Committee members agreed that the process should ensure a defensible written record of decisions. In that regard, the Committee concluded that it had followed a rational process on April 16 and April 21, but should articulate that rationality in order to be consistent. Thus, the Committee proposed the following protocol:

(a) the Committee will retain the subcommittee structure, defined by the knowledge areas and the division of membership noted in the April 16 minutes, since at least one member of the subcommittee was associated with work in the designated knowledge area. Those divisions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Knowledge Areas</th>
<th>Committee Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Diverse Cultures</td>
<td>Eckman, Maranto, Pustejovsky, Wiseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Mathematical Reasoning</td>
<td>Byleen, Ksobiech, Machan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Individual &amp; Social Behavior</td>
<td>Laatsch, Lowrey, Naylor, Wierzbicki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Histories of Cultures &amp; Societies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Human Nature &amp; Ethics</td>
<td>Heinrich, Malin, Rossi, Snow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science &amp; Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) the subcommittees will meet independently with regard to particular course submissions in each of their respective knowledge areas;

(c) where necessary, a designated representative from the subcommittee will consult with the department about course issues that might arise during subcommittee deliberations;

(d) the subcommittee will recommend to the full Committee that particular courses be approved for inclusion in the core of common studies or disapproved for that purpose;

(e) when recommended for consideration by the full Committee, each particular course will be identified on the agenda so as to provide specific notice to interested parties;

(f) the Committee will deliberate the subcommittee recommendations, summoning representatives from the affected departments only where necessary to inform its collective deliberations;

(g) the Committee will complete a cover sheet (checklist) for each course and append that cover sheet to the template and supporting course materials;

(h) the Committee will communicate its determination to the department/instructor who made the submission;

(i) the Committee will maintain a file of each submission, accompanied by the Committee’s recommendation.

VII. Concluding Business. Dr. Snow indicated that she would like the Committee to fashion a motion on the working standard for review and the protocol at its June 7 meeting. She also proposed to continue the subcommittee review of templates and to devise a preliminary checklist of items for inclusion in the cover sheet. She and Professor Wiseman would review the minutes of April 16 and April 21 in order to devise the preliminary list. At that meeting the Committee would also determine its next form of communication with department chairs and instructors who had submitted proposals for core courses.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Reporter
Core Curriculum Review Committee
The meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m. on Thursday, June 7, 2001 in Straz Hall Room 456 by Dr. Nancy Snow. **Members Present:** Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Rev. Philip Rossi, S.J., Dr. Nancy Snow, and Dr. Michael Wierzbicki. **Members Excused:** Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Michele Malin, and Prof. Christine Wiseman.

[Reporter’s Note: Dr. Snow served as reporter, since Prof. Wiseman was on vacation.]

Dr. Snow opened the meeting by offering a prayer for continued wisdom, strength, and courage for the tasks ahead of us. She offered thanks for the spirit of collegiality that has informed the Committee’s deliberations, and petitioned that this spirit continue to be with us in our work.

**I. Minutes.** The Committee addressed the minutes of May 31, 2001. Drs. Quade and Courtright pointed out a typographical error on p. 2, and Dr. Ksobiech suggested that the word ‘by’ be replaced by ‘on’ on p. 3(protocol (e)). There being no further amendments or corrections, Dr. John Pustejovsky moved to approved the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ken Ksobiech and passed unanimously.

**II. Chair’s Report.** Dr. Snow reported that Dr. Shelly Malin has graciously agreed to serve on the Subcommittee that will meet this summer to adjust the template and to draft guidelines for those submitting proposals for core courses. Dr. John Pustejovsky and Dr. Nancy Snow have also agreed to serve on that Subcommittee.

Dr. Snow also reported that Dr. Stephanie Quade has graciously agreed to serve on one of the Subcommittees that will review course submissions. Dr. Quade agreed to serve on either Group I (Diverse Cultures; Literature) or Group III (Individual and Social Behavior; Histories of Cultures and Societies). Dr. Courtright volunteered to join Group IV (Human Nature and Ethics; Science and Nature; Theology). Dr. Snow reported that Fr. Rossi, SJ, has also indicated an interest in joining the Subcommittee that is planning the fall conference.

Dr. Snow reported that an E-News announcement had been sent to the University community on Monday, June 4, 2001, with a heading that had not been approved for release by Dr. Snow. That heading reads, “36-credit university core curriculum approved.” The text of the e-mail had been drafted and approved for release by Dr. Snow. Fearing that the heading would misleadingly imply that the core had been approved by the University hierarchy, including Fr. Robert Wild, SJ, President of Marquette, Dr. Snow telephoned Steve Schulz of the Office of Communication and urged that an e-mail correcting the heading be sent out immediately. Mr. Schulz consented to do this, but another person at the Office of Communication intervened and refused to send out a correction, on the ground that the text and the heading are not misleading. Dr. Snow then referred the matter to Dr. David Buckholdt, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Institutional Planning.

Dr. Snow updated the Committee on conversations regarding the Lilly Endowment Project. At this point, it appears that a request for monies for core course development over a five-year period may be included in the grant proposal to the Lilly Endowment. Sixteen grants are proposed over five years for core course development. To be eligible for this funding, a course would have to be approved for the core by the Core Curriculum Review Committee, then be approved for funding by a separate grant committee. Two representatives from the Core Curriculum Review Committee would serve on the grant committee, thereby guaranteeing sufficient overlap. Dr. Snow suggested that she and Professor Christine Wiseman, the Academic Affairs representative to the CRCC, could serve on the grant committee. It is also envisioned that, to be eligible for funding, faculty would complete a workshop on vocation for at least a day, if not a
day and a half. Details remain to be worked out by the Lilly Planning Committee. Dr. Naylor requested to review the completed grant proposal.

Finally, Dr. Snow updated the Committee on the progress of the Subcommittee on conference planning. Dr. Snow reported that she would meet with Dr. Buckholdt that afternoon, and would present him with a budget request for approximately $13,000 to fund a day-long conference to be held on September 28, 2001, in the ballroom of the Alumni Memorial Union. Dr. Snow had been able to reserve the entire ballroom on that day. In accordance with the Subcommittee’s wishes and pending approval from Dr. Buckholdt, Dr. Snow was preparing to invite Dr. Barbara Walvoord of the University of Notre Dame to speak on assessment.

III. Review of the Working Standard. Turning to additional items on the agenda, Dr. Snow opened the floor for continued discussion of the working standard for review of proposed courses that was formulated at the previous meeting: “Clear evidence upon which the Committee could conclude that the learning objectives are addressed in this course.” As noted in the agenda for the meeting, Dr. Snow reminded the Committee that this standard is to be supplemented with appropriate guidelines, as fashioned by the Subcommittee that will review the templates this summer. The guidelines and the revised template will be submitted by the Subcommittee to the CRCC for review, revision, and adoption in the fall.

Dr. Courtright opened the discussion by questioning how the Committee would know that the learning objectives will be addressed in core courses. He suggested that the standard be supplemented with further language that conveys a sense that satisfaction of the learning objectives will be subject to ongoing assessment. Dr. Maranto offered that there are various ways in which assessment and oversight can be built into the course approval process. One such way is to bring the chairs into the process more directly. Fr. Rossireminded the Committee that the standard provides guidance for qualifying courses. Whether particular sections of courses meet the learning objectives is an issue of ongoing assessment, and not of initial course qualification. These are two separate issues. If the course is appropriately taught, there is a good chance that the learning objectives will be met. Dr. Wierzbicki commented that we have to take the claims made on templates and syllabi in good faith. He warned the Committee not to set itself in an adversarial relation to faculty. Dr. Laatsch suggested that in our next call for proposals, we make clear the expectation that learning objectives be listed on syllabi, and cautioned that in the health sciences, this is not done as a matter of course. Dr. Courtright volunteered that course submissions should go through a department, and Dr. Pustejovsky mentioned that the Core Curriculum Steering Committee had envisioned ongoing assessment as a part of the process. Fr. Rossi endorsed the idea that course submissions should have the endorsement of the department, either through review by the department chair or by the department’s undergraduate committee. Dr. Courtright suggested that the working standard as formulated could be improved by the addition of an appropriate modifier. The following amended version of the working standard was suggested: “Clear evidence upon which the Committee could conclude that the learning objectives are substantively addressed in this course.” Dr. Snow asked for a motion on the working standard as amended. Dr. Pustejovsky moved to approve the amended working standard; Dr. Laatsch seconded the motion. In the absence of further discussion, the issue was tabled until the next meeting, where a vote will be taken in accordance with the Committee’s two-meeting and proxy rules.

IV. Review of the Protocol. Turning to the next agenda item, Dr. Snow directed the Committee’s attention to the protocol that was proposed at the meeting of June 7, 2001:

(a) the Committee will retain the subcommittee structure, defined by the knowledge areas and the division of membership noted in the April 16 minutes, since at least one member of the subcommittee was associated with work in the designated knowledge area. Those divisions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Knowledge Areas</th>
<th>Committee Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Diverse Cultures</td>
<td>Eckman, Maranto, Pustejovsky, Wiseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>(Quade)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Snow proposed that the protocol as drafted be enhanced to provide sufficient time for subcommittee and Committee members to review submissions. Subcommittee members should normally be allowed one month from the date of receipt of submissions to meet and review submissions. (For the case of course submissions yet to be evaluated by this Committee, i.e., those in excess of the “three per department” rule, this timeframe would not apply.) This would allow adequate time for subcommittee members to contact relevant parties for further information if necessary. After the requisite one month review period, the subcommittees’ recommendations regarding submissions could be relayed to Committee members by the Committee Chair. The Chair would then leave at least two weeks for Committee members to review contested submissions prior to the meeting at which those proposals would be discussed. Two weeks would also provide sufficient time for the Committee Chair to invite representatives from the affected departments if necessary. Dr. Snow then opened the floor for discussion on the protocol and the proposed enhancements.

Dr. Courtright opened by expressing the concern that the timing of submissions, review, and approval be such as to meet the deadlines for publication of courses in the University Undergraduate Bulletin. The deadline for publication in the Bulletin for any given academic year is November 1 of the previous academic year. Drs. Pustejovsky and Ksobiech cautioned that the Committee should not be overly concerned with the publication deadlines. Fr. Rossi commented that the Undergraduate Bulletin provides a historical snapshot of course being offered in the University. Departments can offer new courses even though they are not listed for publication in the Bulletin. Dr. Quade advised that the Committee on Academic Procedures (CAPS) be consulted for advice on appropriate timeframes for publication, and that the CRCC should keep a semester by semester record of courses that qualify as core courses. The suggestion was made that, at some future time, an item could be added to the protocol addressing the timeframe and publication issues. Dr. Naylor stated that the timing enhancements seemed adequate, then raised the question of whether file space in O’Hara Hall could be made available for storing records of the submissions that come before the CRCC. Dr. Snow agreed to pursue the question during her interview with Dr. Buckholdt that afternoon.
Continuing the deliberation on the protocol, Drs. Wierzbicki and Maranto raised the issue of appeals. Dr. Wierzbicki offered that those submitting proposals not approved by the Committee should be advised to resubmit the next semester to ensure sufficient time for thoughtful revision. With the help of the Committee, Dr. Snow crafted the following enhancement to the protocol:

Unapproved courses may be revised and resubmitted no sooner than the semester following initial submission.

Dr. Snow then asked for a motion on the enhanced protocol. Dr. Maranto moved to approve; Dr. Pustejovsky seconded. In discussion on the motion, Drs. Pustejovsky and Wierzbicki stressed that, in the event a submission is not approved by the Committee, no further appeal beyond the CRCC is contemplated, for example, by bringing an unapproved submission before the Vice President for Academic Affairs. As there was no further discussion on the motion, it was tabled until the meeting of June 14, 2001, when a vote will be taken in accordance with the Committee’s two-meeting and proxy rules.

V. Review of the Draft Checklist. As agreed in the meeting of June 7, 2001, Dr. Snow submitted for the Committee’s review a draft of a checklist. The checklist would serve as a cover letter to the revised template. It would serve a dual function. First, it would alert those submitting core courses to the qualification criteria being used by the Committee. Secondly, it would enable Committee members reviewing courses to identify and record the presence or absence of those criteria in submitted materials. Copies of completed checklists would be among the records of submissions kept on file by the Committee. Drafts of the checklist as well as supporting material from earlier meetings had been distributed before the beginning of the meeting.

Dr. Snow then directed the Committee’s attention to item (1) of the draft. Item (1) of the draft had read, “[Does this course submission:] Provide sufficient information to show how the course addresses the learning objectives?,” with the suggested alternative: “(Or, provide sufficient information to show that there is a sufficient fit between the course and learning objectives? . . .)” The alternative had been framed in response to Subcommittee responses to a specific course submission. The Committee suggested that the alternative be abandoned, and that item (1) be reworded as follows: “Provide sufficient information to show that the course substantively addresses the learning objectives?” Dr. Maranto wondered if the checklist should specify some percentage or number of learning objectives that course must address to qualify as core courses. Drs. Ksobiech and Pustejovsky interjected that only counting numbers of objectives satisfied does not guarantee that those objectives will be met in substantive ways. Dr. Maranto responded that it is probably best to evaluate courses on a case by case basis, without prescribing in advance numbers of learning objectives that must be satisfied by any given course. Dr. Laatsch offered that the Committee should direct the Subcommittee charged with revising the template to change the language of the template from asking how the learning objectives would be addressed to asking how they will be addressed.

Dr. Snow directed the Committee’s attention to the second checklist item: “If no to (1) for any learning objective, is satisfactory explanation given of why not?” In the absence of significant discussion, Dr. Snow inferred the consent of the Committee to this item.

The Committee proceeded to item (3): “Include syllabi that show how the learning objectives are addressed?” Dr. Laatsch commented that the revised template should include directions regarding syllabi: (a) that syllabi should be in English; (b) that syllabi should include information as to how the course objectives satisfy the learning objectives; and (c) that syllabi should show how textbooks for the course tie into the relevant knowledge area. All of these suggestions were offered on the basis of the review of templates submitted for the Committee’s consideration this past spring.

In further deliberation on item (3), Dr. Byleen expressed the preference that one syllabus be provided per course. This should be a representative of all sections of the course. A model for this exists in the mathematics department. Dr. Wierzbicki preferred to see a variety of syllabi from different professors teaching the same course. Dr. Maranto wanted to see all of the syllabi. Dr. Pustejovsky suggested that item (13), “Explain how multiple sections will be coordinated?” should be moved to follow item (3) on the
checklist, and should be amended to include the sentence: “Include departmental guidelines where appropriate.”

Dr. Snow then proceeded to a discussion of item 4: “Address issues of sequencing and integration within the knowledge area? (E.g., if two courses are proposed to satisfy jointly the learning objectives in a knowledge area, is it clear which courses satisfy which learning objectives?)” Dr. Wierzbicki suggested that item (4) be moved up and included as a sub-part under item (1).

VI. Concluding Business. Noticing a general lag in the conversation, Dr. Snow checked the wall clock and noted that eleven o’clock was fast approaching. In accordance with Committee procedure, she asked if there were closure issues, and volunteered her belief that the meeting had been productive.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:00 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy E. Snow  
Chair  
Core Curriculum Review Committee
Core Curriculum Review Committee
Approved Minutes
June 14, 2001

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m. on Thursday, May 31, 2001 in Straz Hall Room 456 by Dr. Nancy Snow. Members Present: Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Michele Malin, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Rev. Philip Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki and Prof. Christine Wiseman. Members Excused: Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Cheryl Maranto and Dr. John Pustejovsky.

Dr. Snow opened the meeting with a reflection, thanking God for the collegiality and progress which had marked the Committee’s work this academic year. She also sought continued blessings on the Committee and the summer work of its members.

I. Minutes. The Committee addressed the minutes of June 7, 2001. Fr. Rossi expressed reservations about paragraph four of the Chair’s Report, noting that it was premature to conclude that a request for core course development would be included in the Lilly grant proposal. He observed that since the grant proposal to the Lilly Endowment was still in draft form and a budget had not yet been proposed, the wording of the second and third sentences might be misleading. Professor Wiseman therefore suggested that the second sentence of paragraph four be amended to read as follows: “At this point, it appears that a request for monies for core course development over a five-year period may be included in the grant proposal to the Lilly Endowment.” She also proposed that the third sentence be amended to read: “Sixteen grants are proposed over five years for core course development.” As amended, Dr. James Courtright moved to approve the June 7 minutes. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ken Ksobiech and passed unanimously.

II. Chair’s Report. Dr. Snow reported that Dr. Robert Deahl had agreed to join the Group IV subcommittee (considering course submissions in the areas of Human Nature & Ethics, Science & Nature, and Theology). She also noted for the record that she had received proxy votes from Drs. Deahl, Laatsch, Naylor and Pustejovsky regarding the two motions scheduled for vote at the instant meeting. Beyond these, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki carried the proxies for Dr. Tim Machan.

(a) Turning to her June 7 interview with Dr. David Buckholdt, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Snow reported that a filing space for Committee records on core course submissions would be provided on the third floor of O’Hara Hall. She also indicated the Academic Affairs would fund the fall core conference in the amount of $5,557. These monies would include a stipend for the speaker, the speaker’s hotel, food and travel costs, catering costs for a continental breakfast and luncheon, and refreshments during the course of the conference. Dr. Buckholdt had also agreed to fund a cocktail hour to conclude the conference. However, he determined not to include stipends for participants nor would he cancel classes on Friday, September 28, when the conference is scheduled. Dr. Malin and others suggested that although stipends might be inappropriate, it would be important to recognize faculty participation in some fashion. Committee members concluded that it might be appropriate to distribute a book on core development or assessment to each participating member. They acted by consensus to encourage Dr. Snow to pursue that option further with Dr. Buckholdt.

(b) Dr. Buckholdt also had requested that Mr. John Hopkins, Vice President for Communication, issue an e-mail announcement to correct the misleading headline published by his office on June 4, 2001. The transmission to all personnel erroneously suggested that a thirty-six hour core curriculum had been approved by the University. Dr. Snow cautioned that faculty might conclude that the approval process had been finalized, requiring no further consideration by the Academic Senate or the Administration. Committee members noted that other faculty had commented to them as well about the misleading nature of the headline. Since no retraction had yet appeared, the Committee discussed corrective measures. Among these were the suggestion that Professor Wiseman consult with Ms. Kriss...
Schulz, Assistant Vice President in the Office of Communication, to pursue this matter directly or that Academic Affairs issue an electronic memorandum to all faculty informing them about the Committee’s progress and reiterating the complete approval process for the common University core.

(c) After consulting with Dean Madeline Wake, Dr. Buckholdt had determined that **course equivalencies for core courses would be determined by the individual colleges.** Dr. Snow therefore suggested that this issue had been removed from the Committee. Committee members responded, however, that the larger issue of transfer credits for core courses had many facets and widespread implications. For example, Dr. Eckman noted that the matter of transfer credits applied not only to transfer students. Since there were residency restrictions on the number of major courses taken elsewhere, Marquette students often completed their core requirements at other institutions. This situation could have widespread implications in defining a Marquette graduate, consistent with the Marquette mission. Dr. Wierzbički added that it might be necessary to establish a residency requirement for the core as well.

Many Committee members suggested that it would be important to gather information from each college about how they implement core transfer credits. In particular, Fr. Rossi observed that the Committee should require sufficient information to ascertain the policies within each college for awarding transfer credit and to ascertain how such policies are implemented. He suggested that it would be important to see whether certain patterns emerge. Committee members concluded that the issue of transfer credits was complex and multi-faceted. Hence, this issue was not fully foreclosed by Dr. Buckholdt’s determination. Dr. Snow noted that the Committee would need to revisit this matter at some length next fall. To that end, Dr. Quade offered that the Committee should develop a list of questions for associate deans or deans in the various undergraduate colleges to assess this information.

(d) To update the Committee on **progress for the fall conference,** Dr. Snow reported that Fr. Wild would issue a welcoming address. However, Dr. Barbara Walvoord of Notre Dame has declined the Committee’s invitation to offer a keynote address on assessment since she has a conflict. Instead, she suggested Dr. Virginia Anderson of Towson University in Maryland. Dr. Courtright also suggested that Dr. Dan Maguire might provide another option. Dr. Courtright recalled a particularly noteworthy lecture on the liberal value of a Jesuit Catholic education, which could be tailored for the conference.

(e) Finally, Dr. Snow reported on the **Lilly Endowment discussions.** She indicated that she had reviewed a rough draft of the grant proposal, noting that a section requesting funding for core courses had been included. However, in her opinion, that section would require significant revision.

**III. Evidentiary Standard for Evaluation of Core Course Submissions.** At its June 7 meeting, Dr. John Pustejovsky had moved to approve the following evidentiary standard for evaluation of core course submissions: “Clear evidence upon which the Committee could conclude that the learning objectives are substantively addressed in this course.” The motion had been seconded by Dr. Linda Laatsch. Professor Wiseman, who was not present at the June 7 meeting, observed that the wording of any evidentiary standard should be phrased in the present tense to suggest that the Committee acts (rather than acted) upon the standard when reviewing course proposals. Thus, she suggested that the word “can” should replace the word “could.” The Committee accepted that friendly amendment by consensus. Dr. Snow then called for a vote on the motion. The Committee voted unanimously in favor of the motion to adopt the “clear evidence” standard, recording fourteen (14) votes in favor, with none opposed and no abstentions. Dr. Snow observed that Dr. Maranto, who was on vacation, had not submitted a proxy vote. She noted that Dr. Maranto could register her vote at a subsequent Committee meeting. Thus, the standard upon which core course submissions will be evaluated is as follows: **“Clear evidence upon which the Committee can conclude that the learning objectives are substantively addressed in this course.”** Dr. Snow reminded the Committee that this standard would be supplemented by a set of guidelines to be crafted this summer by the subcommittee working on template revisions.

**IV. Protocol for Reviewing Core Course Submissions.** Committee members reviewed the enhanced protocol for reviewing core course submissions, as identified by the agenda. The enhanced
protocol reflects the subcommittee membership of Drs. Courtright and Quade, and was identified as follows:

(a) the Committee will retain the subcommittee structure, defined by the knowledge areas and the division of membership noted in the April 16 minutes, since at least one member of the subcommittee was associated with work in the designated knowledge area. Those divisions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Knowledge Areas</th>
<th>Committee Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Diverse Cultures</td>
<td>Eckman, Maranto, Pustejovsky, Wiseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>(Quade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Mathematical Reasoning</td>
<td>Byleen, Ksobiech, Machan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Individual &amp; Social Behavior</td>
<td>Laatsch, Lowrey, Naylor, Wierzbicki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Histories of Cultures &amp; Societies</td>
<td>(Quade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Human Nature &amp; Ethics</td>
<td>Heinrich, Malin, Rossi, Snow, Courtright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science &amp; Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) the subcommittees will meet independently with regard to particular course submissions in each of their respective knowledge areas;

(c) where necessary, a designated representative from the subcommittee will consult with the department about course issues that might arise during subcommittee deliberations;

(d) the subcommittee will recommend to the full Committee that particular courses be approved for inclusion in the core of common studies or disapproved for that purpose;

(e) when recommended for consideration by the full Committee, each particular course will be identified by the agenda so as to provide specific notice to interested parties;

(f) the Committee will deliberate the subcommittee recommendations, summoning representatives from the affected departments only where necessary to inform its collective deliberations;

(g) the Committee will complete a cover sheet (checklist) for each course and append that cover sheet to the template and supporting course materials;

(h) the Committee will communicate its determination to the department/instructor who made the submission;

(i) the Committee will maintain a file of each submission, accompanied by the Committee’s recommendation;

(j) subcommittee members normally will be allowed one month from the date of receipt of submissions to meet and review submissions;

(k) after the requisite one month review period, the subcommittee’s recommendations regarding submissions will be relayed to Committee members by the Committee Chair, who will then allow at least two weeks for Committee members to review contested submissions prior to the meeting at which those proposals will be discussed;

(l) unapproved courses may be revised and resubmitted no sooner than the semester following initial submission.

Dr. Snow noted that Dr. Cheryl Maranto had moved to adopt the enhanced protocol at the June 7 meeting. Dr. John Pustejovsky had seconded the motion. Following Dr. Snow’s request for continued discussion, Professor Wiseman suggested that the motion should be amended to allow Professor Wiseman to re-order the final three items of protocol to reflect their logical sequence. Dr. Byleen then questioned whether Item (h) should be amended to delete the reference to instructor. Some members offered that course submissions should always emanate from the department rather than an instructor, and a response should be directed to the department chair. After discussion, however, Committee members elected to
retain the dual reference in order to provide the Committee with flexibility about communicating its
decision to the department chair or the instructor, depending upon circumstances within the department.
Professor Wiseman offered that the communication process might favor the department chair over the
individual instructor after the fall conference, when chairs have an opportunity to discuss a more
programmatic approach to learning objectives. Dr. Snow then called for a vote on the motion to adopt the
enhanced protocol, noting that the some items would be re-ordered to reflect their logical sequence. The
Committee voted unanimously in favor of the motion, recording fourteen (14) votes in favor, with none
opposed and no abstentions. Dr. Snow again observed that Dr. Maranto, who was on vacation, had not
submitted a proxy vote. She reiterated that Dr. Maranto could register her vote at a subsequent Committee
meeting.

V. Draft Checklist. Dr. Snow distributed a draft checklist for use when analyzing University
core curriculum course submissions. Committee members expressed general satisfaction with the
evaluative tool. Additional discussion concerned two issues: the purpose of the checklist and whether or
when it should be made public during the review process. Professor Wiseman suggested that the purpose
of the checklist was to implement the “clear evidence” standard adopted earlier by the Committee.
Committee members therefore determined by consensus to include the following heading: “Clear Evidence
Upon Which Committee Can Conclude that Learning Objectives are Addressed: Evaluation Tool.” In
addition, the draft would be amended by consensus to include: (1) a line for the title and number of the
course; (2) a line at the end of the form for the signature of the evaluator and the date of the evaluation; and
(3) a revision to the final item on page 2 of the form so that it reads “Evaluator’s Summary” rather than
“Evaluator’s Comments.”

Committee members adopted other amendments as well, noting that the first two columns marked
“YES” and “NO” should be reduced in size, to be followed by a third column marked “Comments.”
Furthermore, item (3) on page one of the form would be amended to read as follows: “Include syllabi, each
of which shows how the learning objectives are addressed.” Finally, at the suggestion of Dr. Quade, the
Committee determined to incorporate a bullet-point version of the checklist items into the guidelines for
core course submissions and “publish” them in that fashion. Concluding this discussion, Dr. Snow noted
that she would initiate review of the guidelines, the revised template and the evaluation tool at the
Committee’s first fall meeting so as to generate a motion for adoption of all three.

VI. Draft Language Justifying Credit Hours in the Common Core. Dr. Snow circulated a
draft of a two-page document justifying the credit hour allocation adopted by the Committee for the
common core. (A copy of that document is attached to the original of these minutes). Dr. Snow had
authored the document, derived from earlier iterations of the Preamble, after meeting with a subcommittee
convened for that purpose.

Committee members uniformly commended Dr. Snow for her efforts. In particular, Fr. Rossi
focused on language explaining that the “first tier [of courses] empowers students to examine the world; the
second inspires them to engage it; the third challenges them to evaluate and change it.” Dr. Naylor
likewise offered that this document did much to relieve his concern over the thirty-six hour common core
since it addressed sequencing and integration. Furthermore, the last paragraph of the document “urged” the
colleges to continue this effort in adopting their own core requirements. Since some members observed
that “urge” might not convey the directive strongly enough, Professor Wiseman suggested that the last
paragraph be amended to read that “[j]he Committee charges each College in the University to structure its
core and professional curricula to build upon and facilitate the student’s core experience at Marquette.” Dr.
Quade added that the paragraph might also invite the rest of the University to participate in and contribute
to the core experiences. Finally, other members suggested that the Committee might want to broaden the
delineation of core experiences to include items beyond capstone seminars, advising or service learning, or
to make those experiences mandatory. Dr. Snow remarked that these matters warrant additional
consideration as the Committee moves to structure its fall conference.

In closing, Dr. Snow thanked the Committee members for their prodigious efforts and reiterated
her gratitude for the pleasant and productive experience leading this group. There being no further
business, the meeting adjourned at 11:03 a.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Reporter
Core Curriculum Review Committee
The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. on Friday, September 14, 2001 in Emory Clark Room 117 by Dr. Nancy Snow. Members Present: Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Michele Malin, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Rev. Philip Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow, and Dr. Michael Wierzbicki. Members Excused: Dr. Tim Machan. (Professor Christine Wiseman was excused for part of the meeting to allow her to meet with Rev. Robert Wild, S.J.; she joined the meeting at 10:45 a.m.)

Before the meeting commenced, Dr. Wierzbicki requested that the Committee adjourn earlier than scheduled to allow CRCC members to participate in the University prayer service for victims of the September 11 terrorist attacks. Dr. Snow agreed to honor the request as entirely appropriate.

Dr. Snow then opened the meeting by asking Committee members to observe a moment of silence in memory of those who were killed or injured in the events of Tuesday, September 11, 2001. She invited Committee members to follow the moment of silence with their individual prayers.

I. Minutes. The Committee addressed the minutes of September 5, 2001. Dr. Maranto requested that her name be added to the list of those members who contributed to the Subcommittee on Conference Planning, which met over the summer months. Dr. Laatsch noted the absence of her suggestion that the Committee communicate with someone from the Registrar’s Office to examine record-keeping issues raised by the new University core curriculum, especially in light of computerized record-keeping. She asked that those comments be added to the minutes as well. Dr. Heinrich then suggested the following change in the text of the minutes: “Dr. Heinrich asked when final approval would be obtained for the number of credits comprising the University core, allocated by knowledge area, since some Engineering faculty questioned the prudence of revising curricula prior to final approval of the core. He also noted that the Department of Biomedical Engineering was recently required to add a physiology course following its ABET accreditation visit, and that this change might adversely affect the Department’s ability to accommodate the proposed 36-credit core.” Dr. Heinrich then suggested that the next sentence in the minutes be changed from “Dr. Deahl and Dr. Courtright agreed …” to “Dr. Deahl and Dr. Courtright suggested . . . .” Dr. Deahl moved to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Dr. Laatsch, and the amended minutes were unanimously approved.

II. Chair’s Report. (a) Report on Dr. Snow’s Meeting with Dr. David Buckholdt. Dr. Snow reported that she had met with Dr. David R. Buckholdt, Vice President for Academic Affairs, at 8:30 a.m. on Friday, September 14, 2001. The meeting concerned the implications of the University’s administrative reorganization on the core curricular initiative. She noted that the University’s reorganization would mandate two new offices: Provost and Senior Vice President. The Provost position will be filled pending the results of a national search. Mr. Gregory Kliebhan will assume the post of Senior Vice President. Dr. Buckholdt assured Dr. Snow that, whatever changes occurred, the core initiative would receive ongoing support from Academic Affairs, the President, and the Board of Trustees. Dr. Buckholdt offered that the core curricular initiative was central to the accreditation report that would be submitted to North Central. He maintained that the accreditation report would be prepared with the assumption that the core curricular process will move forward. He urged the Core Curriculum Review Committee to complete its work and submit its final report this academic year. Fr. Rossi interjected that the CRCC does not need the permission of higher University administration to continue this process. Dr. Snow agreed, but indicated that any lasting efforts at core curricular reform would require the support of the central administration. She added that Dr. Buckholdt had given that support, and she advised that Professor Christine Wiseman was meeting with Fr. Wild to obtain similar assurances from his office.

(b) Conference Update. Dr. Snow reported that, at last count, approximately 85 participants had pre-registered for the Core Curriculum Conference to be held on Friday, September 28 in the AMU Ballroom. She solicited volunteers to facilitate small group discussion for the first session on the
continuing role of faculty in the core process. Drs. Robert Deahl, Ellen Eckman, Michele Malin, Cheryl Maranto, Phillip Naylor, John Pustejovsky, Nancy Snow and Michael Wierzbicki, as well as Fr. Philip Rossi, graciously agreed to serve in this capacity. Dr. Snow indicated that the subcommittee for Conference Planning would meet the following week to finalize details for the conference; she expected to e-mail facilitators with guidelines recommended by the subcommittee. Dr. Snow then asked those department or unit chairs situated on the CCRC to lead the discussion surrounding the chairs’ responsibilities, now scheduled as the last conference session. Dr. Ken Ksobiech and Fr. Rossi agreed to serve in this capacity. Dr. Snow then requested that Drs. Michele Malin and John Pustejovsky join her in leading the concluding discussion on templates and guidelines, since they had served on the subcommittee that revised the template and devised guidelines over the summer. Drs. Malin and Pustejovsky agreed to serve in this capacity as well. Dr. Snow thanked all of these individuals for volunteering in these extra efforts.

(c) Propriety of a Second Call for Core Courses. Dr. Snow asked whether the Committee would issue a second call for courses at the core conference, and reminded members that this possibility had been broached at the September 5, 2001 CRCC meeting (one of the “semester at a glance” items). She offered that if the Committee issued such a call and set the deadline for submissions one month from the date of the call (the end of October), the semester schedule would need to be changed to allow for review of these submissions under the process approved by the Committee at its meeting of June 14, 2001. Such a schedule change would contemplate canceling the December 12 meeting and rescheduling it for December 14, 2001, in order to allow the Committee to comply with timeline constraints for submission review. The Committee thereafter agreed to this change. After further discussion, the Committee agreed to allow the academic units to submit an unlimited number of proposals with the understanding that: (a) the Committee would have the flexibility to proceed in an orderly fashion when reviewing the proposals, perhaps necessitating some practical delays in reviewing them; and (b) the Committee would ask units to prioritize their submissions in order to facilitate the review process.

Dr. Naylor departed the meeting at 10:50 a.m., but provided his proxy to Dr. Snow regarding votes then pending before the Committee. Dr. Snow also held the proxy votes of Dr. Laatsch, who likewise departed the meeting at this time.

Professor Christine Wiseman entered the meeting at 10:55 a.m., having just concluded her meeting with Fr. Robert Wild. She recounted her discussions with him relative to continued revision of the core of common studies. In particular, she reported to Fr. Wild certain e-mail communications she had received which questioned whether the core process was likely to move forward in view of the contemplated administrative reorganization. Responding to these concerns, Fr. Wild vehemently expressed that the core curriculum was his vision for the University, and gave the CRCC a directive to “go forward and do good.” He explicitly asked that Prof. Wiseman carry his message back to the Committee, asking as well that she express his gratitude to the CRCC for its efforts. Dr. Snow sought and received the Committee’s approval to send Fr. Wild an e-mail of thanks for his expressions of support and gratitude. [Reporter’s Note: That e-mail message was issued to Fr. Wild by Dr. Snow on Friday, September 14]. She also would invite him to support the Committee’s work by attending the Academic Senate meeting at which the Final Report of the Committee was presented. Dr. Heinrich then informed the Committee that he was unclear as to the specific approval process for the Committee’s Final Report. Dr. Eckman argued in favor of seeking a strong endorsement from the Academic Senate. Dr. Pustejovsky concurred. Professor Wiseman, Dr. Ksobiech, and Dr. Heinrich joined the discussion with a suggestion that the CRCC Executive Committee devise a revised timeline for drafting the report, submitting it to various University bodies, soliciting and incorporating commentary, and submitting the Final Report to the administration. Fr. Rossi added that the Final Report itself should be brief, accompanied by a number of appendices that incorporate any supporting documents.

III. Core Documents. Noting that motions were pending for approval of the Revised Template, Evaluation Tool For Use By Committee Members, and Guidelines For Qualifying a Core Course, Dr. Snow asked for discussion on the Revised Template. Copies had been distributed in a packet to CRCC members. Dr. Malin noted that the Revised Template needed a title and a line for identifying the course title, the department or unit submitting the proposal, the course number, and the name of the person responsible for
Dr. Snow next distributed a revised first page of the “Evaluation Tool For Use By Committee,” since she had inadvertently neglected to make those changes dictated by the September 5 meeting before distributing the document in the members’ packets. She then asked for discussion on the document. Hearing none, she called the vote. The Evaluation Tool was approved by an unanimous vote of all sixteen voting members of the Committee, including proxies. There were no negative votes and no abstentions.

Dr. Snow finally asked for discussion on the document, “Guidelines for Qualifying a Core Course.” The Committee accepted Dr. Malin’s suggestion to rephrase the fifth bulleted item as a friendly amendment. That item will now read: “Courses not initially approved may be revised and resubmitted no sooner than the semester following initial submission.” Hearing no other discussion, Dr. Snow called the vote. The Guidelines likewise were approved by a unanimous vote of all sixteen voting members of the Committee, including proxies. There were no negative votes and no abstentions. The Committee also accepted Dr. Malin’s suggestion that a date be placed at the bottom of all of these documents to indicate the date of issuance by the Committee.

IV. Course Submissions. Dr. Snow then asked the Committee to consider the course submissions emanating from the initial call for core courses in spring, 2001. She asked the Committee to consider fourteen courses that had been recommended for approval by the four subcommittees and sought to list those courses on the board. A general discussion ensued regarding pending issues. For example, Dr. Wierzbicki questioned whether the subcommittee had pursued additional information regarding BISC 010 from the Biology Department since a representative from Biology had not been present at the April 16 meeting. Dr. Courtright echoed those concerns, but noted insufficient time to re-examine the submission. Dr. Eckman recounted that the submissions were examined for evidence that the courses addressed learning objectives, but indicated that she would like to review the submissions in light of the newly-adopted Evaluation Tool. Dr. Snow responded that it might be best for the four subcommittees to complete an Evaluation Tool for each of the courses considered by them and identified in the April 16 and April 21 minutes. The tools could then be gathered by the presenters for each subcommittee and reviewed by the full Committee at its October 10 meeting. Dr. Pustejovsky and Dr. Ksobiech suggested that the Committee could move to approve the subcommittee reports (recommendations on a block of courses), followed by discussion of any individual courses.

Dr. Heinrich then inquired how the Committee might respond to a series of courses, each of which addressed only some of the learning objectives (e.g., Phil 50 and Phil 104). Fr. Rossi offered that it might not be possible to address all learning objectives in one course; thus the Committee had recommended six credits in some knowledge areas. Dr. Heinrich then observed that if another interdisciplinary course were devised to address the entire set of learning objectives in three credits, a student still might be required to take an additional three credits in the knowledge area. He also suggested that, as core courses developed, any given course might address only some of the learning objectives. Care would have to be taken to insure that students did not duplicate core courses that addressed the same set of learning objectives. Instead, students should be required to avail themselves of the full range of learning objectives in a given knowledge area. Such a system could be difficult to administer, however. Professor Wiseman responded that it was within the Committee’s purview to recommend that specific courses be sequenced or combined, e.g., “Phil 50 and Phil 104” or “Phil X and Phil Y,” in order to forestall the situation contemplated by Dr. Heinrich. These determinations could be made as specific courses were qualified.

In view of the late hour, Dr. Snow suggested returning to the methodology contemplated for the October 10 meeting. Dr. Ksobiech then moved that the Committee adopt all of the subcommittee course recommendations as noted in the minutes of April 16 and April 21, 2001, retaining the ability to edit or revise those recommendations on October 10, depending upon the continued work of the individual subcommittees between this date and October 10. The motion was seconded simultaneously by Drs. Courtright and Wierzbicki. Dr. Snow referred the members to the minutes of June 14 for lists of subcommittee members. She also suggested that the subcommittees might meet as a group or not between
now and October 10, so long as each subcommittee member completed an Evaluation Tool for each course earlier considered by the group. Dr. Ksobiech reminded Committee members that the intervening time between now and October 10 afforded them an opportunity to follow up with department chairs and request additional information as needed. Finally, it was determined that the following individuals would function as chairs of the specific subcommittees for these purposes: Group I (Dr. Maranto), Group II (Dr. Ksobiech), Group III (Dr. Wierzbicki), and Group IV (Dr. Malin).

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m. so that all members might participate in the University prayer service as indicated at the outset.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Reporter
Core Curriculum Review Committee
The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m. on Wednesday, October 10, 2001 in Johnston Hall Room 303 by Dr. Nancy Snow. **Members Present**: Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Michele Malin, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Rev. Philip Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki and Prof. Christine Wiseman. **Members Excused**: Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Cheryl Maranto and Dr. Stephanie Quade.

Dr. Snow opened the meeting by seeking a reflection from among the members. Dr. John Pustejovsky responded by offering a prayer learned from a retreat director. Reflecting the closing comments of the core conference, he asked that God instill trust in the hearts of all concerned with this process.

**I. Minutes.** The Committee addressed the unapproved minutes of September 14, 2001. Dr. Heinrich asked that the final full paragraph of Section II, page 2 of the minutes be amended to read: “Dr. Heinrich then informed the Committee that he was unclear as to the specific approval process for the Committee’s Final Report.” There being no further additions or corrections to those minutes, Dr. Ken Ksobiech moved their approval, as amended. The motion was seconded by Dr. John Pustejovsky and passed unanimously.

**II. Chair’s Report.** *(a) Core Curriculum Conference.* Dr. Snow indicated that verbal reports from conference attendees were uniformly positive regarding all aspects of the conference: structure, organization and the choice of assessment speaker. Inasmuch as the supply of assessment books had been depleted, Dr. Snow would attempt to order more. She also postponed to a future date the consideration of individual conference evaluations, which she had not yet reviewed. Dr. Malin volunteered to analyze those evaluations and compile a summary for distribution to Committee members.

Fr. Rossi noted that it was critical for the Committee as a whole to spend time reflecting on the core conference in order to appreciate its impact. He suggested some urgency since the passage of time might diminish powers of reflection. Dr. Snow responded that she had also considered the issue. She reported as well that the Core Curriculum Assessment Committee had proposed a joint meeting to de-brief the core conference and to consider the larger issue of core course assessment. She also indicated that some focus group leaders at the core conference had submitted their collective group comments for use by the Committee. Therefore, she proposed to continue this discussion in the form of a joint meeting with the CCAC. She also proposed to schedule additional meetings of the CCRC, since the meetings now scheduled would be consumed with regular business. Dr. Heinrich added that once Dr. Malin has concluded her compilations, those should be e-mailed to members of the CCRC to provide individual members with an opportunity for reflection before coming together as a group. Professor Wiseman added that Committee members might also compile a list of issues that surfaced at the conference and prioritize these issues for consideration by the CCRC.

*(b) Excess Submissions from the Initial Call for Core Courses.* Dr. Snow had polled the members regarding their consideration of excess course submissions beyond the three to which each Department had been limited in the initial call for courses. Committee members agreed by consensus to consider any excess submissions since the course proponents had been conscientious in responding to the call for courses. Dr. Snow then submitted a list of those “excess” courses. These included:

1. English: English 023, 032, 033, 042, and 044 (Literature Knowledge Area);
2. English 159 (Diverse Cultures);
3. Political Science: Political Science 159 (Diverse Cultures);
4. Psychology: Psychology 101 (syllabi needed) (Individual and Social Behavior), Psychology 111 (Individual and Social Behavior), Psychology 060 (Mathematical Reasoning), and Psychology 112 (Diverse Cultures);
(5) Foreign Languages and Literatures: French 101 (Diverse Cultures), Greek/Latin 108 (Literature), Italian 101 (Diverse Cultures), Italian 148 (Literature), Spanish 050 (Literature), Spanish 055 (Literature), Spanish 100 (Diverse Cultures), Spanish 102 (Diverse Cultures), Spanish 175 (Literature), Spanish 192 (Literature); and

(6) History 006 (Histories of Cultures and Societies).

Dr. Wierzbicki indicated that he had consulted with Dr. Robert Lueger, Chair of the Psychology Department, who asked that the Committee refrain from further consideration of the original templates covering the four Psychology courses noted in Item (4) above. Dr. Lueger indicated that the Department would fashion new templates for those courses as a result of discussions at the core conference. With respect to the six additional submissions in the Diverse Cultures knowledge area, Dr. Snow asked that Subcommittee I (Eckman, Maranto, Pustejovsky and Wiseman) review those submissions and prepare them for discussion by the full Committee at its regular meeting on November 30, 2001. She also asked that the subcommittee prepare a motion regarding those courses for introduction at the November 7 meeting, in conformity with the Committee’s two-meeting rule. Dr. Snow indicated that the second call for core courses carried an October 29 deadline. Thus, she would distribute those templates to the Committee at the November 7 meeting. The Committee also indicated a willingness to consider the template for History 006, which had been submitted to Dr. Snow after the initial deadline, since Dr. Lance Grahn, Chair of the History Department, was also aware of its submission. Fr. Rossi noted that it would be a good idea for the CCRC to establish standing deadlines for submission of additional core courses so that faculty could refer to those deadlines in planning their submissions. Dr. Snow agreed to devise such a schedule for review by the larger Committee. Finally, Dr. Snow informed the Committee that its December 14 meeting would convene in CU 414 rather than Emory Clark Hall.

(c) Suggested Time Line for Submission and Review of Final Report. Dr. Steve Heinrich devised a tentative time line for submission and review of the Final Report of the CCRC. Drs. Heinrich and Snow surmised that nearly twenty University groups would need to see the report. These included the College and/or Department Curriculum Committees, the A&S Dean’s Advisory Council, the University Deans Council, and the Academic Senate. Dr. Heinrich volunteered to contact these constituencies to coordinate the submission of the CCRC report with their regularly scheduled meetings. After some discussion about the feasibility of certain suggested dates, it was decided that a draft of the final report should be completed by February 1, 2002. Such a report would also include a revised Preamble and a rationale for the number and distribution of credits within the core of common studies. Professor Wiseman added that the report should memorialize the entire process of core curricular review, including the qualification of core courses, so that the process could be institutionalized for the future. Dr. Heinrich offered that he would revise the time line to accommodate the regular meeting dates of the various constituent groups. Fr. Rossi emphasized, however, that this time line should represent a working schedule for the CCRC rather than a list of deadlines by which the larger University could bind the CCRC. Other members cautioned that some groups could seize the opportunity for review of the final report to attempt a last-minute veto of the revised core. Dr. Machan added that when approaching the various constituencies with a final report, the CCRC should carefully phrase the purpose for which their review was sought. He suggested it might be most appropriate to distribute the final report as an “informational update.” That approach would be consistent with current CCRC practice.

Dr. Courtright stated that the CCRC should use another term to replace the term “Draft,” when submitting the final report, since the University often adopts a draft as its end product. He also suggested that the two-meeting rule adopted by the CCRC should be promulgated for use by the Academic Senate. Professor Wiseman offered that the Board of Undergraduate Studies was considering a resolution, drafted by Dr. John Pustejovsky, urging a protocol by which the Senate would vote on curricular matters. She suggested that the CCRC might want to join that resolution. Dr. Pustejovsky offered that he would present the resolution to the CCRC following its adoption by BUS.

(d) ROTC Issues. Dr. Snow reported that representatives from the ROTC programs had met with the Executive Committee to convey their concerns that an increase in credits occupied by the core of common studies would significantly increase the graduation requirements and the time within which ROTC students might graduate. An increased core would also reduce their flexibility to pursue other areas of
interest. Dr. Heinrich reported that about 240 Marquette students were also ROTC students and that approximately sixty of them pursued majors in Engineering. Collectively, these students received approximately $3.5 Million in scholarship monies, but the scholarship monies in some cases would only extend over four years of undergraduate study. Dr. Snow acknowledged that there was a problem for the ROTC programs, but she reported that the parties would seek ways to work together on these issues. At present, curricular directors for the ROTC programs were exploring whether some of their courses might qualify as core courses in the various knowledge areas by comparing applicable learning objectives. Dr. Ksobiech added that the Executive Committee was reasonably firm that the ROTC curricular programs must find some way to accommodate the 36-hour core. Dr. Heinrich suggested that the ROTC problem was not unlike the problem of deciding transfer credits within the core and suggested that the ROTC matter be considered with the transfer credit issue. To promote efficiency, Professor Wiseman suggested that the CCRC might create a subcommittee directed to that issue. Dr. Snow responded that three subcommittees would be formed with volunteer members from the CCRC as follows: (1) ROTC and Transfer Credits (Heinrich, Ksobiech, Malin, Naylor, and Snow); (2) Rationale for Number of Credits (Rossi, Snow and Wiseman); (3) Preamble (Courtright, Pustejovsky and Rossi). Dr. Snow suggested that the Preamble subcommittee should contact Dr. Rich Friman, Chair of Political Science, who had submitted relevant comments about the Preamble. She added that the Transfer subcommittee should contact Ms. Connie Bennett in Admissions and Ms. Vickie Trautschold with regard to existing protocol for transfer credits.

Dr. Deahl concluded the discussion by noting that the CCRC should arrange a meeting schedule for the spring semester 2002 as soon as possible. Dr. Snow responded that she would distribute another schedule grid to each member by e-mail.

III. Qualification of Core Courses. Continuing its discussion of the first round of core courses begun last spring, Dr. Snow observed that the following motion was pending as of September 14 and was subject to vote at this meeting in accord with the two-meeting rule: Dr. Ksobiech then moved that the Committee adopt all of the subcommittee course recommendations as noted in the minutes of April 16 and April 21, 2001, retaining the ability to edit or revise those recommendations on October 10, depending upon the continued work of the individual subcommittees between this date and October 10. The motion had been seconded simultaneously by Drs. Courtright and Wierzbicki.

Turning to the various subcommittees, the recommendations of (Group I) for submissions in Diverse Cultures and Literature were as follows:

- French 100 and French 101 (Diverse Cultures): Qualify
- Anthropology 001 (Diverse Cultures): Qualify
- Health 025 (Diverse Cultures): Qualify
- Philosophy 188 (Diverse Cultures): Reject and Remand
- English 022 (Literature): Qualify

Recommendations of the subcommittee considering submissions in Mathematical Reasoning and Rhetoric (Group II), were as follows:

- COSC 050 (Mathematical Reasoning): Qualify
- MATH 060 (Mathematical Reasoning): Reject and Remand
- MATH 070 (Mathematical Reasoning): Qualify
- SOCI 060 (Mathematical Reasoning): Reject and Remand
- ENGL 001 (Rhetoric): Qualify
- ENGL 002 (Rhetoric): Qualify

Turning to courses in Individual and Social Behavior and Histories of Cultures and Societies (Group III), the following recommendations were offered:

- PoliSci 020 (Individual and Social Behavior): Qualify
- PoliSci 040 (Individual and Social Behavior): Qualify
- PoliSci 060 (Individual and Social Behavior): Qualify
PYSC 001 (Individual and Social Behavior): Qualify
PYSC 078 (Individual and Social Behavior): Reject and Remand
PYSC 137 (Individual and Social Behavior): Qualify

As a final matter, the CCRC considered the course recommendations offered by the subcommittee covering Human Nature and Ethics, Science and Nature, and Theology (Group IV):

Phil 050 (Human Nature and Ethics): Qualify
Phil 104 (Human Nature and Ethics): Qualify
Theo 001 (Theology): Qualify
Theo 115 (Theology): Qualify
Chem 001 and 002 (Science and Nature): Reject and Remand
Physics 009 (Science and Nature): Reject and Remand
BISC 010: postponed

In view of these recommendations and the amendments thereto, the Committee restated its motion as follows: That the CCRC adopt all the recommendations of the subcommittees regarding core courses as announced or amended at the October 10 meeting. The motion passed on the unanimous vote of all voting members, including three proxies. There were no abstentions. [Editor’s Note: Courses not approved may be resubmitted in the spring semester 2001.]

Before closing, Dr. Tim Machan distributed a memo from Dr. Heather Hathaway expressing concern that some knowledge areas had morphed into other areas, e.g., Diverse Cultures/Foreign Languages; Literature/Performing Arts. Dr. Snow responded that she would place this matter on the agenda at the October 26 meeting. The hour for adjournment having arrived, the meeting concluded at 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Reporter
Core Curriculum Review Committee
Core Curriculum Review Committee
Approved Minutes
October 26, 2001

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m. on Friday, October 26, 2001 in Cudahy Hall Room 143 by Dr. Nancy Snow. Members Present: Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Rev. Philip Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki and Prof. Christine Wiseman. Members Excused: Dr. Michele Malin.

Dr. Snow opened the meeting by seeking a reflection from among the members. Dr. Cheryl Maranto responded by offering a prayer invoking a continued spirit of civility and compromise as the Committee seeks to serve the needs of Marquette students in the core process.

I. Minutes. The Committee addressed the unapproved minutes of October 10, 2001. Fr. Rossi offered an amendment to the second paragraph of the Chair’s Report on page 1 of the minutes, asking for deletion of the phrase, “Noting that the conference incorporated several opportunities for group reflection.” Thus, the opening sentence of paragraph 2 will read: “Fr. Rossi noted that it was critical for the Committee as a whole to spend time reflecting on the core conference in order to appreciate its impact.” Dr. Stephen Heinrich then asked that the last sentence on page 2 of the minutes be amended to insert the word “approximately sixty.” He also suggested that the second sentence on page 3 be amended to read, “but the scholarship monies in some cases would only extend over four years,” and that the ninth sentence in that same paragraph be amended to read, “and suggested that the ROTC matter be considered with the transfer credit issue.” Finally, Dr. Heinrich asked that his comments in the second full paragraph on page 4 of the minutes be amended as follows: “Dr. Heinrich observed that a substitute for sequenced courses might also affect Engineering since they might be more concerned about the ‘speaking’ aspect of Rhetoric than the enhanced writing skills offered by English 002 . . .” Dr. Wierzbicki then asked that his comments in the concluding sentences on page 4 of the minutes be amended to read: “Dr. Wierzbicki noted that although the instructor had submitted a revised syllabus, the original template would need to be revised to address other concerns of the subcommittee.” There being no further additions or corrections to the October 10 minutes, Fr. Philip Rossi moved their approval, as amended. The motion was seconded jointly by Dr. John Pustejovsky and Dr. Michael Wierzbicki and passed unanimously.

II. Chair’s Report: Announcement of Approved Courses. Dr. Snow announced that a list of courses thus far approved for the core of common studies had been distributed by e-mail to all deans and department chairs, although it appeared that some department chairs had not notified relevant faculty members. Committee members agreed, therefore, that Dr. Snow would forward another e-mail to department chairs asking them to please inform their faculty about which courses had been approved. Committee members also agreed that redacted minutes would be posted on the Academic Affairs website following communication of the relevant course determinations by the CCRC to proponents of the different courses (or departments sponsoring their submission). The Committee agreed that all discussion in Part III of the October 10 minutes would be redacted, save for the introductory material, the name of the courses and the bold-face determination. The Committee agreed that Professor Wiseman would prepare the redacted minutes and add an editor’s note indicating that courses which were not approved could be resubmitted in the spring semester 2001.

Discussion followed about whether the Committee should return individual course evaluation forms to each proponent (redacting the evaluator’s name) when courses were “rejected and remanded.” One member suggested that the Committee had earlier determined to issue a “summary report” that would be edited for clarity and distributed to each instructor or department chair. He reminded the Committee that it was important for the Committee to speak with one voice when issuing such reports. Another member suggested that these summary reports should be returned to the department rather than the individual instructor, since core course submission was a departmental function rather than a private function of individual enterprise. Furthermore, it was important to foster a culture suggesting that responsibility for the core is a shared responsibility. Others agreed but suggested that the evaluation tool
itself should be the final report, cautioning that when the Committee fashioned repetitive evaluations or reports it ran the risk of miscommunication. Dr. Pustejovsky suggested that a single evaluation tool should be returned to the department chair which reflected the consensus determination of the Committee. The Committee agreed, therefore, that the subcommittee chairs would revise the individual course evaluations to reflect the collective determination of the Committee. These would be returned to Dr. Snow without affixing the names of subcommittee members. Dr. Snow would then return these evaluation tools to the department chairs, noting on each evaluation tool that the departments were free to resubmit their course proposals in the spring semester 2001.

III. Continued Discussion of BISC 010. Dr. Linda Laatsch distributed a memorandum to each Committee member outlining the predominant issues slated for discussion. These were: (1) the process by which the course was evaluated and (2) whether the template was sufficient to demonstrate that the course met the learning objectives for Science and Nature. (A copy of Dr. Laatsch’s memo is attached to the original of these minutes).

Committee members then engaged an exhaustive discussion of the process and its implications for other core submissions. Among the issues discussed were the level of scrutiny to which core submissions should be subjected; the appropriate process when experts disagreed about how learning objectives should be addressed; whether faculty from other departments, beyond the members of the CCRC, should be consulted about a given course submission; whether it was critical that a core course was taught by adjuncts rather than regular faculty, and how much confidentiality should be preserved when discussing course submissions outside the Committee. In particular, some members were concerned that the level of scrutiny to which this course was subjected was more intense than the level of scrutiny accorded other core submissions. Others noted that each voting member of the Committee represented a different substantive area and was expected to bring that expertise to bear when qualifying core courses. Professor Wiseman observed that the Committee should not view the matter in terms of a “process violation.” Rather, the Committee was confronting a matter of first impression in this case, i.e., how to evaluate substantive concerns affecting the learning objectives when experts disagreed. Dr. Wierzbicki concurred, noting that the Committee would be required to evaluate future courses in various knowledge areas submitted by other than traditional departments. Dr. Deahl added that the Committee’s actions were not punitive in nature but intended to place these courses in the best form to suit everyone’s needs. Thus, the Committee would require the expertise of many departments if the core were to succeed. Dr. Snow remarked, however, that the Committee would need to exercise some care in consulting faculty outside its membership lest it appear that faculty in traditional departments had a disproportionate voice in the qualification process. She suggested that it might be important for the Committee or its subcommittees to consult with as broad a range of individuals as possible when engaging these discussions. Dr. Machan agreed, noting that the University had a vast array of faculty with whom to consult, so long as the final decision was made within the Committee. Dr. Wierzbicki added that it was appropriate to summon experts, but the Committee should do so systematically.

Turning to the specific submission, Dr. Laatsch recommended that BISC 010 be qualified as a core course. She argued that the template addressed the learning objectives in Science and Nature as appropriate for non-science majors, which was the group to which this course was directed. However, members of the subcommittee on Science and Nature noted a number of issues with respect to the template. First of all, it appeared that the syllabus submitted covered a two-credit course. Some suggested that the Committee should request a submission for the three-credit course contemplated as a core course. Thus, although this course could be presented in such a way to qualify as a core course, it did not qualify at present. Dr. Heinrich also noted that the math component of the course was very minimal, and Dr. Courtright reasoned that although the course held great potential, the template and accompanying materials offered no evidence that students would engage the experimental method and evaluate results. In other words, there was no indication of what scientific standards would apply in the course. Dr. Maranto and Professor Wiseman offered that if the Committee were to engage this level of scrutiny, any feedback to the department must be specific to the template and framed in terms of the learning objectives. Others agreed but noted that the experimental or scientific method was crucial to the Science and Nature objectives and that such evidence was missing from the template and accompanying materials. Mr. Lowrey observed that qualifying core courses must involve more than an effort at “grantsmanship.” That is, it must be more than
an exercise in writing for the template. Thus, insufficient evidence with respect to a given learning objective was an appropriate consideration. The Committee agreed, however, that it was irrelevant whether a proposed course was taught by adjunct or regular faculty, so long as the department committed the necessary resources and the learning objectives were met.

At this point, Dr. Snow inquired about how best to proceed, given the reservations affecting this submission. Dr. Courtright suggested that the subcommittee (Group IV) should meet further with Dr. Linda Vaughn, Chair of Basic Health Sciences, and the instructor before subjecting the submission to a formal vote. Dr. Snow added that the meeting should include Drs. Linda Laatsch and Shelly Malin as well, since they also held an expertise in the Science and Nature knowledge area. Based upon the information gathered at this meeting, Group IV would provide a recommendation regarding BISC 010 at the November 7 CCRC meeting.

The hour for adjournment having arrived, the meeting concluded at 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Reporter
Core Curriculum Review Committee
Core Curriculum Review Committee  
Approved Minutes  
November 7, 2001

The meeting was called to order on Wednesday, November 7, 2001 in 303 Johnston Hall at 10:10 AM by Dr. Nancy Snow. **Members present:** Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. Jim Courtright, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. Jim Lowrey, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Shelly Malin, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Dr. Nancy Snow, and Dr. Michael Wierzbicki. **Members excused:** Dr. Phil Rossi, Dr. Bob Deahl, Dr. Ellen Eckman, and Professor Chris Wiseman.

Dr. Snow opened the meeting by seeking reflection from a committee member. Dr. Laatsch shared a prayer.

The initial discussion centered on whether to publish the minutes from the October 26 meeting in their entirety, or a redacted version. The concern arose because of the sensitive nature of the discussion. The consensus was to publish the minutes in their entirety, omitting only the name of the individual instructor who teaches the course that was at issue in the discussion, in order to ensure the continued openness of the committee’s deliberations.

I. Minutes. The Committee addressed the unapproved minutes of October 26, 2001. The only correction offered was the spelling of Dr. Wierzbicki’s name at the end of the second full paragraph on page 2. Dr. Laatsch moved to accept the minutes, Dr. Courtright seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

II. Chair’s Report: Continuing Review of Submissions for the Balance of the Semester. Dr. Snow noted her desire to determine a timetable for review of the courses that were submitted subsequent to the latest call for core course submissions, so that the full CCRC could review all course submissions by the Nov. 30 meeting, with a vote at the Dec. 14 meeting. A question arose as to whether some of the course templates should be distributed more equally across subcommittees for initial review, since a majority of submissions are falling in one subcommittee’s area (i.e., literature and diverse cultures). Following a discussion, the consensus was to retain the current subcommittee structure for review of courses by knowledge area, given that each subcommittee was developing greater familiarity and expertise in that area, as well as to help ensure consistency of review across courses within a knowledge area. However, given the preponderance of courses being submitted for one subcommittee’s review, it was decided that the subcommittee would review and make a recommendation on 10 courses by the Nov. 30 meeting, with the remaining courses to be reviewed prior to the Dec. meeting of the full CCRC.

The issue of the difficulty of finding a meeting time for spring semester was raised. There appears to be no day/time slot that would not lead to a few committee members being chronically absent. Dr. Snow suggested the possibility of Saturday morning or weekday evening meeting times. After discussion, Dr. Malin suggested the advisability of working on the fall 2002 schedule now. She offered to undertake this task. She asked committee members to make a timely response to an email she would send soliciting alternatives.

Dr. Snow then suggested the need to publish a timetable for our continuing call for submissions of courses to qualify for the core, in order that faculty be given notice of these future opportunities. She further noted her desire to establish a timetable that would allow for a maximum number of courses to be qualified in time to be included in the copy for the 2003-04 catalog of courses. She then proposed a Sept. 1 2002 deadline as a last submission date for roll-over
out of the new core (as it would stand at that time) to be published in the catalog. Dr. Ksobiech noted that November 13 is typically the deadline given for final catalog copy. Backing up from this date, it was noted that departments might want to review courses prior to their submission to the CCRC. Discussion centered on how late we could establish a call for next academic year and still enable them to get through the review process at all levels in time to qualify. Dr. Laatsch noted that as long as the CCRC publishes the deadline dates for submission in advance, faculty would have sufficient notice to optimize submissions. Dr. Pustejovsky noted that there may be a bit of flexibility in the catalog deadline, though Dr. Ksobiech noted that would not be the case if everyone wanted to extend past the normal deadline. Dr. Maranto expressed concern about whether a September 1 deadline would provide the CCRC with sufficient time to allow review and approval and still make the catalog deadline. If not, she suggested it might be better to not hold out the possibility that those Sept. 1 submissions would make it through the process in time. The consensus that emerged was to have a Sept. 1 2002 deadline for fall submission, but to note publicly that, if a faculty member and/or department wanted to insure course approval in time to appear in the catalog, they should submit by March 1, 2002. The committee gave Dr. Snow permission to publicize the March 1, 2002 and Sept. 1 2002 schedule for continuing course submissions.

III. Discussion and Vote on BISC 010. Dr. Snow then opened the discussion of whether BISC010 should be qualified as a core course. Noting that discussion of BISC had proceeded for almost two hours at the last CCRC meeting, she determined that discussion should take no more than thirty minutes; at the end of this time, a vote would be taken. Dr. Snow reported that the subcommittee (Group IV) performing the initial review on Science and Nature Submissions and Dr. Linda Laatsch met for two hours with the department chair and instructor who offer BISC 010 about the course. Dr. Heinrich had prepared a list of questions concerning the course. The instructor responded in writing, and the written response was submitted to the Group IV subcommittee. The subcommittee voted 4 to approve and 1 to reject and remand the course back to the department. Dr. Snow distributed the e-mail correspondence of Group IV’s deliberations to CCRC members, then opened the floor for discussion.

In the ensuing discussion, several reservations were expressed. It was suggested that the template does not adequately capture the encompassing goals of the overall knowledge area. However, BISC 010 met the details set out in the template. Dr. Maranto suggested that the source of concern appears to be that the knowledge area goals are not adequately reflected in the learning objectives or the evaluation template. However, if the course satisfies the written objectives, it is difficult to make the determination that the course does not qualify. It was noted that the subcommittee members approved the course based on the additional feedback from the instructor. Dr. Malin noted that only one science course has to this point been submitted for inclusion in the core. Dr. Heinrich observed that the Science and Nature knowledge area will be difficult to address because no basic introductory course analogous to THEO 001 or PHIL 001 currently exists. Dr. Courtright suggested that courses that qualify for Science and Nature should include coverage of non-human models as well as human models. Modern biology tells us that over 26,000 human genes have been sequenced and over 90% of them are identical to other species. The bottom line is that humans are not unique. To solve problems in the human context, we need to go beyond the human model, and give students a view of how humans fit into the entire scheme of nature. He expressed the belief that courses in this area should provide a broader view than that provided by this course. Science can provide good ways to solve problems, but students need to model systems and cases, and explore where humans fit in the expanse of the biological continuum. His sense is that the instructor and the department do not want to expand the scope of this course to do so. Dr. Laatsch observed that there are different ways to teach a course, and different faculty take different approaches. Earlier a concern was expressed that there was no
discussion of research in this course, but rather that static conclusions were presented. Dr. Laatsch noted that the subcommittee learned that research findings are woven throughout the course, and that research is based on both human and animal models. Students do literature searches that include animal research. She concluded that perhaps the source of disagreement stems from a difference in philosophy, and noted that this course is intended for non-science majors. Dr. Malin agreed with Dr. Courtright that the human model is not the only model. But it is a valid model. After the instructor and chair responded to the subcommittee’s list of questions, she had concluded that it is a good course. Dr. Courtright’s ideas might improve the course, but that should not stop the course from being approved in its current form. Dr. Courtright noted that nowhere in the textbook or in her comments was the phrase “will test animal models” used, nor was there an indication that the course covers vertebrate nutrition. He suggested the need for the instructor to talk to faculty in other departments. Dr. Maranto noted that there is nothing in the description of the knowledge area that indicates a need to go beyond the human model, and questioned whether the CCRC can hold a course to a standard that was not articulated by the faculty focus groups that defined the knowledge area and learning objectives. Dr. Wierzbicki expressed his concern about whether the course adequately addresses the scientific method and hypothesis testing. Perhaps if mainstream science courses had been approved first, we wouldn’t have this problem. Dr. Malin asserted that the instructor does address the scientific method and hypothesis testing throughout the course. However, she approaches it through her coverage of content, rather than having a separate lecture on it. Dr. Mahon proposed that if the problem is that the definition of the knowledge area and template now are determined to be inadequate, that we should change them. Dr. Snow asked whether we need to change the template to explicitly state that faculty submitters must include how all aspects of the knowledge area are addressed. Dr. Maranto suggested that two separate issues were being raised: (1) Does the template adequately reflect the knowledge area, and (2) Does the knowledge area description adequately cover what should be addressed? Dr. Malin opined that Science and Nature has been a difficult knowledge area to grapple with throughout the Core Curriculum process. From the beginning, faculty in this area have struggled with the fact that different paradigms exist within the area. Dr. Pustejovsky observed that the CCRC meetings just keep getting more and more interesting. He drew the analogy to debates over whether a faculty member should be promoted on the basis of potential or achievement. Drs. Machan and Ksobiech noted that faculty are never promoted on the basis of potential. Dr. Malin suggested that the entire core curriculum process is based on potential. We won’t know with certainty whether any course truly addresses the learning objectives adequately until after assessment occurs. Dr. Pustejovsky suggested the need for the CCRC to articulate a broad goal, and noted that whatever the committee creates will be scrutinized for detail and subject. Dr. Ksobiech then asked whether the committee ever talked about the possibility of a term for course approval (e.g., 3 – 5 years), instead of approving courses in perpetuity.

Dr. Heinrich brought the discussion back to the topic of Science and Nature goals. He noted that they do articulate the need for courses to provide a broad science groundwork and basis for scientific inquiry. Dr. Malin stated that she has been on the curriculum committee in her college for 11-12 years. The guiding principle has always been that when the curriculum is reviewed and approved based on a set of objectives, it is not possible to judge content or to approve or reject a course based on the methods used by a faculty member. Rather, the question must be: Is there a high probability that this course will meet the learning objectives? She suggested that the CCRC can make comments/friendly recommendations on how a course might be changed or improved. But if we use this as a basis of approval, we will get into big problems. Dr. Byleen noted the desire for a science course to include qualitative, quantitative and symbolic reasoning. He noted his reluctance to approve this course on that basis, and suggested that the course should be remanded for revision and resubmission. Having exhausted further discussion, a vote was taken, 10 in favor and 5 against approval of BISC 010 for inclusion in the core. Dr.
Ksobiech suggested that the Chair should communicate the friendly recommendations concerning this course to the department chair and instructor, drawing particular attention to the goals of the science and nature area. Dr. Courtright noted that he had given long and serious thought to the question of what we should be doing when we approve courses for the core. He suggested that perhaps friendly suggestions should be provided for all knowledge areas. He believes that core courses should address broader questions than other courses. The question should be: Does this course encourage, expand, or extend student thinking to some of the profound questions of human existence and the world we inhabit, or does the course analyze the elegance of human thought or endeavor in seeking solutions to problems? He suggested that perhaps that is contained in the Preamble. Dr. Quade noted that many comments made during the committee’s deliberations concerned questions of the adequacy of the template in reflecting the broader goals of the knowledge areas. She wondered whether there is or should be an ongoing revision of the templates? Dr. Snow suggested that we add broad goals to the top of each template, and add a statement that the committee will also examine whether the course appears to address these broader issues. Dr. Ksobiech suggested that we should put it through our process. The decision was made to reactivate a subcommittee to revise the template, and to resubmit it to the full CCRC for approval. The subcommittee will consist of Drs. Malin, Snow and Pustejovsky. Dr. Pustejovsky noted the need to address the question of the permanence/fluidity of how a knowledge area is articulated. It should reflect the thinking of the faculty as a whole.

IV. Recommendations on Excess Proposals from the First Call for Courses. Dr. Snow asked for the report and recommendations of Group I dealing with literature and diverse cultures on excess course proposals from the first call for courses. [Reporter’s Note: Dr. Snow had informed CCRC members in a previous e-mail that History 006, which had initially been submitted among the excess proposals, had been withdrawn from consideration at this time by the chair of the History Department, Dr. Lance Grahn.] Dr. Cheryl Maranto began the report. She recommended remanding several courses because there was insufficient evidence to evaluate them: French 101, Political Science 159, Greek/Latin 108, and Italian 108. These courses had syllabi that had little more information than a list of topics and dates, and no supplemental information was provided other than the template. Dr. Snow reminded Group I that French 101 had been qualified by recommendation of Group I and vote of the CCRC along with French 100 as part of the CCRC’s evaluation of proposals from the first round of submissions. Regarding the issue of lack of information on syllabi, some CCRC members have noted previously that, in some disciplines, the syllabus typically does not include more than a schedule of topics. Dr. Malin wondered if perhaps we should provide an example syllabus. Dr. Snow noted that several department chairs in the sciences have raised concerns that the syllabus is typically just a schedule of topics. Somehow the CCRC needs to be provided with information as to how the course addresses the learning objectives. Thus, submitters should be asked to provide assignments or other course documents that demonstrate how learning objectives are addressed. Dr. Ksobiech noted that faculty may have been using this sort of syllabus for many years, and it is a good course. But they need to re-articulate their course in terms of the learning objectives. Dr. Wierzbicki suggested that the Chair of the CCRC advise deans that they could facilitate our process by directing faculty to include how their course addresses its learning objectives in their syllabus. This needs to be clarified for faculty. Dr. Malin observed that learning objectives need to be written in non-technical language so that CCRC members who are not in that discipline can understand. Perhaps we need to provide concrete examples of what a learning objective is.

Dr. Pustejovsky discussed five literature courses from the Department of Foreign Languages that the subcommittee reviewed. He observed that the submissions for SPAN 050, 055 and 175 all had the same templates. Obviously, these courses have been part of the core for years, and should continue to be, but the course materials do not adequately demonstrate how they each
address the learning objectives. The subcommittee recommended that they be remanded for additional information. The template for SPAN 192 template also did not provide examples of how learning objectives are met. It indicated that the objectives were important, but not how they were met. Recommendation: remand for more information. ITAL 148 is one of a series of 148 courses that are topics courses taught in English translation. Although the responses in the template are not as explicit as to how learning objectives are addressed as desired, it is clear from the template that the classroom experience provides this exposure. The subcommittee recommended ITAL 148 be approved once a more explicit statement of how learning objectives are addressed is provided.

Dr. Ksobiech posed the question of whether we should approve topics courses for the core. These can be very different courses, depending on the instructor and topic. Dr. Courtright noted that additional questions of coverage arise when a course is delivered by temporary faculty. Dr. Ksobiech acknowledged that this is a concern, but that it is the responsibility of department chairs to ensure uniformity of coverage in a course, regardless of what faculty member teaches it. That is a different issue than topics courses in which the topic differs.

Group I also reviewed a series of English courses: ENGL 159 as well as ENGL 023, 032, 033, 042, 043, and 044. It was recommended that the latter courses be approved pro forma, on the basis of the prior approval by the CCRC of English 022. English 022 was approved pursuant to English Department guidelines which govern all of these sophomore English courses. The guidelines explicitly address how learning objectives will be addressed in all of the courses in this series. Referring back to the foreign language literature courses, Dr. Wierzbicki expressed concern about rejecting courses on the basis that the template responses are identical for different courses. Dr. Maranto noted that it was the combination of the identical templates and the lack of sufficient detail in the syllabus or other accompanying materials that led the subcommittee to recommend that these courses be remanded.

Group I having concluded its discussion on the submissions noted above, Dr. John Pustejovsky moved to approve the subcommittee report as presented. That motion was seconded by Dr. James Courtright. The motion will be subject to vote at the November 30 meeting in accord with the two-meeting rule.

V. Subcommittee Reports: Subcommittee on Transfer Students and ROTC. The subcommittee addressing transfer credits and ROTC then reported on their work. Dr. Snow, the subcommittee chair, reported that the subcommittee has been meeting with ROTC faculty and helping them to meet both their own requirements and core requirements. Dr. Snow also reported as chair of the “rationale subcommittee” (formerly known as the “subcommittee on language justifying the number of credits”). She noted that their draft document was distributed at the last meeting, and that this language will have to be revised, depending on how the Preamble is revised. The latter endeavor is ongoing. Dr. Pustejovsky, chair of the Preamble subcommittee, reported that they met twice to work on revising the text of the Preamble. The subcommittee will meet with Dr. Quade and Ms. Stephanie Russell, Executive Director of Mission and Identity, before the revised text is brought back to the CCRC. Dr. Karl Byleen, chair of the statistics subcommittee, reported that the subcommittee met with department chairs, and had asked for information on the textbooks used. A question was raised whether the CCRC should be that involved in course review, and how the CCRC should work with faculty whose submissions have been rejected. Dr. Snow suggested that each subcommittee could use its own judgment, but noted that it is not the CCRC’s job to write the templates. Dr. Ksobiech asked whether courses should be remanded to the department as opposed to individual faculty members.
Since the statistics courses are taught by three people in three different departments, it was suggested that the CCRC encourage discussion among the three instructors.

In concluding, Dr. Snow complimented the CCRC members on their continuing work and noted that input from various department chairs had been positive.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl L. Maranto
Standing in for Christine M. Wiseman
The meeting was called to order at 10:15 a.m. on Friday, November 30, 2001 in Cudahy Hall Room 143 by Dr. Nancy Snow. **Members Present:** Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Michele Malin, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Rev. Philip Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki and Prof. Christine Wiseman. **Members Excused:** Dr. Robert Deahl.

Dr. Snow opened the meeting by noting that Dr. Cheryl Maranto had agreed to provide the initial reflection. Dr. Maranto obliged by seeking patience, knowledge and wisdom to consider the various templates in a thoughtful way with the goal of enhancing student learning.

**I. Minutes.** The Committee next addressed the unapproved minutes of November 7, 2001. Dr. Snow remarked that the November 7 minutes should have included English 042 and English 159 among courses considered by Group 1 and nominated for approval within the core of common studies. Others also recalled that Dr. John Pustejovsky had moved to approve the report on recommended courses offered by Group I, as seconded by Dr. James Courtright. That motion was pending for vote at the November 30 meeting. Dr. James Courtright then added that the broader questions addressed by core courses, as stated at the top of page 4 of the November 7 minutes, should reflect his actual comments as follows: “Does this course encourage, expand, or extend student thinking to some of the profound questions of human existence and the world we inhabit, or does the course analyze the elegance of human thought or endeavor in seeking solutions to problems?” There being no further additions or corrections to the November 7 minutes, Dr. Ken Ksobiech moved their approval, as amended. The motion was seconded by Dr. Michael Wierzbicki and passed unanimously. Professor Wiseman would edit the November 7 minutes to reflect these changes.

**II. Chair’s Report.** Dr. Snow articulated four items for further consideration by the Committee. First of all, she announced that Marquette was awarded a $2 million grant from Lilly Endowment, Inc. to create the Manresa Project, and that core course development was included within that project. The grant will be supervised generally from the Office of Mission and Identity and will be directed by Dr. Susan Mountin. Dr. Snow noted that a member of the Core Curriculum Review Committee would need to sit on the specific committee that manages the distribution of smaller course development grants and asked for volunteers from the CCRC. Interested persons should report to Dr. Snow. Secondly, Dr. Snow solicited participation from Committee members in the meeting schedule for spring semester 2002. The members determined to meet on Wednesday mornings from 10:00 a.m. until 12:00 noon, with alternative weekend or evening dates for additional meetings. After some further discussion, members agreed by consensus that Thursday evenings provided the best alternative for those additional meetings. As a third matter, the Committee agreed to invite Ms. Stephanie Russell, Executive Director of University Mission and Identity, to join their membership in view of core course participation in the Lilly grant. Professor Wiseman also reminded the Committee to think about adding a student member, since many general education committees at other universities also include a student perspective. She observed that it might be worthwhile to include a student perspective as the process becomes increasingly institutionalized. Finally, Dr. Snow expressed renewed interest in a joint meeting of the Core Curriculum Review Committee and the Core Curriculum Assessment Committee. Professor Wiseman indicated that further meetings of the Assessment Committee had been suspended until such time as both committees could come together to generate ideas regarding the role of assessment in administering the core of common studies. After some discussion, the CCRC determined to hold a joint meeting before the spring semester begins in order to accommodate myriad teaching schedules. The Committee agreed to host a joint meeting on Wednesday, January 9, 2002. Although the CCRC would meet from 9:00 until 11:00 a.m., it would invite members of the Assessment Committee to join the meeting from 10:00 until 11:00 a.m. The meeting would convene with whichever members of both committees were available at that time. The agenda likely would include debriefing the September core curriculum conference and discuss the role of assessment, as noted above. Professor Wiseman would arrange for a room and refreshments. **[Reporter’s Note: The joint meeting]**
will be held in Cudahy 414 beginning at 10:00 a.m.; refreshments have been arranged].

III. Revised Documents: Template, Evaluation Tool for Use by Committee; Guidelines for Qualifying a Core Course. Turning to the substantive agenda, members spent an hour discussing the sufficiency of the template and course evaluative tools in light of their experience and relevant feedback. Among the many suggestions, the following were authorized.

(1) Core Course Proposal Template: the printed form of each template would reflect the specific knowledge area and the learning objectives unique to each knowledge area. The template would also add the following items: Course Title and Number; Department or Unit Submitting Proposal; Signature of Unit Head or Department Chair, and Person Submitting Proposal. Then, in bold face, the template would be divided into two sections: “Goals,” followed by question 1: “Briefly describe how this course meets the goals of this knowledge area,” and “Learning Objectives, Course Content, Pedagogy and Assessment,” followed by question 2: “Briefly describe how this course enables students to fulfill the following learning objectives. If any learning objective is not met, please explain why.” A list of the various learning objectives would follow the chart as originally devised. Specifically, the sentence “We believe this course meets the requirements for the (fill in name) Theme within the Core of Common Studies and submit the following evaluation for your consideration” would be deleted. Beyond that, original question 3 asking, “Please describe how the learning objectives of the knowledge area . . . are addressed in this course” would be eliminated as well.

(2) Evaluation Tool: Conforming to the revised Template, the Evaluation Tool would reflect certain changes prescribed by the Committee as well. In that regard, the first question on the tool would be revised to read as follows: “Describe how the course meets the goals of the knowledge area.” Question 2 would require: “Include syllabi or other course documentation that list specific learning objectives for the course.” Question 3 would echo the request now listed as Question 1, with the addition of the phrase, “of the knowledge area” at the end of the item: “Provide sufficient information to show that the course substantively addresses the learning objectives of the knowledge area.” Question 4 would follow with: “If no to (3) for any learning objective, is satisfactory explanation given of why not?” Questions 5 through 16 would continue in the same order as before, seeking an explanation about the coordination of multiple sections and the allocation of department resources; sequencing and integration within the knowledge area; sequencing and integration across knowledge areas; addressing the Preamble; assessment of learning objectives; who would provide instruction; course capacity per semester and per academic year, and how often the course would be taught and in how many sections. The Committee thereafter authorized Dr. Snow to coordinate the numbers in the “template evidentiary reference” column with the appropriate reference questions on the revised course template.

(3) Guidelines for Qualifying a Core Course: Committee members likewise authorized Dr. Snow to make edit the “Guidelines” so that they conformed to the revised Course Template and Evaluation Tool. Dr. Snow then sought a motion to authorize her to make the changes to the Committee documents. The motion was made by Dr. Shelly Malin and seconded by Dr. Karl Byleen. The Committee next discussed whether it might be appropriate to suspend the two-meeting rule to allow for immediate approval of the changes following the extensive Committee discussions. Professor Wiseman moved that the Committee suspend its two-meeting rule in order to approve the changes enumerated above. The motion was seconded by Dr. James Courtright. Dr. Byleen cautioned, however, that it might be appropriate to see the changes in print before approving them for larger distribution. Dr. Snow then called the question, and the motion failed on only four affirmative votes. Dr. John Pustejovsky then moved to approve the edits to the Template, the Evaluation Tool and the Guidelines for vote at the December 14 meeting. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ken Ksobiech. Thus, the Committee will vote to approve the edits at its December 14 meeting in accord with the two-meeting rule.

IV. Vote on Extra Submissions from First Call for Core Courses. As reflected in the minutes of November 7, 2001, a motion was pending with regard to the following courses:

ENGL 159: Qualify
ENGL 023: Qualify pro forma based on ENGL 022 departmental guidelines
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ENGL 032: Qualify pro forma based on ENGL 022 departmental guidelines
ENGL 033: Qualify pro forma based on ENGL 022 departmental guidelines
ENGL 042 (added by amendment to the November 7 minutes): Qualify pro forma based on ENGL 022 departmental guidelines
ENGL 043: Qualify pro forma based on ENGL 022 departmental guidelines
ENGL 044: Qualify pro forma based on ENGL 022 departmental guidelines
French 101: Remand (insufficient evidence to evaluate) NOTE: course recommendation WITHDRAWN per discussion below
ITAL 148: Qualify, pending a more explicit statement of how learning objectives are addressed
Poli Sci 159: Remand (insufficient evidence to evaluate)
Greek/Latin 108: Remand (insufficient evidence to evaluate)
Italian 108: Remand (insufficient evidence to evaluate)
Spanish 050: Remand (insufficient evidence to address learning objectives)
Spanish 055: Remand (insufficient evidence to address learning objectives)
Spanish 175: Remand (insufficient evidence to address learning objectives)
Spanish 192: Remand (no examples of how learning objectives are met)

When discussing the motion, Dr. Snow reminded the Committee that French 101 had been earlier qualified for inclusion in the core, in tandem with French 100. The subcommittee concluded, however, that it had approved French 101 in error, thinking that the syllabus was the same as French 100. In point of fact, it appeared that French 101 addressed a different student population with different objectives. In view of this dilemma, Dr. Pustejovsky suggested that the subcommittee should withdraw its recommendation and further deliberate its options. When discussing these options, one member suggested that the Academic Senate might have final jurisdiction in this matter and the issue might be determined by that body when it finally approves the core. Others responded that no deliberating body was contemplated beyond the Core Curriculum Review Committee; hence, it would constitute bad precedent to await Academic Senate deliberation. They agreed with Dr. Pustejovsky that the subcommittee should extract French 101 from the pending vote, identify any concerns with the template, and communicate those concerns to the French instructors in the Department of Foreign Languages. Dr. Machan offered that although a chair might be very upset at receiving such news, the CCRC guidelines for qualification of core courses were evolving in the course of a continuing dynamic. As part of that dynamic it might be expected that a decision made months ago in a very short-lived process would not survive interminably. Dr. Snow cautioned, however, that the decision on this course had been publicly broadcast to the department chair, in the minutes, to the Academic Senate at its October 15 meeting and to the Dean’s Council at its recent meeting on November 28. She indicated that university constituencies were awaiting these decisions on core courses and they were not easily retractable.

Dr. Heinrich offered that when the CCRC moved to qualify core courses it also provided feedback. In that feedback it might communicate that French 101 was qualified on the assumption that the syllabus was identical to French 100. Discovering otherwise, the Committee has determined that the course requires new and additional information. Dr. Snow reiterated that the matter required further deliberation and explanation. Again she requested that the subcommittee withdraw French 101 from the list of recommendations, allowing the matter to return to the subcommittee for further consultation with the department chair. Fr. Rossi added that the CCRC should be honest in acknowledging its need for assistance in these deliberations. The subcommittee agreed to comply with Dr. Snow’s request. Fr. Rossi then moved that the Committee approve the recommendations for core courses noted above, amending the list to withdrawing the recommendation regarding French 101 and add the recommendation to approve English 042. The motion was seconded simultaneously by Drs. Stephen Heinrich and John Pustejovsky. The motion passed. All present voted in favor of the motion, and affirmative proxies were received from Drs. Linda Laatsch and Phillip Naylor. There were no abstentions and no members opposed the motion, although Dr. Robert Deahl had not registered a proxy vote.

V. Subcommittee Reports and Recommendations on Submissions Resulting from Second Call for Core Courses. The Committee turned to the various subcommittee reports on those submissions resulting from the second call for core courses. Beginning with Group I, Dr. Snow reminded the
Committee that Group I would present only ten recommendations in view of the volume of core submissions pending in their areas (Diverse Cultures and Literature). With that proviso, Professor Wiseman offered the following recommendations for Group I:

**French 115 (Middle Ages) (Literature): Qualify** (a model template; it provides a good illustration of the pertinence of historical issues for core education);

**French 130 (French Canadian Culture) (Diverse Cultures): Remand** (instructor provided insufficient information; difficult to determine whether specified learning objectives were satisfied since the instructor simply delineated course objectives without further explanation);

**German 065 (Modern German Short Story) (Literature): Qualify** (excellent proposal; recommend as model template);

**Greek 175 and Latin 175 (Classical Mythology) (Literature): Qualify** (well-planned and responsive template);

**ORLE 135 (Culturally Diverse Organizations) (Diverse Cultures): Remand** (examples provided are not specified nor do they provide information about how the course addresses the required learning objectives for diverse cultures. The CCRC requires some evidence as to how the learning objectives are addressed);

**PSYC 112 (Psychology of Prejudice) (Diverse Cultures): Qualify** (Template is filled with specific relevant examples; objectives are met with a focus on student learning);

**Spanish 056 (Spanish Literature 2) (Literature): Qualify** (syllabus is reflective of developmental goals of course; development of types of assessment and their inclusion in syllabus is impressive);

**Spanish 103 (Contemporary Issues in Hispanic World) (Diverse Cultures): Qualify** (commend proponent on detail provided by template; template constitutes a “model” in the Diverse Cultures knowledge area);

**HIST 198 (History of Rock and Roll) (Diverse Cultures): Remand** (intent of this knowledge area is to provide students with knowledge and skills that enhance their cross-cultural competence and to provide deeper knowledge about at least one racio-ethnic culture other than one’s own. A course in the history of blues that investigated the impact of slavery and of African-American culture would probably satisfy the learning objectives of this knowledge area, but there is no evidence that this course does so as it is currently constituted).

**Group II** (Mathematical Reasoning and Rhetoric) had considered four courses. Dr. Ken Ksobiech offered their recommendations as follows:

**MATH 080 (Calculus I) (Mathematical Reasoning): Qualify**;

**MATH 071 (Elements of Calculus I) (Mathematical Reasoning): Qualify** (both of these courses offer detailed templates and specific syllabi);

**PHIL 001 (Logic) (Mathematical Reasoning): Remand** (though course is useful and students should avail themselves of its substantive content, reviewers questioned whether the course fulfilled the objectives of mathematical reasoning. When analyzed, less than a quarter of the Math Reasoning objectives were fulfilled in the course. Under the circumstances, Dr Snow suggested that Phil 099 might be a better option for this area).

**PSYC 060 (Psychological Measurement and Statistics) (Mathematical Reasoning): Remand for clarification** (no indication that student learning is emphasized in revisions to template; remand to department for clarification and request re-submission).

**Group III** (Individual and Social Behavior; Histories of Cultures and Societies) had considered six submissions in the Histories of Cultures and Societies knowledge area and six in the Individual and Social Behavior knowledge area. Their recommendations with respect to these submissions were made by Dr. Michael Wierzbicki as follows:

**HIST 001 (Growth of Western Civ I) (Histories of Cultures and Societies): Qualify**;

**HIST 002 (Growth of Western Civ II) (Histories of Cultures and Societies): Qualify** (templates for both courses constituted model documents);

**HIST 071 (Latin America) (Histories of Cultures and Societies): Qualify** (proponent submitted
additional notes that should be added to the template for the CCRC archives;

GERM 101 (German Contributions to Western Civ) (Histories of Cultures and Societies): Withdrewn (Dr. Wierzbicki met at length with the instructor regarding subcommittee concerns but the instructor was unable to respond by the November 30 CCRC meeting. Thus, the instructor withdrew the submission for consideration at a later date).

HIST 006 (Intro. to American History) (Histories of Cultures and Societies): Defer Consideration;

HIST 083 (East Asia) (Histories of Cultures and Societies): Defer Consideration (the latter courses raised questions on a number of template entries requiring a more thorough response. However, none has been received as yet. The subcommittee therefore wished to defer these courses pending receipt of further information).

CRLS 051 (Introduction to Criminology) (Individual and Social Behavior): Qualify;

ECON 043 (Principles of Microeconomics) (Individual and Social Behavior): Qualify (these courses present few concerns and satisfy the templates);

PSYC 101 (Developmental PSYC 1) (Individual and Social Behavior): Qualify;

PSYC 103 (Developmental PSYC 3) (Individual and Social Behavior): Qualify;

PSYC 111 (Social PSYC) (Individual and Social Behavior): Qualify;

PSYC 165 (Human Sexuality) (Individual and Social Behavior): Qualify (All of these courses maintain PSYC 001 as a prerequisite; they were submitted by the department because some colleges may well have six to nine credits of social science and these courses typically are taken as a second and often the only other psychology course. It is also possible that some students may transfer in and test out of PSYC 001).

Finally, Group IV (Human Nature & Ethics; Science & Nature; Theology) had considered nine courses as well. Their recommendations were presented by Dr. Shelly Malin as follows:

Physics 001 (General Physics I) (Science and Nature): Qualify (excellent submission though more emphasis could be placed on the student’s ability to identify appropriate and inappropriate sources of information);

Physics 002 (General Physics II) (Science and Nature): Qualify (course proponents should be commended; template clearly identifies how the course relates to the knowledge area with inclusion of succinct, detailed information about how student learning is assessed in the course);

Physics 007 (Survey of Meteorology) (Science and Nature): Qualify (evaluation tool should communicate that a statement of commitment to a learning objective-specific assessment plan is needed as well as a new syllabus that clearly delineates learner focused objectives);

Physics 008 (Astronomy and Space Physics) (Science and Nature): Remand (subject matter is properly relegated to the core but template responses and syllabus do not frame the course so as to demonstrate how course pedagogy functions in terms of assessable learning objectives; encourage resubmission);

Physics 009 (Earth and Environmental Sciences) (Science and Nature): Defer Consideration (subcommittee needs additional time to evaluate template in light of earlier recommendations);

PRST 018 (Aspects of Modern Science) (Science and Nature): Remand (course holds strong potential for core but template should be resubmitted after subcommittee insures that proponent understands what CCRC is seeking in opening questions of template);

THEO 101 (New Testament Overview) (Theology): Qualify (evaluation tool should communicate that learning objective-specific assessment plan is needed; Committee should also solicit agreement to coordinate this assessment across all sections of THEO 101);

THEO 106 (Theology through the Centuries) (Theology): Qualify (evaluation tool should specify that learning objective-specific assessment plan is needed; Committee should also solicit agreement to coordinate this assessment across all sections);

THEO 111 (Explorations in Christian Theology) (Theology): Qualify (learning objective-specific assessment plan again needed; course should constitute an excellent second-level core course within the Theology knowledge area).

The subcommittees having concluded their analysis, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki moved to accept the recommendations of the subcommittees (Groups I through IV) as noted above. The motion was seconded
by Dr. John Pustejovsky; a vote will be called at the December 14 meeting.

VI. Additional Subcommittee Reports: Preamble Subcommittee. Dr. John Pustejovsky reported that the Preamble had been revised, effective November 15, 2001. In particular, revisions were made to the *Diverse Cultures* paragraph, and sections were renamed consistent with the Rationale Statement. In addition, the parenthetical remarks following each of the four Jesuit values were excised from Part I. Beyond these revisions, Dr. Pustejovsky noted that Dr. Stephanie Quade and Ms. Stephanie Russell, Executive Director of University Mission and Identity, had met with the subcommittee to offer their comments on its structure. However, Fr. Rossi reminded Committee members of their continuing need to discuss the overriding principles and role of the Preamble document. Questions remained about its audience and its purpose. Dr. Machan suggested as well that additional revision was necessary since even the revised Preamble continued to morph Literature and the Performing Arts. Dr. Ksobiech noted that originally Performing Arts was included in the Literature and Performing Arts knowledge area but only Literature had survived for inclusion within the core of common studies. Other members added that the parenthetical remarks excised from Part I should be excised as well from Part III of the final document. Dr. Snow acknowledged the need for holistic discussion of this document; she agreed that the document would be discussed at the December 14 meeting. She closed the meeting by noting that the Subcommittee on Transfers and ROTC had met and would continue to meet regarding ROTC courses whose learning objectives might satisfy core requirements as identified in the relevant templates.

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Reporter
Core Curriculum Review Committee
The meeting was called to order at 10:08 a.m. on Friday, December 14, 2001 in Cudahy Hall room by Dr. Nancy Snow. **Members Present:** Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Michele Malin, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Philip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Fr. Philip Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow, and Dr. Michael Wierzbicki. **Members Excused:** Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Ellen Eckman, and Prof. Christine Wiseman.

Opening prayer led by the Fr. Philip Rossi, S.J. In recognition of the last day of Ramadan, Fr. Rossi read a prayer for peace by Pope John Paul II.

I. Minutes. The Committee addressed the unapproved minutes of the November 30, 2001 meeting. Referring to the Chair’s report, Dr. Pustejovsky asked if the Committee had approved the addition of Executive Director of Mission and Identity, Ms. Stephanie Russell to the Committee. Dr. Snow replied that she had inferred the Committee's consensus. Dr. Byleen indicated that in the courses listed under Group II, Math 180 should be changed to Math 080. Dr. Courtright stated that for Group IV, Theology 006 should be changed to Theology 106. In the discussion of Psychology 165, Dr. Wierzbicki asked that the text read “a second and often the only other psychology course.” For clarification purposes only, Dr. Ksobiech noted regarding the discussion of the Preamble document that originally Performing Arts was included in the Literature and Performing Arts knowledge area. Dr. Laatsch moved to approve the minutes as amended. Dr. Maranto seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

II. Chair’s Report.

A. Spring Meeting Schedule
Dr. Snow presented the schedule for the spring semester. Thursday evening meetings will be held in David Straz, room 488; other meeting locations to be announced.

B. Meeting with Executive Director of Mission and Identity, Ms. Stephanie Russell
Dr. Snow reported on her meeting with Ms. Russell. Dr. Snow articulated the time commitments involved in the Committee and presented Ms. Russell with the Spring Semester meeting schedule. Ms. Russell will join the committee as a non-voting member. Dr. Snow reiterated the value in a strong connection between the work of the CCRC and the Office of Mission and Identity. Additionally, it was noted that Ms. Russell will be supervising the implementation of the recently-awarded Lilly grant, which includes provisions for core course development monies.

C. ROTC and Transfer subcommittee report
Dr. Snow reported that the subcommittee met and that they passed along the templates submitted for Group III (Individual and Social Behavior; Histories of Cultures and Societies).

III. Agenda Items

A. Revision of CCRC Documents: Template, Evaluation Tool and Guidelines

General discussion regarding the most recent revisions of the Core documents took place. Regarding the template, Dr. Laatsch indicated that while Item 4 asks the person submitting the template to attach a syllabus, the syllabi do not always include learning objectives. The question arose whether the template should be amended to ask for a “syllabus with learning objectives.” Dr. Courtright agreed, stating we should ask submitters to please include supplemental materials if learning objectives were not included on syllabi. Dr. Maranto stated that “supplemental materials” depends on faculty understanding of what a syllabus is, as there is no standard applied across the campus. She articulated as well that faculty members should be sure to share
learning objectives with their students. Dr. Laatsch suggested amending Item 4 of the template to read “Please attach a syllabus which includes course learning objectives.” Dr. Heinrich remarked that in Item 2 of the template there is no apparent connection between knowledge area objectives and course objectives. He suggested the following wording be added: “Correlation of the course’s learning objectives (as identified on the syllabus) with the learning objectives of the knowledge area will be particularly important to the review committee.” Dr. Courtright stated that the “language of documentation” must be written for non-specialists: perhaps we should specify “using appropriate language.” Dr. Maranto indicated that “appropriate” is probably not the right word; Dr. Snow suggested “non-technical.” Dr. Malin asked whether the template should note that since CCRC members represent all areas of the University, those submitting templates should please use non-technical language. It was determined that these suggestions could be incorporated in Item 2: Item 2 would thus begin “Briefly describe in non-technical language how this course enables students…” and end with Dr. Heinrich’s sentence as noted above. Dr. Pustejovsky asked whether Dr. Heinrich’s suggested addition should be on guidelines instead of the template.

Dr. Maranto questioned the applicability of Item 4 on the template for courses with multiple sections: do we need to specify all syllabi for multiple sections? She also asked how this language is incorporated on the checklist. Dr. Wierzbicki indicated that last summer, the members of the CCRC agreed that in cases of multiple sections, a representative syllabus would be solicited. Dr. Snow suggested leaving that wording as it is, and having subcommittees ask for additional syllabi if necessary. Fr. Rossi indicated that this is a key departmental responsibility: if a department submits a proposal with multiple sections, the CCRC can expect some indication of how sections are going to be coordinated. Dr. Maranto said that Item 7 of the template addresses this concern (“How will multiple sections achieve the same learning objectives? Please include departmental guidelines where appropriate”). Dr. Laatsch indicated that Items 13, 14, and 15 of the Template are not addressed in the evaluation tool or guidelines. Dr. Snow said Items 14 and 15 were added as the process has evolved and may be more informational in nature. Dr. Malin concurred that they were primarily informational, not connected to the approval or evaluative processes. Fr. Rossi said they are more than just informational; they are in some way educational of certain principles and should be incorporated by the academic community. He added that if members of the community were more strongly encouraged to discuss values and principles, we might be more inclined to use these in the evaluative process. Dr. Snow asked whether we should add them to the Guidelines or the Checklist. Fr. Rossi said that if we add them now, we are doing so ad hoc, and thus he suggested not adding them to the other documents. Dr. Courtright said that as long as they are here, we should add them to the “whole package.” Fr. Rossi said that in absence of prior discussion, we cannot make these items “functional” in terms of preparation or evaluation of templates. Dr. Snow joined the discussion by indicating that, for example, the Physics Department specifically included a justice perspective in a course submission, showing that the inclusion of these items on the Template may be yielding positive results. She raised the question again regarding including Items 13, 14 and 15 on Evaluation tool. Dr. Malin wondered if we would be using them in the evaluation process. Dr. Heinrich said that not having them on the checklist or other documents may imply that they are not as important as other items. Dr. Maranto asked whether these items are essential to course submissions. Dr. Courtright asked whether these are essential to approving some courses. Dr. Malin said we might want to use these items for later data analysis—not as evaluative information. For example, can they be used in a report on “the state of core courses.” Dr. Snow articulated that course submissions are addressing the items. Dr. Maranto asked whether information that was not being used to decide to accept a course should be included on the evaluation. Dr. Courtright said if submitters are answering the questions, we should take note. Dr. Pustejovsky said that criteria for course approval is based on learning objectives: Items 13, 14, and 15 were not designed as part of the approval process and should not be included in the evaluation tool or used in making recommendations regarding course approval. Dr. Malin asked whether we should comment on responses on the evaluation tool. Fr. Rossi indicated that he appreciates the inclusion of, for example, service learning information on submissions. He further indicated that by including space for comments on these items on the evaluations, CCRC
members can “commend” particular courses, even if we are not using these items to evaluate or approve courses. Dr. Snow tried to assess the Committee’s sentiment regarding the inclusion of Items 13, 14, and 15 on the evaluation tool and in guidelines. Dr. Ksobiech responded by indicating that we are looking with great depth at submissions: if we are denying courses, it is because they have missed the learning objectives in a large part. Dr. Malin commented on the helpfulness of the inclusion of the items to the ability able to provide “comments” or “friendly suggestions” for submitting departments. After much discussion, the general consensus seemed to be to include the items on the other documents. Dr. Heinrich suggested that any future changes to one document bring about changes in all documents. Dr. Snow recalled the motion from the previous meeting regarding approving revisions to all the documents (Template, Guidelines and Evaluation Tool), incorporating the suggested changes from the November 30 meeting, the December 14 meeting and including Dr. Heinrich’s amendment regarding changes in one document henceforth resulting in parallel changes to all other documents where appropriate. The Motion was unanimously approved, including the 2 proxies for excused voting members.

B. Discussion and vote on subcommittee recommendations

The Committee then turned its attention to the other motion pending from the November 30, 2001 meeting, the subcommittee recommendations regarding course submissions. Regarding Group IV, Science and Nature, Dr. Courtright brought up a question regarding the Physics course submissions. He identified Physics 008 and 009 as the “non-science” major courses. He asked if Physics 007 conforms to 008 and 009 and indicated if we are approving 007, we should approve 008 and if we do not approve 008, we should re-consider 007. Fr. Rossi said that dialog with department should be considered. In a discussion regarding the role of courses that primarily serve general education needs of the student body, Fr. Rossi suggested that it is helpful for departments to recognize that these needs can be quite different from the needs of students in courses that are introductory for majors within a particular discipline. Regarding the approval process for the Physics courses, Dr. Heinrich said that the evaluation tool utilized for Physics courses and written feedback was provided to department. Dr. Snow indicated that there has been some miscommunication with the Physics department, resulting in a timing issue in terms of submission of physics courses. Dr. Malin suggested that the subcommittee meet again to discuss all physics courses and defer Physics 007, 008, and 009.

In Group II, Mathematical Reasoning, Dr. Heinrich brought up the submission for Philosophy 001 and the question raised by Philosophy Chair, Dr. John Jones: is there no place in core for a logic course? He indicated that the course submission was strong, but the course content may not fit best in the Mathematical Reasoning knowledge area. Dr. Byleen said most of the course syllabus and submission seemed to consist of rhetoric. The text seemed to emphasize argumentation and the percent of the course that is dedicated to “symbolism” seemed low. Dr. Ksobiech said that logic is a key course that does not seem to fit learning objectives for math or rhetoric areas.

No other discussion arose so Dr. Snow recalled the motion from the previous meeting regarding the subcommittee recommendations on the following course submissions:


Group IV (Human Nature and Ethics; Science and Nature; Theology): Approve: Physics 001, Physics 002, Theo 101, Theo 106, Theo 111; Remand: PRST 018; Defer: Physics 007, 008, 009.

The motion to approve the subcommittee recommendations as amended at the meeting passed unanimously, including the 2 proxies for excused voting members.

C. Discussion on Preamble to the Marquette Core of Common Studies

Dr. Snow began this portion of the meeting by indicating that this will not be the only discussion of the preamble; we will also bring it up at the next meeting. Dr. Maranto said the Preamble has been vastly improved in terms of accessibility and readability. She raised a concern over the wording in the diverse cultures area about foreign language. She indicated that “Reflective appropriation of this diversity” should be a goal of the study of foreign culture and not just foreign language. Dr. Machan made more general comments regarding the Preamble, beginning by indicating that he finds the document hard to follow. He questioned the audience and purpose intended for the document. Fr. Rossi discussed the subcommittee meetings and document origins: he indicated that while the document was being constructed, its audience has shifted. He further stated that the question of the document’s audience is connected to the broader issue of the “function of the document with respect to the decision-making of the committee” and the function of document with respect to the shape of the broader discussion of undergraduate education at Marquette. Was the document originally for the faculty? It could be used to engage faculty in a reflective discussion of formative principles of curriculum. Is it for students? Is it a public document? The original writing of the document was not focused on engaging a particular audience, and it has not been a document that has been widely discussed. Dr. Pustejovsky said not much discussion has happened. The preamble originated in the first of the most recent Core committees, as the committee searched for principles.

A discussion ensued regarding the “voice” of document. Dr. Pustejovsky indicated that he wanted first personal plural to reflect voice of faculty. He envisioned a document that was “the assent of the faculty.” He stated during the revisions that Fr. Pat Burns articulated a need for a piece to wed the mission statement of the University and the “knowledge, skills, and abilities” documents being produced in conjunction with the core revision. Dr. Machan said we need a different document for students. Dr. Malin suggested two separate documents, 1) guiding principles for faculty and 2) a document introducing the process to students. Fr. Rossi indicated that the prior work of the CCRC (the focus groups, the establishment of the CCRC, and the discussion with the Academic Senate) had not included a process for the broader discussion of a statement of principles. Fr. Rossi said the preamble might be most important piece, as it might prompt a much-needed discussion of values and principles. He asked if the preamble focus group meetings had ever been connected with the rest of the core process, positing that since the learning objectives and preamble were never “re-integrated” after the focus group meetings their terminology was still unclear. Dr. Pustejovsky said the document has three parts because of different authors. Dr. Machan thanked Dr. Pustejovsky and Fr. Rossi for these insights into the history of the document and indicated he was glad to have clarity on its audience. He continued, however, that he remains unclear about some of the rhetoric of the document: the values implied by the document do not seem to apply to all. He felt there was an anger or militancy that runs through the document and that there are some values articulated in the document that do not necessarily reflect what we do. Dr. Courtright stated that he is uncomfortable with the document, and thought it needed a “Philadelphia try-out:” he does not think it is ready for Broadway in its current form. Dr. Machan added that the document is not coherent, its parts don’t hang together. Dr. Wierzbicki said many social sciences faculty are not happy with the document in its current form and feel that social sciences are not portrayed as “equal” to other areas and are left out of whole portions of the document.

Dr. Malin asked whether the committee could agree on the audience for the document and commission members of the English and communication faculty to re-tool it. Dr. Quade
mentioned that in addition to audience, the purpose of the document should also be agreed on. Dr. Machan asked how the “whole report” will proceed and whether the preamble was intended to be part of the official Committee report. He further indicated that he felt that concerns with the document seem to go beyond re-tooling; there are some basic issues of context that need to be addressed. Dr. Malin asked what is the best way to re-edit the document. Dr. Pustejovsky asked whether this is a statement by the faculty to the faculty. Dr. Quade asked whether we need a preamble and a statement of principles. Dr. Pustejovsky asked why do we call it a preamble. He further stated that the document needs focus, and needs to bear interpretation suggesting a finished product that is “half expository, half historical.” Mr. Lowrey said in its current state the document has “an edge” and needs to be briefer and more meaningful. Dr. Pustejovsky suggested we “go at it again” with a specific charge from the CCRC. Dr. Snow said we need a bridge between the mission statement and the core to go along with the final report, in order to frame and contextualize the core and knowledge areas. Dr. Wierzbicki said we needed to consider North Central accreditation and be able to articulate how do we go from the mission statement to the core: he also called for a “bridge document.” Dr. Courtright stated that the audience for the document should be the faculty, but its focus should be what we want students to learn. Dr. Quade said a Marquette specific document is needed. Fr. Rossi said that in editing or rewriting, it is important to keep communication open and ensure broad representation from the whole community. He also stated that the document should be aspirational and challenging, not simply reflective of how we deliver courses. Dr. Snow indicated that we were striving for a document that is “challenging but not cranky.” Dr. Pustejovsky asked about aspirations: this needs to be a founding document in terms of changing nature of Jesuit education. Dr. Naylor indicated that he appreciates the links to Jesuit education and history in the current document, but agreed that the document needs revision. He appreciates the placing of Marquette in a historical context. Dr. Snow said the document needed to reflect Marquette in its past, present, and future. She asked where justice is embedded in the document and indicated that it is harder to have justice emphasized in the core without its being emphasized in the “bridge” document. She then solicited volunteers to work on the next iteration of the document. Dr. Pustejovsky volunteered and Dr. Naylor offered to help. Dr. Ksobiech suggested simply sending all feedback to Dr. Snow. Dr. Courtright asked whether we should involve a member of the Jesuit community. Dr. Heinrich suggested that Drs. Naylor and Pustejovsky create an outline first and then secure the committee’s endorsement of the basic outline of this document. Dr. Malin asked Drs. Naylor and Pustejovsky to send us a proposed outline and they agreed to do so. Dr. Wierzbicki asked whether we should produce more than one document. Dr. Courtright asked whether there was university charter we could refer to in drafting this document.

There being no further discussion regarding any of the agenda items, Dr. Snow thanked the committee members for their continued productivity and work and wished everyone a Merry Christmas. The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie L. Quade